# Ablenormativity AFF

## 1AC- Draft

#### This year’s debate topic tasks us with devising new ways to invest in America’s transportation infrastructure. Unfortunately, most traditional debate teams will approach the topic in an inherently ableist way through modes of transportation infrastructure that are inherently ablenormative in the status quo.

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1652 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Disabled people's mobility and movement are highly circumscribed by sociocultural attitudes, practices, and the related design of the built environment. From the microarchitecture of urban streetscapes, to the discontinuous nature of transportation infrastructure and networks, one can agree with Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 605) who suggest that it is ``hegemonic bodies that are culturally formative of the codes and idioms'' which condition the norms of movement and mobility (also, see Corker, 1998; 1999; Hughes, 1999). Such norms revolve around conceptions of the bodily incompetence of people with physical and mental impairments, while propagating welfare policies and procedures which seek to discipline disabled people into a state (and status) of nonimpaired carnality. For disabled people, then, their immobility is their own fault or the consequences of a deviant corporeality which requires medical care and rehabilitation or, failing that, the application of charitable works.

#### As debaters, we construct an ideal image of what the world should look like and how this ideal image may come to fruition through investing in more transportation infrastructure. We ignore whom our plans and advocacies serve to increase transportation infrastructure for. Debaters assume that our goal is to save the lives of other people. Utilitarian thought causes us to assume that every human being is the same. We disregard difference and that maybe some people can’t access the very infrastructure we invest in. Our research focuses on the able body. What can we perfect? What is imperfect now serves as something to be rectified.

#### This Ablenormativity fails to theorize difference-it idealizes a conception of “able-bodiedness”

Campbell, Griffith University, 8

(Fiona Kumari, 2008, “Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism,” M/C Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2008), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46/0>, Date Accessed: 7/2, JS)

Typically literature within disability and cultural studies has concentrated on the practices and production of disablism, specifically by examining those attitudes and barriers that contribute to the subordination of people with disabilities in liberal society. Disablism is a set of assumptions (conscious or unconscious) and practices that promote the differential or unequal treatment of people because of actual or presumed disabilities. On this basis the strategic positions adopted to facilitate emancipatory social change whilst diverse, essentially relate to reforming those negative attitudes, assimilating people with disabilities into normative civil society and providing compensatory initiatives and safety nets in cases of enduring vulnerability. In other words, the site of reformation has been at the intermediate level of function, structure and institution in civil society and shifting values in the cultural arena. Such an emphasis produces scholarship that contains serious distortions, gaps and omissions regarding the production of disability and re-inscribes an able-bodied voice/lens towards disability. Disability, often quite unconsciously, continues to be examined and taught from the perspective of the Other (Marks; Solis). The challenge then is to reverse, to invert this traditional approach, to shift our gaze and concentrate on what the study of disability tells us about the production, operation and maintenance of ableism.

The earlier work of Tom Shakespeare concludes, “… perhaps the maintenance of a non-disabled identity … is a more useful problem with which to be concerned; rather than interrogating the other, let us de-construct the normality-which-is-to-be-assumed” (28). Hughes captures this project forcefully by calling for a study of the “pathologies of non-disablement” (683). An Abled imaginary relies upon the existence of an hitherto unacknowledged imagined shared community of able-bodied/minded people (c.f. Butler & Parr) held together by a common ableist homosocial world view that asserts the preferability and compulsoriness of the norms of ableism. Overboe and Campbell point to the compulsion to emulate the norm through the internalisation of ableism. Ableistnormativity results in compulsive passing, wherein there is a failure to ask about difference, to imagine human be-ingness differently.

Ableism operates as master trope illuminating the fundamental tactic of oppression—the naturalization of social inferiority as biological difference

Siebers, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism, 9

Tobin, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, Lecture, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdisabilities.temple.edu%2Fmedia%2Fds%2Flecture20091028siebersAesthetics_FULL.doc&ei=LWz4T6jyN8bHqAHLkY2LCQ&usg=AFQjCNGdkDuSJkRXMHgbXqvuyyeDpldVcQ&sig2=UCGDC4tHbeh2j7-Yce9lsA>, accessed 7/7/12, sl)

Oppression is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves “groups,” and not “individuals,” means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority—what some call “in-built” or “biological” inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics—not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed.

One additional thought must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. “Racism” disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. “Sexism” disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. “Classism” disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. “Ableism” disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature.

As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority—and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression—the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.

#### **Instead, we begin our engagement with this year’s resolution by turning to narratives of embodied experience with transportation infrastructure**

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

A more critical reading of contemporary disability life writing has the potential to render these works not simply as individualistic trauma narratives, but as important sites of social action and critique (Couser, 2005). As Mark Sherry (2005) stated, attending to these texts, which situate the body at the "intersection of biological and the discursive" (p. 168), forces us to consider how disability is "simultaneously a very personal and an intensely social experience" (p. 164). In other words, life writing helps to complicate the disability/impairment distinction that has been rightly critiqued for ignoring the ways that impairment itself is constructed and for erasing the experiences of people with chronic illness and other nonobvious disabilities. Multiply situated and grounded in embodied experience, much of contemporary disability life writing can and should be read as challenging a tangle of oppressive ideologies and destabilizing any claim to a normative or fixed center. Moreover, rather than eliding the body, these narratives insist that critical theory, perception, and subjectivity are all grounded in the "poetics and politics" (Mintz, 2007) of the lived and situated body. What we see in disability life writing is a "conscious rendering of altered physicality in prose" (Kuusisto, 2005, p. 150). As such, disability life writing offers a necessary "return to the visceral in disability studies," resulting in theorizing that is at once personal, social, political, and embodied (Mintz, p. 3).

#### Jean Flynn in 2012

Jean M. Flynn, June 29, 2012, “Lorain County Transit- an unacceptable situation”

<http://midlifeandtreachery.wordpress.com/2012/06/29/lorain-county-transit-an-unacceptable-situation/>, accessed 7/12/12

Imagine you woke up tomorrow and there were no cars. You didn’t have one, your neighbor didn’t have one, your cousin in Vermillion didn’t have one.

Also no bikes, vespas, or motorcycles. No highway transport of any kind, except for the occasional delayed and underfunded ambulance.

So you could get to medical care sometimes.

But what is the list of things you are completely unable to do?

If groceries aren’t close, that’s shot. What about your pharmacy?

I’m one of the lucky ones. By accident of location I am close to church, banking, pharmacy, and groceries.)

What about clothing, shoes, or dental care? Glasses?

Never mind the out of reach luxury of visiting friends, taking in a movie, or going to the park. Out to dinner? Forget about it.

That’s the kind of life that many many people with disabilities live in Lorain County right now, and have since 2009 when paratransit and fixed transit disappeared from everywhere in Lorain County except Lorain and Elyria in 2009. (With some exceptions that I’ll detail in a moment.)

And please don’t bring out that tired old saw: “We don’t have that problem in Lorain County…I never see any folks with disabilities in my business anyway so it’s not my problem.”

The \*reason\* you don’t see us spending our time or money in your businesses, houses of worship, or homes, folks….is because we \*cannot get to them.\* If we cannot get to then, how would you ever be able to accurately grasp the scope of the problem?

Some of us do not have friends or family with accessible transport that can step in. It’s not like there’s a lift van in every garage.

We cannot walk where we need to go.

We cannot defray some of our own “cost” to society as we would very much like to do, by full or part time employment, because how in the heck do we get there? One of my neighbors lost a cool job because her transport source became inaccessible to her.

There was a meeting last week for us to voice our opinions about this. Be heard.

Irony of Ironies,

Couldn’t get there to talk about why I couldn’t get there,,,,,

#### Mia Mingus in 2010

Mia Mingus 5/3/10, is a queer physically disabled woman of color, korean transracial and transnational adoptee writer, organizer and community builder, “Wherever You Are Is Where I Want To Be: Crip Solidarity”, <http://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2010/05/03/where-ever-you-are-is-where-i-want-to-be-crip-solidarity/>, accessed 7/12/12

I want to be with you. If you can’t go, then I don’t want to go. If we are traveling together, sharing political space together, building political family together, then I want to be with you. I want us to be together.

We resist ableism dividing us. I resist my disability being pitted against your disability. We will not be divided.

What does crip solidarity look like? Between crips?

We are traveling, trying to track down food. My chair can’t go into this restaurant, your dog isn’t allowed in that restaurant; so we will order in. You can’t fly to the meeting, so we will come to you—all of us. They won’t let you go to the bathroom because they say you’re “too slow”, so we will demand they do—and make them wait for you—together. Sometimes we are comrades, sometimes we are strangers, but we will stay together. We move together.

I know what it is like to be left behind, left out, forgotten about. I know you know as well. We vow to not do that together, to each other.

I am not “giving-up” an evening out with able bodied friends. This is a glorious evening in with crip love as opposed to a night out without you (and without parts of me). Loving you more helps me to love me more. Loving me means loving you.

Because the truth is, I am continually giving-up the able-bodied-washed version of myself that people have come to know. What I came to know as a disabled child because I never knew things could be any other way. For most of my life it has been easier to perform a survival able-bodied-friendly version of myself, rather than nurturing the harder to live disabled-self-loving version of who I ache, desire and need to be. Because it has often meant the difference between a-little-bit-more-connection and a-little-less-isolation. But what is the point of connection, if you still feel isolated and alienated from your self? And what is that connection built upon and from? How do I want to be connected?

And it is not easy. But being together helps.

And when taxis won’t take us because of one of us, or both of us. And I can’t use mass transit, but you can. Then we will use our crip super community powers and do what we do best: make shit happen; make something out of nothing; and survive, one ride, one pill, one stop to rest at a time. Together.

We will find other ways (create our own ways) and talk liberation and access and interdependency with our comrades. We will weave need into our relationships like golden, shimmering glimmers of hope—opportunities to build deeper, more whole and practice what our world could look like. We will practice what loving each other could look like every day. Courageously. And we will help each other to do it, in the face of seductive ableism; in the face of isolation as queer people of color, again; in the face of isolation from political community and movements, again. We will help each other love each other and, in doing so, love ourselves.

#### Narratives help us understand the epistemology of the inherent ableism in debate and society- Our use of the narrative relating to disability studies is crucial to disrupting abelist modes of thought.

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, [http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability\_Life\_Writing\_and\_the\_Politics\_of\_Knowing](%20http%3A//syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing), accessed 7/12/12)

Seeking to interrupt the dominant scripts of disability (Ferri, 2008) and to delve more deeply into the "interplay between ableism and other aspects of [identity and] culture" (Baglieri, Bejoian, Broderick, Connor, &Valle, 2011, this issue), scholars in disability studies in education (DSE), like scholars in other critical fields of inquiry, increasingly employ interdisciplinary methods in their research and teaching. To counter a critical understandings of disability in special education discourse, for example, scholars in disability studies often incorporate fiction, film, popular culture, and first-person narratives into their teaching and scholarly work. These works are valued for their ability to help us to "imagine disability otherwise . . . and move beyond overly deterministic normalizing discourses of cure and care" within clinical and popular discourses (Ware, 2002, p. 146).

Autobiographical narratives as a form of "counter discourse" (Couser, 1997) are valued for their ability to "talk back" to dominant understandings of disability as deficit (Mintz, 2007). Disability life writing locates "disability as a complex social, political, and embodied position from which an individual might legitimately narrate [his/]her life experience" (p. 17). These kinds of narratives "do cultural work. They frame our understandings of raw, unorganized experience, giving it coherent meaning and making it accessible to us through story" (Garland-Thomson, 2007, p. 121). In other words, these texts should be seen as a form of social critique. Of course, the publishing industry, like the film and television industry, privileges sentimental and emotional stories that position disability as loss, or triumphal stories of individuals overcoming adversity through sheer force of will or determination (Couser, 2002). Such stereotypical portrayals of the inspirational "super-crip" who succeeds against the odds seem designed to make "disability palatable to an ableist" audience (Mintz, p. 17). According to Couser, however, autobiographical works that are counterdiscursive are written from the "inside of experience," in ways that are self-consciously political and challenge conventional meanings ascribed to disability (pp. 109-110).

#### Traditional approaches to the problem of ablenormative modes of transportation will attempt to “solve” the problem using a macro-level change in national policy. History proves that this approach will do nothing. The Americans with Disabilities Act passed in the 1990s attempted to apply regulations to the industry in order to accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities, but did very little to actually “solve” the problem – in fact, this change in policy only perpetuated ableist modes of thought in transportation policy

#### Ableism requires a shift in orientation – Vote to affirm the life writings in the 1ac

Cherney, Wayne State University, Department of Communications, Assistant Professor 11

(James L, 2011, Disability Studies Quarterly, “The Rhetoric of Ableism”,Vol 31, No 3, <http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/1665/1606>, accessed 7-4-12 FFF)

Recognizing ableism requires a shift in orientation, a perceptual gestalt framed by the filter of the term "ableism" itself. The same texts that broadcast "Ableism!" to those oriented to perceive it are usually read innocently even when viewed from a liberal, humanitarian, or progressive perspective. Ableism is so pervasive that it is difficult to identify until one begins to interrogate the governing assumptions of well-intentioned society. Within the space allowed by these rhetorical premises, ableism appears natural, necessary, and ultimately moral discrimination required for the normal functioning of civilization. Consider a set of stairs. An ableist culture thinks little of stairs, or even sees them as elegant architectural devices—especially those grand marble masterpieces that elevate buildings of state. But disability rights activists see stairs as a discriminatory apparatus—a "no crips allowed" sign that only those aware of ableism can read—that makes their inevitable presence around government buildings a not-so-subtle statement about who belongs in our most important public spaces. But the device has become so accepted in our culture that the idea of stairs as oppressive technology will strike many as ludicrous. Several years ago when I began to study ableism, a professor—unconvinced of the value of the project—questioned my developing arguments by pointing to a set of steps and exclaiming, "Next you'll be telling me that those stairs discriminate!" He was right.

The professor's surprise suggests that commonplace cultural assumptions support themselves because the very arguments available against them seem unwarranted and invalid. Interrogating stairs was such an outrageous idea that a simple reductio ad absurdum argument depicted the critique of ableism as a fallacy. As an ingrained part of the interpretive frameworks sanctioned by culture, ableism gets reinforced by the everyday practice of interpreting and making sense of the world. Using this idea of what ableism does at the intersection of rhetoric and ideology, I next develop a way of understanding how it operates. I argue that this way of conceiving ableist thinking as rhetorical practice identifies potential approaches for challenging ableism.

#### Our aff exposes the “normative” able body as central to policy making against the disruptive disabled “other”-you as the judge should not view the round as a hypothetical policymaker, –policy making only re-enforces acts that re-entrench ableism. In order to change debate as well, we need to re-assess how we both judge rounds, and how we are told (by debaters) to judge rounds. By refusing to be a traditional policy maker, we will in turn advance socially and politically in term of rejecting ablenormativity in debate, and further encouraging others.

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 350 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC

Disability studies teaches that an assumed able body is crucial to the smooth operation of traditional theories of democracy, citizenship, subjectivity, beauty, and capital. By assuming that the normative human is an able-bodied adult, for example, liberal theory can conflate political or economic interests with desires, political representation with having a voice in policy-making, social organization with voluntary association, and so on. Liberal theory naturalizes the political by making it personal. And the “person” at the center of the traditional liberal theory is not simply an individual locus of subjectivity (however psychologically fragmented, incoherent, or troubled). He is an able-bodied locus of subjectivity, one whose unskilled labor may be substituted freely for the labor of other such individuals, one who can imagine himself largely self-sufficient because almost everything conspires to help him take his enabling body for granted (even when he is scrambling for the means of subsistence). However, the mere possibility of a severely cognitively disabled adult citizen disrupts the liberal equations of representation and voice, desire and interest. Advocacy for the severely cognitively disabled is not a matter of voicing their demands. More generally, the intricate practical dialectics of dependence and independence in the lives of many disabled people unsettle ideals of social organization as freely chosen expressions of mutual desire.

#### Ableism is an a priori social issue that we need to debate about in order to change the status quo- reflects a deep culture of ideology and disability. Our alternative conception of debate is to re-examine the epistemology of ableism and how it is entrenched in our discourse, rhetoric, and actions as policy debaters. We need to re-evaluate how we learn and teach debate, but above all we must re-evaluate how we as debaters participate in the activity and how we represent our actions.

Longmore, professor of history and director of the Institute on Disability, ‘9

(Paul K.,“Making Disability and Essential Part of American History,” Organization of American Historians Magazine of History, Volume: 23, Issue 3, 2009, P. 11, LPS).

At that conference, a planning group focused on disability history curricular materials to aid middle school and high school history and social studies teachers. A particularly valuable resource for those teachers is being developed online at the Disability History Museum. The team building that impressive website is continually adding to the wide-ranging stock of primary source documents and historical images in its “Library.” Its “Education” section, which is under construction, will include “Teacher Resources” and “Course Packets.” The site will also ultimately include a “Museum” which will present online exhibits and a newsletter. Even in its present state, the “Library” is a useful teaching resource (8). "[Disability] is not just part of people's private lives. It is a social problem Americans grapple with in the public arena, a cultural metaphor they unconsciously but constantly invoke, a political and policy issue they debate. In each of these areas, disability operated in distinctive ways. Yet at the same time, its functioning in all of them reflected a deeper culture-wide modern ideology of disability."

## Status Quo

### Mobility

#### Status quo depictions of mobility reinforce ablenormativity

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1641-1642 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

The inequities of mobility and movement are connected to sociocultural values and practices which prioritise mobile bodies or those characterised by societally defined norms of health, fitness, and independence of bodily movements. Such bodies are, as Ellis (2000, page 5) notes, ``naturalised as a biological given'' and projected as ``the legitimate basis of order in a humanist world''. Illustrative of this are the plethora of metaphors of mobility and movement which are infused with conceptions of bodily completeness and independence, of the (normal) body far removed from those with physical and mental impairments. Such representations counterpoise the mobile body to the immobile, the capacitated to the incapacitated, the abled to the disabled, and the normal to the abnormal. These binary divides reinforce what Oliver (1990) refers to as a ``legacy of negativism'', or values which mark out disabled people as ``problems because they are seen to deviate from the dominant culture's view of what is desirable, normal, socially acceptable, and safe'' (Corker, 1999, page 20; in addition, see Abberley, 1987; Paterson and Hughes, 1999).

#### The hegemony of the mobile body in policymaking refuses recognition of differing embodiements

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1643 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Such discourses see disability as a social burden which is a private, not public, responsibility. The impairment is the focus of concern, and biological intervention and care are seen as the appropriate responses. The problem of immobility is seen as personal and specific to the impairment; that it is this that needs to be eradicated, rather than transformations in sociocultural attitudes and practices, if mobility is to be restored. In particular, political and policy assumptions about mobility and movement are premised on a universal, disembodied subject which is conceived of as neutered, that is without sex, gender, or any other attributed social or biological characteristic (see Hall, 1996; Imrie, 1994; Law, 1999; Whitelegg, 1997). The hegemony of what one might term the mobile body is decontextualised from the messy world of multiple and everchanging embodiments; where there is little or no recognition of bodily differences or capabilities. The mobile body, then, is conceived of in terms of independence of movement and bodily functions; a body without physical and mental impairments.

### SQ – Car & Highway Bias

#### Cars are ablenormative

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1643 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Barnes et al (1999, page 121), for instance, note that UK households with a disabled person are half as likely as those without to own a car (also, see OPCS, 1993). In addition, most cars are designed for standardised bodies and few mobility-impaired or ambulantimpaired disabled people are able to get into one. Specially adapted cars are expensive, and insurers regard disabled people as a risk and charge high motor insurance premiums. These experiences are connected to the domination of medical discourses which are infused with conceptions of the incapacitated and immobile body, or the body which is malfunctioning due to a loss of functional capacity. Disabled people are portrayed as less than whole and as a population requiring particular forms of regulation, discipline, and control by state programmes and policies. Indeed, Le¨vi-Strauss (1955) refers to modern societies as anthropoemic or, asYoung (1999, page 56) defines it, societies that ``vomit out deviants, keeping them outside of society or enclosing them in special institutions''.

#### **People with disabilities lack transportation- biased towards highways and cars**

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(5-8-12, American Association of People with Disabilities, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” <http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf>, p.1, accessed 6-30-12, LH)

Transportation and mobility play key roles in the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity in the disability community. Affordable and reliable transportation allows people with disabilities access to important opportunities in education, employment, health care, housing, and community life. Because our nation’s investments in transportation infrastructure have disproportionately favored cars and highways, those who cannot afford cars or do not drive cars often lack viable transportation options. People with disabilities—particularly in rural areas— need accessible, affordable transportation options that bring employment, health care, education, housing, and community life within reach.

### Ableist Transportation

#### We live within a disabling world which only perpetuates oppressive behavior

Lang, Overseas Development Group Senior Research Associate, 1

(Dr. Raymond, January, 2001, University of East Anglia, Overseas Development Group, “THE DEVELOPMENT AND CRITIQUE OF THE SOCIAL MODEL OF DISABILITY,” http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lc-ccr/lccstaff/raymond-lang/DEVELOPMMENT\_AND\_CRITIQUE\_OF\_THE\_SOCIAL\_MODEL\_OF\_D.pdf, accessed: 7-8-12, CAS)

Disabled people have been subjected to a multiplicity of oppressive social attitudes throughout history, which have included “horror, fear, anxiety, hostility, distrust, pity, over-protection and patronizing behavior” (Barton, L. 1996:8). Such pejorative attitudes, coupled with an inhospitable physical environment such, as inaccessible buildings and unusable transport systems, are considered to be the real concerns of disability. (Barnes, C. 1991). It is therefore maintained that “disabled people live within a disabling world”.

#### Ableist transportation is like a giant set of stairs bringing the highway to a screeching halt for the disabled

Scott Pruett community-based therapeutic recreation, Sarah Pruett, occupational therapist, 12

(Scott & Sarah Pruett, April 23, 2012 “UniversalDesign: Simplified.” [http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook pg. 4-5 accessed 7-8-12](http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook%20pg.%204-5%20accessed%207-8-12) BC)

Imagine if you hopped in your car one day and on the way to your destination, you had no other choice but to come to a screeching stop because you came upon a set of stairs in the middle of the road. (Your car wasn’t designed to climb stairs, obviously.)

That’d be crazy, right?!

 Imagine the feelings and emotions you might have. What are the chances that you’d consider driving your car down “Stairway Drive” ever again? I’m guessing a big fat zero.

Yes, this is a fictional scenario that would never happen, but it is a valid analogy that may help give you an idea of what people with less-than-perfect levels of ability encounter on a regular basis. There are barriers in our society that can force someone to come to a screeching halt because of a disability. The effects of enough encounters with barriers are detrimental to one’s ability to feel safe, comfortable, and successful in life. Barriers that exist for some people may be completely invisible, unless you know what to look for.

### Transportation Infrastructure

#### Limits mobility options

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1643 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

For many people, their inability to go places or restrictions on their mobility and movement is of paramount importance in their everyday lives. Children, for example, are often not permitted to travel unaccompanied on airlines and find their access to places reduced by heavy doors and high counters.(4) A raft of research also highlights the gendered nature of mobility and, in particular, women's unequal access to transport (Huxley, 1997; Little et al, 1988; Massey, 1994; Matrix, 1984; Wajcman, 1991). Likewise, the mobility of ethnic minorities is often confined to particular times of day and places because of fear of racial abuse and physical assault (Greater London Council, 1985; Wajcman, 1991). Moreover, elderly people often find their movement and mobility restricted by virtue of a poorly designed built environment, including narrow and uneven pavements and steep steps into shops (Hine, 1999; Hine and Mitchell, 2001). Such illustrations indicate that the mobility and movement of a large segment of the population are limited by existing patterns of transportation provision and related infrastructure, and this is particularly so for disabled people.

## Life Writing Good

### Life Writing - Ovelgone

Eric Ovelgone, “Low Speed Vehicle Laws need to be updated for Disabled” 7/11/12

<http://darkrubymoon.blogspot.com/2012/07/low-speed-vehicle-laws-need-to-be.html>

For those of you who don't know me or follow this blog only through my DarkRubyMoon store, I was born with a disability called Spinal Muscular Atrophy or SMA for short which is a form of muscular dystrophy that has confined me to a wheelchair since birth. Such a disability creates endless complexities and complications with navigating a world in which everything is designed for the able-bodied, particularly with respect to transportation. Bus services and public transportation for the disabled, when rarely available is undependable and unreliable at best. As I can only ride in a wheelchair lift equiped van, my sole means of transportation has been either friends or family providing my transportation. Now that my mother has suffered a severe stroke, and with my dad aging, I am almost totally confined to our house.

For years, I've been looking for some means to be able to drive myself, even if it was just as far as to the local grocery store. Considering the severity of my disability and the excessive cost for converting a van or other vehicle such that I could drive it, I've always assumed that I would never be able to drive. Even if I could manage to find the 80,000 dollars needed to convert a van such that I could drive it, I simply would not feel safe handling such a large vehicle with my limited mobility and ability to react. It would simply be too dangerous, not only for myself, but for others on the road as well. Then I discovered that two small companies have begun to produce low-speed vehicles just for the disabled. Small cars made specifically for individuals with severe physical disabilities that would make it possible for someone like me to have some small amount of independence. The Kenguru

http://kenguru.com/ and the Quovis http://quovis.com/ are two low speed vehicles designed to carry one driver in a wheelchair. Because these vehicles are low speed and drive just like a wheelchair, the control and safety is exactly what I would need to become mobile.

Unfortunately, while such a vehicle exist that is ideal for my disability, laws in my state and many states simply have not adapted. Low speed vehicles are only capable of speeds up to 35 miles per hour, and my state Maryland limits their use to only roads with a max speed of 30.

Q:Are operations of low speed vehicles on roadways restricted to certain posted speeds?

 A:Yes, a person may not drive a low speed vehicle on a roadway for which the posted maximum speed limit exceeds 30 miles per hour; or on an expressway or another controlled access highway that is signed so as to prohibit the use of these type of vehicles on its roadways.

Q:May I use my low speed vehicle to take my driver test?

A:No, individuals may not use a low speed vehicle to obtain a driver's license. (MVA)

So, not only could I not drive this vehicle off my driveway onto a road with a 40 mile per hour speed limit, I couldn't take a driver's test to get a license for it as this is the only vehicle I can actually drive and you are not permitted to take a driver's test in a low speed vehicle. Maryland and other states need to look into making LSV (Low Speed Vehicle) lanes and making exceptions for individuals with disabilities to get LSV licenses. LSV are very fuel efficient, and exist for the non-disabled as well and are often environmentally friendly as many are fully electric. They generally can't meet the same safety requirements of regular vehicles, but would be very safe if low speed vehicle lanes existed such that collisions with full sized vehicles were unlikely. With fuel cost rising and environmental concerns, it makes sense not only for individuals with disabilities, but for everyone. I should note that while both the Kenguru and Quovis are significantly cheaper than any other mode of transportation for the disabled, they are still significantly more expensive than a standard car costing between $20,000 and $25,000. The only funding for vehicles for the disabled is through vocational rehabilitation which may pay for a vehicle, but only if it is required to get to work. They will not however pay for nursing care which individual may need to get dressed to go to work... and typically once a person is employed, they loose all medical insurance unless it is provided by an employer (a necessity when a new wheelchair cost $16,000).

### Life Writing Good

#### Narratives function as embodied social critique

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

There is much to be learned by attending critically to disability life writing. By allowing the personal to inform the social, we insist on an embodied disability theory as an important site of knowledge production and social critique. Read in this way, memoir becomes an intervention into the politics of knowing as well as the politics of representation. As such, memoirs should not be seen as counter to theory or politics, but should be understood as a form of social action for their ability to talk back to dominant scripts and point to a more embodied form of social critique. Refusing to cede to any one authoritative discourse, disability memoir is theory that, as Mairs (1996a) wrote, stays “close to the bone” (p.17).

#### Embodied life writings rupture binary distinctions in disability theorizing

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

A central defining feature of disability studies aims to dislodge the medical model of disability, replacing narrow and deficit-based understandings of disability with alternative knowledge claims grounded in disabled people's subjective and situated experience. Scholars of contemporary disability studies, for example, locate disabilities within the structures of society rather than within the biology or essence of individuals. Yet, this focus on the social has inadvertently led to a false dichotomy between the social and the personal—mirroring other binary distinctions like mind/body, public/private, ability/disability. Inevitably, when the personal is positioned in opposition to the social, autobiographical works can be seen as too personal, too individualist (Davis, 1997), or too confessional (Mitchell & Snyder, 1997). Yet, to read disability life writing this way is to miss the theory at work in these works.

Instead, by drawing from a more feminist grounded disability studies, I argue that autobiographies of oppressed groups should be read as important sites of intellectual and political resistance (McKay, 1998) rather than apolitical and overly sentimentalized stories about individuals succeeding against the odds or overcoming adversity. Writing specifically about the intellectual tradition of Black women's autobiography, McKay noted that it is never politically insignificant for individuals who have been denied subjectivity and selfhood to "write themselves into being" (p. 97). Thus, as Couser (2002) wrote, "autobiography deserves a prominent place" in disability studies "by the same logic that has made it essential to other area studies," such as women's and ethnic studies (p. 109). Therefore, rather than a dismissal of disability life writing, there is an "urgent need for a critical disability studies analysis of these texts" (Sherry, 2005, p. 167).

As Mintz (2007) argued, "life stories told from the margins" do particular kinds of cultural work (p. 11). For instance, these texts can open up important discussions in the classroom about "whose lives count" and whose stories are worthy of narrating (p. 211). Here it is important to consider not only what kind of bodies get published in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability, but also which versions of those lives are rendered intelligible or tellable. As Mintz wrote, disabled women, although well represented in disability life writing, have "rarely appeared as the subjects of conventional autobiography," which is characterized, at least in Western traditions, by the "disembodied I who pretends to a kind of transparent self-awareness" (p. 6).

Refusing a mind/body divide, disability autobiography locates subjectivity in the body and positions bodily experience as a site of epistemological and ontological insight, rather than an impediment to knowledge or as a transparent medium of the self (Lindgren, 2004, p. 146). Rather than privileging the mind over the body, the body in much of disability life writing forces us to recognize the limits of a stable self or the continuity of identity (Lindgren). Instead, the body is an unpredictable, changeable, and unstable grounding of perception and identity. Whether embracing a strategic transcendence of the body (Wendel, 1996) or insisting on knowledge grounded in the lived body (Mairs, 1996a, 1996b), the disabled body frustrates narrative coherence at the same time that it opens up possibilities for new meanings (Weiss, 2008).

### AT: Narratives Bad

#### Their narrative indicts don’t account for the social & cultural power of disability life writings

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

Yet, some humanities-based scholars in disability studies, most notably Mitchell and Snyder (2000) and Davis (1995), have voiced a concern that disability memoir can inadvertently reify the overcoming script so prevalent in fictional portrayals of disability. These scholars' see personal narrative as "too personal" and too focused on disability as a personal or individual struggle rather than a social and political one (Mollow, 2002). Admittedly, it is not difficult to find narratives that adhere to this well-worn trope. Indeed, the ubiquity of the overcoming script might tell us something about how difficult it is to write oneself into a ready-made discourse, particularly if one wishes to be published.

As Butler (1990/1999) wrote in regard to autobiography, we are never outside of language. The difficulty, according to Butler, is that the "I" can only "express itself through the language that is available to it" (p. xxiv). Normative frameworks, of disability in this case, determine who can and cannot lay claim to subjectivity. In other words, when it comes to narrating one's life, norms constitute intelligibility. Thus, to tell one's story and to be understood, one is inevitably caught within webs of meaning informed by normative assumptions. Unfortunately, the normative view of disability is not a particularly positive one. As Garland-Thomson (2007) wrote, it is a "story of despair, catastrophe, loss, excess, suffering, and relentless cure-seeking" (p. 114). Yet, as Butler explained, even when we are resisting dominant scripts, we still must engage with them to be rendered intelligible. Thus, pushing against hegemonic scripts, we nonetheless call them into being.

Moreover, simply having a narrative grounded in one's lived experience is by no means a guarantee that it will offer either a politically grounded or counter-discursive portrayal of disability (Couser, 2002). Thus, it is not altogether unusual to read disability memoirs that take up dominant notions of disability or enact the overcoming script, as if on cue. These memoirs sometimes reflect an internalization of medical or deficit model understandings of disability. More often, however, these memoirs take the form of the person positioning himself or herself up as an exception to the norm by succeeding against the odds, where others presumably fail. Paradoxically, when one places something or someone as the exception to the rule, although the individual is seen as exceptional, the rule (often a stereotype) is allowed to remain firmly entrenched. In other words, the assumption that people with disabilities are, except for a very few remarkable individuals, helpless or pitiful is not dislodged by the super-crip plot. In this way, the super-crip, as a narrative convention, relies on a problematic and contractory relationship between disability and ability or achievement (Clare, 1999).

Yet, some of the skepticism around disability life writing reflects a very similar reluctance by those adhering to the social model to deal openly with impairment (Sherry, 2005). To those who wish to deal with disability as a purely theoretical construct, perhaps the disabled body is "too much a body, too real, too corporeal" (Porter, 1997, p. xiii). In many ways, the message gleaned from disability studies scholarship could be construed to mean that impairment is something that is acceptable to talk about amongst ourselves, but certainly nothing we should be airing in public. Yet, Mairs (1996a) and other disability life writers willingly take up the task of writing "bare brace and . . . tongue hanging out" (p. 105). In so doing, they refuse any tension between the political, the social, and the personal, insisting on a disability politic grounded in lived experience and necessarily embodied. In reclaiming voices that have "often been usurped by non-disabled people" and by naming their experiences, they seek to change society (Sherry, p. 165).

### AT: Narratives Uses Ableist Language

#### This is what re-appropriation of language looks like

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

In disability life writing, we often are made aware of the politics of language as writers subvert terms of derision, using words like crip, cripple , gimp , and spaz . Rather than terms of ridicule or contempt, these terms are redeployed, twisted from their prior usage and used as a political strategy (Butler, 1993), a source of agency and pride. Mairs (1996a), for example, explained, First, the matter of semantics. I am a cripple. I choose this word to name me. I choose from among several possibilities, the most common of which are “handicapped” and “disabled.” . . . People—crippled or not—wince at the word “cripple,” as they do not at “handicapped” or “disabled.” Perhaps I want them to wince. I want them to see me as a tough customer, one to whom the fates/gods/viruses have not been kind, but who can face the brutal truth of her existence squarely. As a cripple, I swagger. (p. 9) In choosing cripple , Mairs subverts ableist stereotypes by positioning herself as a “tough customer” who does not limp, but swaggers. She also employs humor as a textual practice, another strategy often employed in disability life writing to countercultural tropes of disability as tragedy.

## Solvency

### Ruptures SQ

#### Recognition of disability creates ruptures in status quo thinking

Campbell, Griffith University, 9 (Fiona Kumari, 2009, “Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness,” page 12-13, Date Accessed: 7/7, JS)

Returning to the matter of definitional clarity around abled(ness), Robert McRuer (2002) is one of the few scholars to journey into ableism’s non-axiomatic life. He argues that ableism (McRuer refers to compulsory abled-bodiedness) emanates from everywhere and nowhere, and can only be deduced by crafty reductionisms. Contra the assertions about the uncontainability of disabled bodies which are (re)contained by the hyper-prescription and enumeration, the abled body mediated through its assumption of compulsion is absent in its presence – it just is – but resists being fully deducible. Drawing on Butler’s work, McRuer (2002) writes,

Everyone is virtually disabled, both in the sense that able-bodied norms are ‘intrinsically impossible to embody’ fully and in the sense that able-bodied status is always temporary, disability being the one identity category that all people will embody if they live long enough. What we might call a critical disability position, however, would differ from such a virtually disabled positions [to engagements that have] resisted the demands of compulsory able-bodiedness (pp. 95–96).

My argument is that insofar as this conception of disability is assumed within discourses of ableism, the presence of disability upsets the modernist craving for ontological security.

The conundrum, disability, is not a mere fear of the unknown, or an apprehensiveness towards that which is foreign or strange. Rather, disability and disabled bodies are effectively positioned in the nether regions of ‘unthought’. For the ongoing stability of ableism, a diffuse network of thought depends upon the capacity of that network to ‘shut away’, to exteriorise, and unthink disability and its resemblance to the essential (ableist) human self. This unthought has been given much consideration through the systematisation and classification of knowledges about pathology, aberration and deviance. That which is thought about (the Abled norm) rather ironically in its delimitation becomes vacuous and elusive. In order for the notion of ableness to exist and to transmogrify into the sovereign subject, the normate individual of liberalism, it must have a constitutive outside – that is, it must participate in a logic of supplementarity. When looking at relations of disability and ableism we can expand on this idea of symbiosis, an ‘unavoidable duality’ by putting forward another metaphor, that of the mirror. Here I argue that people deemed disabled take on the performative act of mirroring in the lives of normative subjects:

 . . . To be a Mirror is different from being a Face that looks back . . . with a range of expression and responsiveness that are responses of a Subject-in-Its-Own-Right. To be positioned as a Mirror is to be Put Out of Countenance, to Lose Face. (Narayan, 1997, p. 141)

#### Reconceptualizing knowledge is key

Campbell, Griffith University, 9

(Fiona Kumari, 2009, “Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness,” page 14-15, Date Accessed: 7/7, JS)

Phenomenological studies have long recognised the importance of focusing on the experience of the animated living body (der Leib), in recognition that we dwell in our bodies and live so fundamentally through them. This intensity is captured by Kalekin-Fishman (2001): Before every action, there is a pause . . . and a beginning again. The pause is for description, for mulling over the requirements of balance, for comparing the proposed action with movements that are familiar, and for explaining to myself why I can or cannot do what is at hand . . . In the course of daily living, the thinking is not observable; the behaviour just happens, part of what this person does naturally. The physiology of ‘a slight limp’ is part of the unmediated expression of what my ‘I’ is (p. 36).

In short, we cannot ‘know’ existence without being rooted to our bodies. To this extent, it is problematic to speak of bodies in their materiality in a way that distinguishes between emotions and cognition. This generative body is shaped by relations of power, complex histories and interpreted through a bricolage of complex interwoven subjectivities. This approach to perceiving the body in terms of geist or animation can be applied to re-thinking peripheral bodies deemed disabled. It is this body that infuses the discourses and animates representations. Refusing able(ness) necessitates a letting go of the strategy of using the sameness for equality arguments as the basis of liberal freedom. Instead of wasting time on the violence of normalisation, theoretical and cultural producers could more meaningfully concentrate on developing a semiotics of exchange, an ontological decoder to recover and apprehend the lifeworlds of humans living peripherally. Ontological differences, be that on the basis of problematical signifiers of race, sex, sexuality and dis/ability, need to be unhinged from evaluative ranking and bere-cognised in their various nuances and complexities without being represented in fixed absolute terms. It is only then, in this release that we can find possibilities in ambiguity and resistance in marginality.

Instead of asking ‘how do you manage not being like (the non-stated) us?’ (the negation argument), disability imaginaries think/speak/gesture and feel different landscapes not just for being – in-the-world, but on the conduction of perception, mobilities and temporalities. Linton (1998a, p. 530) points out that the ‘kinaesthetic, proprioceptive, sensory and cognitive experiences’ of disabled people as they go about their daily life have received limited attention. Nancy Mairs (1996) notes that a disability gaze is imbricated in every aspect of action, perception, occurrence and knowing.

Is that something I should take a stance on? In order to return bodies back to difference – in-the-human – a re-conceptualisation of knowing (episteme) is paramount. Only this knowledge is of a carnal kind, where thinking, sensing and understanding mutually enfold. Whilst ever present in ableist normalising dialogue, disability’s veracity is undeniably contingent upon conversations of ableism, its production and performance, to confer validity.

### Disabled Body Ruptures SQ

#### The disabled body is created as a threat to the status quo

Campbell, Griffith University, 8

(Fiona Kumari, 2008, “Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism,” M/C Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2008), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46/0>, Date Accessed: 7/2, JS)

II. “Ableist Relations”

Central to regimes of ableism are two core elements that feature irrespective of its localised enactment, namely the notion of the normative (and normate individual) and the enforcement of a constitutional divide between perfected naturalized humanity and the aberrant, the unthinkable, quasi-human hybrid and therefore non-human. This constitution provides the layout, the blueprint for the scaling and marking of bodies and the ordering of their terms of relation. It is not possible to have a concept of difference without Ableism. Let’s take each of these two elements separately and explore them more closely.

The Able/Not-Able Divide

It is necessary to establish and enforce a constitutional divide. The divide is at the levels of ontology, materiality and sentiency. I wish to focus on the constitutionality of that divide between the normal and the pathological and mechanisms of ordering. This analysis is influenced by the proposals advanced by Bruno Latour in We Have Never been Modern.

Latour speaks of the practices of translation and purification:

… ‘translation’, creates mixtures between entirely new types of being, hybrids of nature and culture. The second, by ‘purification’: creates two entirely distinct ontological zones: that of human beings on the one hand; that of nonhumans on the other (10 - 11).

The devices of translation and purification can assist us to grapple with that which seems ‘unholdable’ and elusive; the uncontainability of the disabled body. ‘Translation’ is based on the notion that structures or networks are not obvious or self-contained. Latour uses the example of a chain flowing from the upper atmosphere, industrial strategies and onto the concerns of government and greenies. ‘Purification’ in contrast, engages in the creation of divides of ontological distinctions, which espouse a foundational (almost first cause) self-evidence. Here, Latour cites that partition between nature (as self contained), nonhumans and culture (created and driven by humans). This ‘modern critical stance’, as Latour calls it, acts as the ethos or template of modernity.

In the context of ableism, Latour’s schema proves helpful. The processes and practices of translation cannot be separated from the creation of that ordering category termed ‘disability’. For many people deemed disabled, in the world of technoscience their relationship with non-human actants has been profoundly cyborgical and hybridisable (for example the use of communication and adaptive devices, implants and transplants). As such the networks of association between human – non human (sentient beings and machines) have always been and increasingly are pushing the boundaries of the practices of purification. The disabled body induces a fear as being a body out of control because of its appearance of uncontainability. The practices of purification insist on this being the case. Ableism’s constitutional divide posits two distinct and entirely clear ontological zones: disabled and abled (normate). Latour explains

…without the first set, the practices of purification would be fruitless or pointless. Without the second, the work of translation would be slowed down, limited, or even ruled out. … So long as we consider these two practices of translation and purification separately, we are truly modern – that is willingly subscribe to the critical project, even though that project is developed only through the proliferation of hybrids down below. As soon as we direct our attention simultaneously to the work of purification and the work of hybridization [translation], we immediately stop being wholly modern, and our future begins to change. (11)

The challenge then is to look beyond social context, at the interactivity between the processes and techniques of purification and translation, in particular to investigate what this interactivity clarifies and obfuscates. Even though Latour claims that purification is not an ideology in disguise, I would assert that the existence of processes of purification creates a simulation if you like, of the conditions of naturalism. Latour’s discussion of whether relations are conscious and unconscious, or are illusion and reality is an important one. He concludes that moderns are not unaware of what they do; rather it is the holding steadfast to dichotomies, the divides, which makes possible the processes of translation. We can by analogy, argue that matters of intentionality or discourse and so forth, are not critical to the emerging technologies of ableism, but rather it is the act of holding stoically to the distinction between ableness and disabledness.

In contemporary developments in high-tech and biotechnologies, it is occasionally possible to witness the glitches in the purview of purification, whether that is in the debates over transhumanism, xenotransplantation or the emergent of new ‘life’ in the form of artificial intelligences (A.I’s). The confusion about where human life begins and ends harks back to the Enlightenment era where philosophers like Locke inquired “What is It?” in trying to make sense of the humanness of changelings (Campbell; Locke,). The fortunes of techno-science continue to disrupt the fixity of defining disability and normalcy especially within the arenas of law and bioethics. Whilst anomalous bodies are undecidable in being open to endless and differing interpretations, an essentialised disabled body is subjected to constant deferral – standing in reserve, awaiting and escaping able(edness) through morphing technologies and as such exists in an ontologically tentative or provisional state.

Latour points out the ultimate paradox of this modern constitutional divide is that whilst the proliferation of hybrids is allowed for, at the same time this constitution continues to deny the very existence of hybrid entities within its formulation (Latour). Contemporary conditions suggest that it is not the event of denial that is operational; rather it is the ‘place’ or significance given to such ambiguous entities that disrupt the rather neat demarcation zones. Practices of purification continue to rein in (successfully or otherwise) the chaos created by increasing ‘grey zones’ along the continuum of human/nonhuman difference. In the governing of prostitution, Razack points to the creation of ‘anomalous zone’ to contain and tolerate the deviance. In dealing with political prisoners, the despised, those interned in concentration camps and institutions, Agamben indicates the manufacturing of states of exception that exist beyond the law and spatiality to enable ‘treatments’ of those existing in the realm of a bare life. The significance of the enforcement of a constitutional divide, for the practices of ableism, is that such orderings are not just repressive but they are ultimately productive; they tell us stories, they contain narratives as to ‘who’ we are and how we ‘should be’.

#### Disability threatens the traditional understanding of human life

Campbell, Griffith University, 8

(Fiona Kumari, 2008, “Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism,” M/C Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2008), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46/0>, Date Accessed: 7/2, JS)

What Normate … Ableist Normativity?

Georges Canguilhem (69) states “every generality is the sign of an essence, and every perfection the realization of the essence … a common characteristic, the value of an ideal type”. If this is the case, what then is the essence of normative abled(ness)? Such a question poses significant conceptual challenges including the dangers of bifurcation. It is reasonably easy to speculate about the knowingness of life forms deemed disabled in spite of the neologism of disability’s catachresis orientation. In contrast – able-bodied, corporeal perfectedness has an elusive core (other than being posed as transparently average or normal). Charting a criterion of Abled to gain definitional clarity can result in a game of circular reductionism – saying what it is in relation to what it isn’t, that which falls away. Disability performances are invoked to mean “any body capable of being narrated as outside the norm” (Mitchell 17). Such as analysis belies the issue whether at their core women’s, black and queer bodies are ultimately ontologically and materially disabled?

Inscribing certain bodies in terms of deficiency and essential inadequacy privileges a particular understanding of normalcy that is commensurate with the interests of dominant groups (and the assumed interests of subordinated groups). Indeed, the formation of ableist relations requires the normate individual to depend upon the self of ‘disabled’ bodies being rendered beyond the realm of civility, thus becoming an unthinkable object of apprehension. The unruly, uncivil, disabled body is necessary for the reiteration of the ‘truth’ of the ‘real/essential’ human self who is endowed with masculinist attributes of certainty, mastery and autonomy. The discursive practices that mark out bodies of preferability are vindicated by abject life forms that populate the constitutive outside of the thinkable (that which can be imagined and re-presented) and those forms of existence that are unimaginable and therefore unspeakable. The emptying (kenosis) of normalcy occurs through the purging of those beings that confuse, are misrecognizable or as Mitchell (17) describes as “recalcitrant corporeal matter” into a bare life (see Agamben) residing in zone of exceptionality. This foreclosure depends on necessary unspeakability to maintain the continued operation of hegemonic power (c.f. Butler). For every outside there is an inside that demands differentiation and consolidation as a unity. To borrow from Heidegger– in every aletheia (unveiling or revealedness) of representation there lies a concealedness. The visibility of the ableist project is therefore only possible through the interrogation of the revealedness of disability/not-health and abled(ness). Marcel Detienne summarizes this system of thought aptly:

[Such a] … system is founded on a series of acts of partition whose ambiguity, here as elsewhere, is to open up the terrain of their transgression at the very moment when they mark off a limit. To discover the complete horizon of a society’s symbolic values, it is also necessary to map out its transgressions, its deviants ( ix).

Viewing the disabled body as simply matter out of place that needs to dispensed with or at least cleaned up is erroneous. The disabled body has a place, a place in liminality to secure the performative enactment of the normal. Detienne’s summation points to what we may call the double bind of ableism when performed within western neo-liberal polities. The double bind folds in on itself – for whilst claiming ‘inclusion’, ableism simultaneously always restates and enshrines itself. On the one hand, discourses of equality promote ‘inclusion’ by way of promoting positive attitudes (sometimes legislated in mission statements, marketing campaigns, equal opportunity protections) and yet on the other hand, ableist discourses proclaim quite emphatically that disability is inherently negative, ontologically intolerable – and in the end a dispensable remnant. This casting results in an ontological foreclosure wherein positive signification of disability becomes unspeakable. Disability can’t be thought of/spoken about on any other basis than the negative, to do so, to invoke oppositional discourses, is to run the risk of further pathologisation. An example of this are attempts at desiring or celebrating disability which are reduced to a fetish or facticity disorder. So to explicate ourselves out of this double bind we need to persistently and continually return to the matter of disability as negative ontology, as a malignancy, that is, as the property of a body constituted by what Michael Oliver refers to as, “the personal tragedy theory of disability.” (32)

Returning to the matter of definitional clarity around Abled(ness). Robert McRuer is one of the few scholars to journey into ableism’s non-axiomatic life. He argues that ableism (McRuer refers to compulsory abled-bodiedness) emanates from everywhere and nowhere, and can only be deduced by crafty reductionisms. Contra the assertions about the uncontainability of disabled bodies which are (re)contained by the hyper prescription and enumeration, the abled body mediated through its assumption of compulsion is absent in its presence – it just is – but resists being fully deducible. Drawing on Butler’s work, McRuer writes

everyone is virtually disabled, both in the sense that able-bodied norms are ‘intrinsically impossible to embody’ fully and in the sense that able-bodied status is always temporary, disability being the one identity category that all people will embody if they live long enough. What we might call a critically disability position, however, would differ from such a virtually disabled position [to engagements that have] resisted the demands of compulsory able-bodiedness … (95–96)

My argument is that insofar as this conception of disability is assumed within discourses of ableism, the presence of disability upsets the modernist craving for ontological security.

The conundrum disability is not a mere fear of the unknown, nor an apprehensiveness towards that which is foreign or strange. Rather, disability and disabled bodies are effectively positioned in the nether regions of ‘unthought’. For the ongoing stability of ableism, a diffuse network of thought depends upon the capacity of that network to ‘shut away’, to exteriorise, and unthink disability and its resemblance to the essential (ableist) human self. This unthought has been given much consideration through the systematisation and classification of knowledges about pathology, aberration and deviance. That which is thought about (the Abled norm) rather ironically in its delimitation becomes vacuous and elusive. In order for the notion of ableness to exist and to transmogrify into the sovereign subject, the normate individual of liberalism, it must have a constitutive outside – that is, it must participate in a logic of supplementarity. When looking at relations of disability and ableism we can expand on this idea of symbiosis, an ‘unavoidable duality’ by putting forward another metaphor, that of the mirror. Here I argue that people deemed disabled take on the performative act of mirroring in the lives of normative subjects:

To be a Mirror is different from being a Face that looks back … with a range of expression and responsiveness that are responses of a Subject-in-Its-Own-Right. To be positioned as a Mirror is to be Put Out of Countenance, to Lose Face. (Narayan 141)

In this respect, we can speak in ontological terms of the history of disability as a history of that which is unthought, to be put out of countenance; this figuring should not be confused with erasure that occurs due to mere absence or exclusion. On the contrary, disability is always present (despite its seeming absence) in the ableist talk of normalcy, normalization, and humanness (cf. Overboe ) on the idea of normative shadows). Disability’s truth-claims are dependent upon discourses of ableism for their very legitimization.

#### Understanding the body’s role in politics is essential to better representations

Campbell, Griffith University, 8

(Fiona Kumari, 2008, “Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism,” M/C Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2008), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46/0>, Date Accessed: 7/2, JS)

III. Disability Imaginaries – Reconceptualising the Human?

Phenomenological studies have long recognized the importance of focusing on the experience of the animated living body (der Leib), in recognition that we dwell in our bodies and live so fundamentally through them. This intensity is captured by Kalekin-Fishman:

Before every action, there is a pause ... and a beginning again. The pause is for description, for mulling over the requirements of balance, for comparing the proposed action with movements that are familiar, and for explaining to myself why I can or cannot do what is at hand ... In the course of daily living, the thinking is not observable; the behavior just happens, part of what this person does naturally. The physiology of ‘a slight limp’ is part of the unmediated expression of what my ‘I’ is ... (136)

In short, we cannot ‘know’ existence without being rooted to our bodies. To this extent, it is problematic to speak of bodies in their materiality in a way that distinguishes between emotions and cognition. This generative body is shaped by relations of power, complex histories and interpreted through a bricolage of complex interwoven subjectivities. This approach to perceiving the body in terms of geist or animation can be applied to re-thinking peripheral bodies deemed disabled. It is this body that infuses the discourses and animates representations. Refusing Able(ness) necessitates a letting go of the strategy of using the sameness for equality arguments as the basis of liberal freedom. Instead of wasting time on the violence of normalization, theoretical and cultural producers could more meaningfully concentrate on developing a semiotics of exchange, an ontological decoder to recover and apprehend the lifeworlds of humans living peripherally. Ontological differences, be that on the basis of problematical signifiers of race, sex, sexuality and dis/ability, need to be unhinged from evaluative ranking and be re-cognised in their various nuances and complexities without being re-presented in fixed absolute terms. It is only then, in this release that we can find possibilities in ambiguity and resistance in marginality (cf. de Beauvoir; hooks).

Instead of asking “how do you manage not being like (the non-stated) us?” (the negation argument), disability imaginaries think/speak/gesture and feel different landscapes not just for being –in-the-world, but on the conduction of perception, mobilities and temporalities. Linton points out that the “kinaesthetic, proprioceptive, sensory and cognitive experiences” of disabled people as they go about their daily life has received limited attention. Nancy Mairs notes a disability gaze is imbricated in every aspect of action, perception, occurrence and knowing.

In order to return bodies back to difference–in-the-human, a re-conceptualization of knowing (episteme) is paramount. Only this knowledge is of a carnal kind, where thinking, sensing and understanding mutually enfold. Whilst ever present in ableist normalising dialogue, disability’s veracity is undeniably contingent upon conversations of ableism, its production and performance, to confer validity.

### Education Solves

Lang, University of East Anglia, Senior Research Associate Overseas Development Group, 1

(Dr. Raymond, January, “The Development And Critique Of The Social Model Of Disability”,

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lc-ccr/lccstaff/raymond-lang/DEVELOPMMENT_AND_CRITIQUE_OF_THE_SOCIAL_MODEL_OF_D.pdf>, p. 30-31, accessed 7/7/12, sl)

A further matter for discussion is the most appropriate strategy for achieving social change so as to result in the construction of a non-disablist world. As the previous section has shown, one of the principal tenets of the social model is that disabled people experience discrimination and social oppression, resulting in disabled people living within a “disabling world”. Upon the supposition that disabled people are indeed an oppressed group, the movement has advocated that conflict should be used in combating such oppression and discrimination.

While appreciating the foundation of such sentiments, and without denying the validity of the assertion that disabled people do indeed face discrimination and oppression, it is contended that disability is a far more complex phenomenon than can be solely and adequately explained by social oppression and discrimination. It is my experience that vast numbers of people, rather than actively oppressing disabled people, are in fact fearful and ignorant of disability, which leads them to relate to disabled people in inappropriate and often demeaning ways. In agreement with this position, the feminist disability writer, Jenny Morris stated:-

“Our disability frightens people. They don’t want to think that this is something that might happen to them. So we become separated from common humanity, treated as fundamentally different and alien. Having put up clear barriers between us and them, non-disabled people further hide their fear and discomfort by turning us into objects of pity, comforting themselves by their own kindness and generosity”. (Morris, J. 1991:192).

Oppression is often of an unwitting nature. If oppression and discrimination were the sole factors in the creation of a disablist society, then conflict might be the most appropriate strategy to adopt. However, if as is contended here, fear and ignorance also provide a significant explanation to societal attitudes towards disability, then a more appropriate and pertinent strategy for the creation of a non-disablist society might be through the medium of education. It is an undisputable fact that disabled people are in the minority within society, albeit a significant one, comprising approximately ten percent of the world’s population. Disabled people, in order to create a society which is indeed non-disablist and which secures effective, full citizenship, needs to foster and build alliances with their able-bodied peers, and this is best achieved through consensus building and education.

### Transportation Key

#### Limited transportation options have negative effects on persons with disabilities

Wasfi, University of Minnesota Research Fellow, et al., 6

(Rania; David Levinson, University of Minnesota Associate Professor of Civil Engineering; and Ahmed El-Geneidy, University of Minnesota Post-doctoral Research Fellow; November 2006, “Measuring the Transportation Needs of People With Developmental Disabilities,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1743631>, p. 3, accessed 7/4/2012, bs)

Transportation systems are designed to serve communities by providing accessibility (the ability to reach valued destinations) and mobility (the ability to move on the network (1, 2). Limitation in mobility occurs when a person cannot move between an origin and a desired destination because of external or individual factors. People with limited mobility include but are not limited to senior citizens, the poor, children, persons who do not speak English, people with physical disabilities, and people with developmental disabilities. Limitation in mobility may affect physical, social, and psychological well-being. There is a growing recognition in the fields of disability services, rehabilitation, education and psychology of the need to promote self-independence for individuals with mental retardation and developmental disabilities (3, 4, 5). Transportation is considered one of the main means to determine the level of independence and self-determination of PDD (6). Independence in transportation is a key towards achieving this goal.

## Framework

### AT: Just Read a Plan

#### The able-normative demand for a plan reinforces a conception of liberal politics that cannot constitute the effective resistance required to de-center Ableism.

Campbell, Griffith University, 8

(Fiona Kumari, “Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism,” M/C Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2008), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46/0>, Date Accessed: 7/2, JS)

Compulsory ableness and its conviction to and seduction of sameness as the basis to equality, claims results in a resistance to consider ontologically peripheral lives as distinct ways of being human least they produce a heightened devaluation. Ontological reframing poses different preoccupations: what does the study of the politics of ‘deafness’ tell us about what it means to be ‘hearing’? Indeed how is the very conceptualisation of ‘hearing’ framed in the light of discourses of ‘deafness’? By decentring Abledness, it is possible to “to look at the world from the inside out)” (Linton 13) and unveil the ‘non-disabled/ableist’ stance. In a different context Haraway (152) exclaims “… [this] cannot be said quite out loud, or it loses its crucial position as a pre-condition of vision and becomes the object of scrutiny”.

So what is meant by the concept of ‘ableism’? A survey of the literature suggests that the term is often referred to in a fleeting way with limited definitional or conceptual specificity (Clear; Iwasaki & Mactavish: Watts & Erevelles). When there is commentary, ableism is described as denoting an attitude that devalues or differentiates disability through the valuation of able-bodiedness equated to normalcy. For some, the term ableism is used interchangeably with the term disablism. I argue however that these two words render quite radically different understandings of the status of disability to the norm. Furthermore, as a conceptual tool, ableism transcends the procedures, structures, for governing civil society and locates itself clearly in the arena of genealogies of knowledge. There is little consensus as to what practices and behaviours constitute ableism. We can nevertheless say that a chief feature of an ableist viewpoint is a belief that impairment or disability (irrespective of ‘type’) is inherently negative and should the opportunity present itself, be ameliorated, cured or indeed eliminated. Ableism refers to

… a network of beliefs, processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the corporeal standard) that is projected as the perfect, species-typical and therefore essential and fully human. Disability then, is cast as a diminished state of being human (Campbell 44).

#### theorizing ableism is a prior question to the formation of a plan

Campbell, Griffith Law School Faculty, 9

(Fiona Kumari, Griffith University Australia, “Disability Advocacy & Ableism: Towards a re-discovery of the disability Imagination”, Keynote Address, 2nd Strengthening Advocacy Conference, Nov 17-18, <http://griffith.academia.edu/FionaKumariCampbell/Papers/118483/Disability_Advocacy_and_Ableism_Towards_a_re-discovery_of_the_disability_Imagination>, p. 1-2, accessed 7/6/12 sl)

Working models (often called conceptual frameworks) are very important as they help us work out which questions to ask, help us interpret and process things and events. We all have conceptual frameworks that shape our beliefs as to why thing happen – even if we do not use that language. In a keynote speech I made at a DPI conference in Adelaide 1984 I said it was important for disabled people to understand the nature of social change “so that we will not be fooled by any token one off gestures or initiatives handed out by government and disability agencies” (1984, 91). I still hold to that idea and add that we always need to test new ideas by asking “what is this proposal or idea saying about disability, does it assume that disability is terrible, or that diversity and difference are terrible or is the idea on about celebrating and bringing out difference”?

From the perspective of political activism, the necessity to have a theory of disability before deciding strategies of political action was well understood as early as 1975 by the Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation UPAIS in the UK whose minutes of a debate between 2 advocacy groups produced a document called The Fundamental Principles of Disability. They decided that disability should not be understood medically as a broken down body, mind or heart, rather society and the way that it is organized had something to do with us becoming disabled ….

Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society. ... To understand this it is necessary to grasp the distinction between the physical impairment and the social situation, called "disability", of people with such impairment. Thus we define … disability as the disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by a contemporary social organization which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from participation in the mainstream of social activities. …Disability is therefore a particular form of social oppression.(UPAIS, quoted in Oliver 1995: 16 – 17)

#### Traditional Policy making essentializes the diverse states of the “disabled”

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1645-1646 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Such observations are apt in relation to the ways in which disabled people's mobility needs are conceived of by policymakers, where there is a tendency to categorise disabled people's corporeality in essentialist terms. As previous research suggests, it is commonplace for disabled people to be defined as having walking difficulties or an impairment that confines them to a wheelchair (Imrie, 1996). These definitions are problematical because they fail to recognise the diversity of physical and mental impairments and the often conflicting and different mobility needs of different categories of (disabled) people (Imrie, 1996).They also have the potential to reduce the provision of modes of mobility to particular types which might, as a consequence, be inattentive to the corporeal diversity of disabled people. Thus, although it is common for public buildings to provide ramps to facilitate wheelchair access, it is less so to see signage, texture, or colour coding of a type which provides ease of sight, direction, and communication to vision-impaired people and those with learning difficulties (see Imrie, 1996; Royal National Institute for the Blind, 1995).

### AT: Use Narrative to Justify a Plan

#### Manipulating life writings to justify a plan text denies the possibility of an “always becoming” conception of embodiment

Ferri, Associate Professor, The Center on Human Policy, Law, and Disability Studies, Syracuse University, 11

(Beth, Teachers College Record, “Disability Life Writing and the Politics of Knowing”, Volume 113 Number 10, <http://syr.academia.edu/BethFerri/Papers/661249/Disability_Life_Writing_and_the_Politics_of_Knowing>, accessed 7/12/12)

As Miller (2005) wrote, "Certain stories can be told in certain ways and for certain purposes" (p. 222). Rather than thinking about autobiography as offering us (or our students) "proof or evidence of some fully examined accessible" self, it is important to view narrative not as a unified, coherent, stable, or essentialized self, but as a self that is socially and discursively produced, always in a state of becoming (Miller, 2005). In autobiography, we are not privy to an unmediated truth, but one that is shaped by the normalizing conventions of the genre, by discourse, and by the particular social, cultural, and historical context from which they are written. Thus, the goal in teaching these kinds of texts must be to help students read autobiography in ways that highlight the particular without essentializing or losing sight of the social/political.

Importantly, disability life writing can help expose ideologies of difference, revealing "the values-laden processes through which 'disability' produces 'ability/ like other socially produced binaries: male/female and black/white" (Baglieri et al., 2011, this issue). Thus, by engaging critically in the constructedness of ability and disability, readers begin to see the interdependence of seemingly opposite yet socially produced and interdependent categories that are upheld in a state of perpetual opposition by the same hegemonic notions of norm(alcy). Moreover, in disability life writing, we can see firsthand the ways that the categories of "normal and abnormal take on great significance" despite being completely naturalized within schools and society.

Particular reading strategies that help students to apprehend the critical nature of these texts include reminding students to resist overgeneralizing or feeling like they have gained access to "the truth" about a particular disability. Couser (2002) suggested assigning students several narratives of individuals with the same disability to avoid leaving students with the idea that they have gained the true or authentic experience of any particular disability. I also find it useful to assign two or more narratives of individuals who share the same disability label but differ from each other in terms of race, gender, class, sexuality, or historical context. In this way, we focus on disability as idiosyncratic and interwoven within a myriad of identities and contexts.

### Educational Settings

#### School curriculums reinforce social otherization of the “disabled”

Ho, University of British Columbia, professor of applied Ethics, 5

(Anita, 4-1-05, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, “Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability in the University Classroom and Curriculum,” http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf, accessed: 7-5-2012, p.20, CAS)

It is not surprising that students continue to hold stereotypes and mistaken or biased views of (people with) disabilities. After all, the current curriculum has done little to dispel the stigma. In fact, it may be part of the problem. As previously mentioned, the “regular” curriculum and textbooks still neglect or marginalize the disability perspective. Recent attempts to promote diversity have resulted in more discussions of gender and racial issues, but the disability perspective remains neglected. Even bioethics textbooks rarely address disability issues. In those seldom cases where textbooks mention disability, they continue to employ a medical model of disability that characterizes disability as a defect that is inherent in the person with an impairment.

These discussions rarely address social and political problems that “disable” many people. Rather, they focus on disability as a physical/mental inferiority that ought to be corrected by medical procedures. It is, therefore, not surprising that students in the mainstream curriculum continue to hold various stereotypes of (people with) disabilities.

#### Must integrate into all curriculum

Ho, University of British Columbia, professor of applied Ethics, 5

(Anita, 4-1-05, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, “Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability in the University Classroom and Curriculum,” http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf, accessed: 7-5-2012, p.20, CAS)

Moreover, disability becomes not just a topic, or an “alternative study.” Rather, it becomes a part of our everyday existence that is relevant to all of us, whether we are in the health-care setting, a business environment or in any other field. We are all born with different characteristics and encounter various circumstances (e.g., injuries, sickness, old age), but our economic and social contexts continue to favor only select forms of existence. It is vital for students to understand, critically examine and challenge such structures in the main curriculum. In promoting diverse perspectives, we also need to pay attention to how we incorporate disability issues. It is not enough that instructors include materials about disabilities. As previously mentioned, some textbooks do discuss disability issues, but they do so from an able-bodied bias, which can perpetuate various stereotypes regarding disability. An inclusive course must balance various perspectives and incorporate the voices of people with disabilities. Students need to critically examine how and why the existing structure may affect individuals of various characteristics and experiences differently.

### AT: Topic Education

#### School curriculums need to be changed to incorporate many perspectives

Ho, University of British Columbia, professor of applied Ethics, 5

(Anita, 4-1-05, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, “Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability in the University Classroom and Curriculum,” http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf, accessed: 7-5-2012, p.22, CAS)

Some may worry that incorporation of disability issues will distract students from the most important topics. Some instructors have told me that, just as it is often impossible to add an extra course to the curriculum, they have no time for a disability topic in their already-full schedules. I challenge the uncritical assumption that the current able-bodied curriculum is best, such that any change would compromise the quality of the learning. Some instructors mistakenly assume that incorporation of disability issues means that we must replace the mainstream topics with disability topics. However, as previously mentioned, disability is not an additional “topic” that is separate from other issues. It is not enough to spend a week “tackling” disability issues. Rather, disability perspectives are an important part of most topics. Many issues have important implications for people with and without disabilities. The strategy is not to replace “traditional topics” with “disability topics.” Instead, the strategy is to examine or incorporate the disability perspective in these “traditional” topics.

#### Separate school courses reinforce social separation

Ho, University of British Columbia, professor of applied Ethics, 5

(Anita, 4-1-05, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, “Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability in the University Classroom and Curriculum,” http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf, accessed: 7-5-2012, p.20, CAS)

Moreover, having separate courses on disability may continue to give mixed signals to students regarding the social and political meanings of disability. Separate courses may reinforce the message that disability is a “fringe” matter that is separate from our everyday experience and political reality. Gender studies, racial/ethnic studies, queer studies and disability studies are all important programs that have made significant contributions to equality in our society. However, many students assume that these subjects are “special studies” that are only of interest to those who fit certain profiles. Just as many assume that only “extreme feminists” enroll in women’s studies, or that only people of color would want to take racial/ethnic studies, a majority of students still seem to think that disability studies is a field of narrow focus that is relevant only to students with disabilities or to others who wish to pursue careers in disability-related fields. Given these concerns, I contend that a better alternative for introducing all students to diverse perspectives is to incorporate disability perspectives in “regular” classes. Incorporation of disability perspectives provides an opportunity for students who are unable or unwilling to take disability studies courses to learn about diverse perspectives. It provides students a venue to critically examine how various issues have important social and political implications on people with diverse characteristics.

### Policymaking

#### Disability studies posit the “normative” able body as central to policy making against the disruptive disabled “other”

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 350 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC

Disability studies teaches that an assumed able body is crucial to the smooth operation of traditional theories of democracy, citizenship, subjectivity, beauty, and capital. By assuming that the normative human is an able-bodied adult, for example, liberal theory can conflate political or economic interests with desires, political representation with having a voice in policy-making, social organization with voluntary association, and so on. Liberal theory naturalizes the political by making it personal. And the “person” at the center of the traditional liberal theory is not simply an individual locus of subjectivity (however psychologically fragmented, incoherent, or troubled). He is an able-bodied locus of subjectivity, one whose unskilled labor may be substituted freely for the labor of other such individuals, one who can imagine himself largely self-sufficient because almost everything conspires to help him take his enabling body for granted (even when he is scrambling for the means of subsistence). However, the mere possibility of a severely cognitively disabled adult citizen disrupts the liberal equations of representation and voice, desire and interest. Advocacy for the severely cognitively disabled is not a matter of voicing their demands. More generally, the intricate practical dialectics of dependence and independence in the lives of many disabled people unsettle ideals of social organization as freely chosen expressions of mutual desire.

#### Ethics of disability provide a critical framework for destabilizing the concept of the normal

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

(Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 350 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

New work in disability studies, however, challenges established habits of thought about “having” a body. Disability studies dissolves deeply entrenched mind-and body distinctions and further destabilizes the concept of the normal, whose charted internal ambiguities have themselves become too familiar. An ethics and a politics of disability are crucial to the work of the university—pedagogically, theoretically, and institutionally. But reconfiguring knowledge in light of disability criticism is a project that is likely to take longer than making public space accessible.

### AT: Cede the Political

#### Our aff is a pre-requisite to a coherent conception of political subjectivity

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 351-352 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Concepts of citizenship, the economy, and the body are embedded in understandings of what constitutes well-being, understandings that generally exclude or marginalize the forms or realities of disability. There are concepts of well-being that value happiness and desire fulfillment on the one hand and liberty and entitlement on the other. Some focus on individual well-being. Others take wellbeing as a collective state. In either case, we can ask how concepts of well-being would be affected if the modal subject were disabled.

Who, for example, is the subject of economist Amartya Sen’s (and more recently philosopher Martha Nussbaum’s) “capabilities” approach to human wellbeing? Does a capabilities approach to well-being presume that the subject pos-sesses a (cap)able body? If so, what new questions would emerge if we posit a disabled modal subject of political economy? The image of a flourishing disabled person in good health, living her life to the fullest, challenges the presumption that a person with a disability necessarily lacks well-being and good health. Or are figures of disability always already conceptually consigned to the position of calling into being the limits of concepts such as normality and flourishing? By way of example, what would a concept of well-being look like if the maimed and disabled in countries riddled with land mines, such as Afghanistan, Cambodia and Angola, were made a measure of capability rather than a measure of its limits? We could ask similar questions of key concepts in education, citizenship, medicine, and the law: What would these concepts look like if disabled figures were our modal subjects? Disability itself covers a multitude of heterogeneous axes of difference. There is no single figure of disability. And unless we assume that all these modes of difference are correctable deviations from a presumed normal center, we will be hard-pressed to come up with a singular, concrete standard of individual or collective well-being against which to measure social justice.

### AT: Focus on the State Good

#### We do – our analysis of disability studies is a crucial component of understanding state actions

Longmore, professor of history and director of the Institute on Disability, ‘9

 (Paul K.,“Making Disability and Essential Part of American History,” Organization of American Historians Magazine of History, Volume: 23, Issue 3, 2009, P. 14, LPS).

Expanding on Baynton's valuable observations, history teachers and historians would do well to consider the role of issues and ideologies pertaining to disability and people with disabilities in the rise of the modern American state. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, political leaders and policymakers, as well as medical, education, charity, and social service professionals, sought to address disability as a social problem in a range of policy arenas: social welfare, public health, public schooling, warfare, and immigration. Not only is an understanding of disability necessary for full comprehension of the histories of each of these policy areas, but the presence of disability-related issues in each of them should alert us to the linkage between the histories of disability and modern state formation. For example, Theda Skocpol's Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: the Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States traces the central role of disability pensions for Union Army Civil War veterans in the historical evolution of federal social welfare policies (14). The work of scholars such as Skocpol demonstrates that we cannot fully and adequately explain the rise of the modern American state without examining the function of “disability” in its development.

### Debate

#### Hiding disabilities results in strained relationships and communication failure. This is a prerequisite to effective debating and discussion of issues.

Shelton, Spalding University assistant professor, and Matthews, University of Kentucky doctoral student, ’01

[Michael W. Shelton, and Cynthia K. Matthews, Fall 2001, Argumentation and Advocacy, “Extending the Diversity Agenda in Forensics: Invisible Disabilities and Beyond,” volume: 38, pgs. 124-5, accessed 7/5/12, JTF]

Research has shown that people with visible disabilities experience avoidance, hostile feelings, and stereotyping from able-bodied others (Hassenfeld, 1993, Mills, Belgrave 8; Boyer, 1984; Thompson, 1982). The limited research that does consider invisible disabilities has found similar responses when the invisible disabilities are made visible (Asch, 1984). However, few researchers have focused their investigations solely on the experiences of people who are invisibly disabled. In response to this oversight, Matthews (l994) conducted a pilot study to investigate the use of privacy boundaries by persons with invisible disabilities. This study indicated that most people with an invisible disability did not disclose their disability unless practical reasons demanded it. Additionally, she found that people with invisible disabilities felt disclosure would encourage unwanted sympathy, elicit judgment, and damage existing relationships with people who might not understand their disability and might not find them believable. Such research points to the need to provide greater overall explication of the significance, contextual functioning, and methods of addressing the relatively new genre of invisible disabilities.

Hayden (1993) explained how persons with chronic diseases often redefine their life roles. A debate example is illustrative here: an assistant coach with a chronic lung disease may be unable to help load vehicles for tournament travel, but she or he may redefine their role as assigning debaters to work through the task. When others do not recognize or understand this redefinition, communication problems, and behavioral maladjustments may occur. In the debate example, for instance, the debaters may well resent the assignments and later rebel in potentially destructive ways. According to Hayden, this redefinition of language used by people with invisible disability leads to decreased shared meaning with able-bodied others.

The likelihood for misunderstanding between invisibly disabled persons and able-bodied others is complicated by the inconsistency in symptomology that is characteristic of many chronic diseases. Disability onset in chronic disease is often progressive (Milliken 8; Northcott, 1996). The ambiguity that arises with this instability of chronic illness is one of the most problematic factors that causes misunderstandings between chronically ill people and those with whom they interact. Many conditions {e.g., lung diseases, arthritis, intervertebral disk disorders) may produce acute symptoms on one day and few or no symptoms the next [Sinnema, 1992). This produces uncertainty both for people with invisible disabilities and for their colleagues and friends who often develop doubts about the seriousness of the disease, leading to the impression on the part of the people with invisible disabilities that their condition is not believable (Matthews, 1994). Individuals with invisible disabilities who do reveal their condition often feel that able-bodied people do not “believe” they are disabled-at least to the extent that they experience the disability (Matthews & Harrington, 2000).

#### The stigmatization of those who are not able-bodied constantly shames, discredits, and dis-incentivize the participation of individuals in debate.

Shelton, Spalding University assistant professor, and Matthews, University of Kentucky doctoral student, ’01

[Michael W. Shelton, and Cynthia K. Matthews, Fall 2001, Argumentation and Advocacy, “Extending the Diversity Agenda in Forensics: Invisible Disabilities and Beyond,” volume: 38, pgs. 125-6, EBSCO, accessed 7/5/12, JTF]

Many significant issues faced by people who are invisibly disabled are also faced by those with visible disabilities. Stigma and shame can be a part of everyday life. Impression management and strategic self-disclosure (Admi, 1996) are, therefore, important communication skills for those with disabilities. A visible stigma is one that is immediately evident to others (e.g., obesity, disfigurement). An invisible stigma is one that is not easily discerned by others (e.g., cancer, HIV). Stigmas, both visible and invisible, are known or not by another, depending on circumstances and relationships. A stigma is more or less obtrusive to the degree that it interferes with social interaction; a debater whose vision is being progressively impaired by diabetes might find reading evidence problematic at times. Finally, a stigma is relevant depending on the content; the vision-impaired debater could well be the most prolific of researchers on a team but be limited in speed of delivery. People with invisible disability are “discreditable” because they are subject to having their disability discovered when they wish to conceal it (Matthews & Harrington, 2000). As a result, people with invisible disabilities use passing behavior to be perceived as credible. Barriers may be raised to prevent the leakage of any information that might give away the existence of the invisible disability (Braithwaite, 1991; Derlega & Chaikin, 1977).

People with invisible disabilities endure continuous threats to their sell'-esteem because of their “discreditable” status. The unknown nature of an invisible disability sets up the possibility for negative discovery. It is not surprising, then, that those with disorders that are invisible tend to experience more emotional problems than those with visible manifestations of their disease (Ireys, Gross, Werthamer-Larsson, & Kolodner, 1994). For this reason, people with invisible disabilities are particularly vulnerable to shame. Shame is an intense emotion involving a negative assessment of the global self (Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992; Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1992). Shame develops from the concept that oneself or one's presentation to others has not met with one’s personal expectations (Lazare, 1987). It can occur in reaction to any disparity between one’s ideal self and one's perception of the actual self (Sidoli, 1988). There is also a relationship between shame and the fear of being negatively evaluated by others (Gilbert, Pehl, & Allan, 1994).

According to Lazare (1987), shame arises from the interaction of a shame-inducing event, the individual‘s vulnerability to shame, and the social context. A shame inducing event is one in which the sell' is exposed and portrayed as inadequate or defective. When individuals feel rejected, weak, somehow bad or defective, messy/dirty, disgusting, or when they fail at something or lose control of themselves or a situation, they are most vulnerable to shame (Lazare, 1987). Chronic illness and disability may be accompanied by a loss of control. Given this circumstance, it is hard to imagine a time when many people with disabilities, particularly those whose disabilities are invisible, would not be vulnerable to shame.

People with disabilities may, when requested to perform a behavior, assess their ability to accomplish the behavior based on past experience (Matthews, 1996). In her Shame Response Model, Matthews (1996) explained that when self-efficacy is high, it is probable that they will attempt the behavior and, barring outside or unexpected obstacles, the behavior will occur. If self-efficacy is low, however, they will perceive some level of shame ensuing from their perceived inadequacy (Bandura, 1977). People may respond to this shame experience adaptively or maladaptively. An adaptive response enables the person to work on whatever inadequacy she or he perceives as preventing the behavior or to make compensations that possibly may make the behavior achievable. However, stigmatized persons often may respond maladaptively, with avoidance, anger or depression. Avoidance relations may generate behaviors such as lying, deliberately failing to comply with requests, or avoiding contact with those connected with the shame experience altogether. Anger can be directed at the person perceived to be fostering the shame response or can be turned toward the self (Lane & Hobfoll, 1992). This is problematic for people with invisible disabilities and for those interacting with them as the cause of the response may be concealed (Matthews & Harrington, 2000).

#### Our discussion solves – it’s not a matter of solving the impacts of ableism in this one instance. Rather, we need to discuss and analyze how ableism permeates debate and educate ourselves through constant discussion.

Shelton, Spalding University assistant professor, and Matthews, University of Kentucky doctoral student, ’01

[Michael W. Shelton, and Cynthia K. Matthews, Fall 2001, Argumentation and Advocacy, “Extending the Diversity Agenda in Forensics: Invisible Disabilities and Beyond,” volume: 38, pgs. 127-8, EBSCO, accessed 7/5/12, JTF]

The relationships and interactions between colleagues and friends, and people who are disabled are complex. Only through repeated and mutual checking of interpretation can shared meaning be accomplished (Bamlund, 1976). Achieving shared meaning is especially difficult when one has invisible disabilities. Communication is affected by issues of impression management, self-disclosure, and issues of shame. It is crucial that colleagues be sensitive to the implications of stigma and disability and the possibility of maladaptive shame responses from the person with invisible disabilities. It is important that they be aware that the person with an invisible disability is actively engaged in impression management and may be going to great lengths not to appear disabled. This problem continues to exist even when the invisible disability is known, affecting communication about changes in the condition or the severity of the condition [Matthews & Harrington, in press). Colleagues must be alert so that they are not led to believe that all is well when, in fact, it might not be. A debate coach, for example, should not merely dictate that an invisibly disabled debater act on the decision to attend the next tournament without discussion simply because she or he was well at the last.

The importance of training should not be ignored for those who interact with people with invisible disabilities. Although it is not common, it is possible for one person to experience shame for another. For example, a close friend or colleague may experience shame for the disabled person (Lazare, 1987). Colleagues, then, need to be aware of the shame response on several levels. Awareness is the beginning in the effort to keep shame from interfering in relationships. It is possible that the forensic community could sponsor workshops to help colleagues learn to avoid sending messages that are inappropriate or easily misinterpreted. They could be taught person-centered communication skills needed to deal with shame.

It is also possible that with education, invisibly disabled people, themselves, could learn to respond differently when confronted by shame-eliciting situations. There is evidence that a stigmatized person’s efforts to think of her or himself as a worthy human being can lead to resentment of a nonstigmatized person’s negative behavior and that, over time, such reactions may become automatic, regardless of the behavior or the nonstigmatized person. Lazare (1987) argues that persons who feel stigmatized, socially discredited, or branded, actually will begin to anticipate unfavorable reactions from others. In a relevant study, Farina, Allen, and Saul (1968) speak to this possibility. This study employed a laboratory manipulation designed to explore changes in behavior and communication when subjects battered they had been stigmatized, when in fact they had not. The study revealed that if an individual believed she or he was perceived unfavorably by another person, her or his behavior in a later interaction was affected independently of the other person‘s actions in the situation. Thus, when one believes that one is viewed as somehow blemished or degraded, behavior can be altered in such a way as to sometimes cause rejection by others. If invisibly disabled persons become aware of this, they may be able to learn to avoid such behavior and enhance relationships with able-bodied others.

# Universal Design AFF

## 1AC – Draft

### Contention One – Inherency

#### Due to lack of funding, people with disabilities cannot access adequate public transportation in the status quo

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg.13, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

This paper analyzes existing transportation systems in the United States with the acknowledgment that these systems are inherently inadequate due to a chronic lack of funding. As the United States focuses its resources on travel by automobile, all other modes are neglected in comparison. As a consistent theme in most transit systems across the United States, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) has spawned great improvements, but many compliance gaps remain that pose significant problems to transportation for people with disabilities. Additionally, because the ADA merely requires that, where public transportation is provided, it must be made accessible for people with disabilities, where there is no public transportation, it is likely that no transportation exists at all for people with disabilities. In some sectors, such as in rural areas, grossly insufficient funding imposes harsh gaps in the transportation grid. In other sectors, such as accessible taxis, a lack of requirements has meant very uneven progress. As a result, people with disabilities are still at a significant disadvantage compared with the general public.

### Contention Two – Ableism Advantage

People with disabilities face systematic exclusion from transportation infrastructure

American Association of People With Disabilities, 12

(American Association of People with Disabilities, The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "Equity inTransportation for People with Disabilities," n. pag, www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf accessed 6-31-12, CNM)

Bus services have improved significantly under the ADA. Universal design features such as low-floor buses with ramps, larger destination signs, floor markings, additional grab bars, audible stop announcements, and monitors that show upcoming stops have greatly enhanced accessibility. However, many transit agencies still fail to comply with the ADA requirement to announce bus stops, which greatly affects individuals with visual and cognitive disabilities. Some rely on automatic stop announcement systems, which often are problematic. Additionally, problems persist with the maintenance of accessibility equipment such as lifts, and with securing mobility equipment such as wheelchairs and scooters. In some cases, drivers do not stop for people with disabilities. Drivers need more training on securing equipment, calling out stops, and following procedures regarding passengers with disabilities.

Over–the-road buses—large buses elevated over a luggage compartment, which are often used for tours and travel— can also be problematic for people with disabilities. These types of buses frequently pick up passengers at curb stops rather than at stations. Although large companies generally tend to comply with accessibility requirements, smaller companies often ignore them.

Train travel has also improved, yet still imposes certain obstacles. With regard to previously existing rail systems, the ADA only requires that key stations be made accessible. Key stations include transfer rail stations, major interchange points, stations where passenger boardings exceed average boardings, and stations serving major activity centers. In cities that have subways, commuter rails, or other systems built before the ADA took effect, including some large East Coast systems such as Boston and New York, there are few accessible stations. Requiring only key stations to be made accessible, rather than incrementally making all existing rail stations accessible, has led to gaps in accessibility. Furthermore, it is difficult to agree on a “key” station. Any station is key to those who use it.

A significant barrier on some rail systems is a lack of elevators or the failure to maintain elevators in working order and to inform riders when they are out of service. Issues with platform accessibility also continue to deter individuals using mobility assistive devices from accessing rail systems. Overly wide gaps between the train and the platform can be problematic. While newer systems have been built with minimal gaps, older systems have larger gaps that can make transportation prohibitive. Stop announcements for people with visual or cognitive disabilities are often unreliable, when agencies fail to test systems regularly, monitor them closely, and make changes necessary to ensure that they function properly.

#### This is not an accident or oversight, this is a result of ingrained able-normative conceptions of mobility

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1652 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Disabled people's mobility and movement are highly circumscribed by sociocultural attitudes, practices, and the related design of the built environment. From the microarchitecture of urban streetscapes, to the discontinuous nature of transportation infrastructure and networks, one can agree with Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 605) who suggest that it is ``hegemonic bodies that are culturally formative of the codes and idioms'' which condition the norms of movement and mobility (also, see Corker, 1998; 1999; Hughes, 1999). Such norms revolve around conceptions of the bodily incompetence of people with physical and mental impairments, while propagating welfare policies and procedures which seek to discipline disabled people into a state (and status) of nonimpaired carnality. For disabled people, then, their immobility is their own fault or the consequences of a deviant corporeality which requires medical care and rehabilitation or, failing that, the application of charitable works.

#### This ablenormativity creates on going marginalization

Cowley, Syracuse University, doctoral candidate in Special Education and Disability Studies, 12

(Danielle, “Life Writing, Resistance, and the Politics of Representation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Eli Clare's ‘Learning to Speak’”, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 6, Number 1,

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v006/6.1.cowley.html>accessed 7/8/12)

Clare's poetic narrative draws our attention to the cultural model of ableism (Linton 9). Ableism privileges the normative body at the same time that it misrepresents the disabled body. It is grounded in notions of normalcy and centers [End Page 88] the nondisabled experience and body while relegating people with disabilities to the margins as dependent and weak. Normalcy emerged in the nineteenth century, coinciding with industrialization, the development of statistics, beliefs of scientific progress, and the birth of the eugenics movement (Davis 4). With the emergence of normalcy, variation from an ideological norm is considered deviant or abnormal (4). As a result, bodies, actions, and ways of being or doing that conform to dominant society's understanding of normalcy are afforded cultural capital and a privileged status (Linton 24).

The construction of normalcy brings about severe implications for people with disabilities. According to Lennard Davis, a hegemonic idea of the body (8) was established through normal curves, classification symbols, and strict definitions of what constitutes a normal body. The normal body is defined as an able-body conforming to Western standards of beauty, fitness, strength, independence, and intelligence (Garland-Thomson 8). Clare describes this marginalization of disabled bodies as acts of thievery ("Stolen Bodies," 363). The bodies of marginalized individuals are stolen through assumptions, biases, prejudice, media representations, film, and so on. Thievery occurs through explicit acts of oppression, such as laughter, stares, or hateful remarks. It also occurs through the systemic ways in which various institutions, including education, the media, and government figuratively, socially, and geographically segregate people with disabilities and deny them a worthy and competent status.

Ableism operates as master trope illuminating the fundamental tactic of oppression—the naturalization of social inferiority as biological difference

Siebers, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism, 9

Tobin, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, Lecture, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdisabilities.temple.edu%2Fmedia%2Fds%2Flecture20091028siebersAesthetics_FULL.doc&ei=LWz4T6jyN8bHqAHLkY2LCQ&usg=AFQjCNGdkDuSJkRXMHgbXqvuyyeDpldVcQ&sig2=UCGDC4tHbeh2j7-Yce9lsA>, accessed 7/7/12)

Oppression is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves “groups,” and not “individuals,” means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority—what some call “in-built” or “biological” inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics—not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed.

One additional thought must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. “Racism” disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. “Sexism” disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. “Classism” disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. “Ableism” disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature.

As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority—and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression—the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.

#### Ableism manifests itself as Internalized oppression

Reeve PhD student Lancaster University 6

(Donna Reeve, September 20, 2006 Department of Applied Social Science, Lancaster University, Disability Studies: Research and Learning “‘Am I a real disabled person or someone with a dodgy arm?’: a discussion of psycho-emotional disablism and its contribution to identity constructions,” <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/events/disabilityconference_archive/2006/papers/reeve2006.pdf> pg. 3 accessed 7-3-12 BC)

So internalised oppression happens when a disabled person believes the negative myths and stereotypes about disability which abound in society – but as Young points out, this internalisation not only affects how they feel about themselves, but also how they feel and act towards other disabled people. And this dual aspect is important.

Internalised oppression within disability studies is not new – it was documented back in Hunt’s seminal 1966 text called "A Critical Condition” (Hunt, 1966) and Micheline Mason wrote in 1992: “We harbour inside ourselves the pain and the memories, the fears and the confusions, the negative self-images and the low expectations, turning them into weapons with which to re-injure ourselves, every day of our lives." (Mason, 1992:27)

Rather than arising from relationships with other people internalised oppression arises from the largely unconscious relationship someone has with themselves, fuelled by the continuing negative images and stereotypes about disabled people which abound in society.

So I would regard this phenomenon as psycho-emotional disablism apparent within a relationship with the self, rather than within relationships with strangers or professionals as I have discussed elsewhere.

#### This Psycho-emotional violence is the worst form of violence – it’s violence against their being and existence, outweighs probabilistic impacts because it denies the very value of life

Goodley, Manchester Metropolitan University Professor of Psychology and Disability, and Runswick-Cole, Manchester Metropolitan University Research Associate, 11

(Dan and Katherine, no full date given, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, "The violence of disablism," 33:4, p. 607-608, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition , CNM)

Critical disability studies have engaged with the psychological and affective aspects of disablism. In Britain, the work of Thomas (1999, 2007) and Reeve (2002, 2008), has crucially intervened in materialist sociological accounts of disablism by drawing attention to the ‘barriers in here’ experienced by disabled people (Reeve 2008: 1). Against a wide understanding of structural inequalities, psycho-emotional disablism interrogates the experiences between disabled people and disabling society. This interrogation has identified direct and indirect forms of discrimination:

Direct forms can be found in discriminatory interactions, acts of invalidation, patronising responses of others and hate crimes such as the destruction of group symbols and hate literature (Sherry 2000, 2010). Recent crime statistics from Britain suggest that 25% of disabled people report being victimised (Roulstone and Balderston 2009). Indirect forms may be due to the side effects of structural disablism or unintended actions, words or deeds. The psycho-emotional refers to the impact of these ingredients of disablism on the ontological security or confidence of disabled people (Thomas 1999). A key psychic reaction to such hostility is internalised oppression: the re-injuring of self through internalising discriminatory values (Marks 1999), lowering self-worth and lessening a sense of intrinsic value (Thomas 2007) (Goodley 2010: 90).

Zˇ izˇ ek (2008: 60) describes this as ontic violence: a violence against being or existence: ‘there is a direct link between ontological violence and the texture of social violence (of sustaining relations and enforced domination)’ (Zˇizˇek 2008: 61). Interpersonal forms of violence threaten to determine the ‘very being and social existence of the interpreted subject’ (Zˇ izˇ ek 2008: 62). The following narratives represent, for us, potent examples of psycho-emotional or ontic violence:

The administrators of the Facebook page for supporters of the Every Disabled Child Matters campaign (see http://www.edcm.org.uk for details of the campaign), have twice had to remove comments from the page full of hatred towards disabled children and their families. Although the comments have been removed swiftly and the people who made them reported and banned from Facebook, it is hard to understand why someone would feel the need to take the time to join as a fan of the campaign and write an offensive message on the wall of the site. (Katherine’s ethnographic notes)

So they [autism outreach teachers] went in with, you know the suggestions of how to do this – and one of the things was, ‘Well it becomes apparent that we don’t understand when Sam’s distressed or upset or anxious, maybe if we introduced a one to five scale, that’s a simple way that he can communicate to us that he’s feeling stressed’. How did it go? Sam told the learning mentor he was at four and was approaching five, her response was, ‘Well how do you think I feel? I’m at a ten’. Can you believe that? I ... honestly ... I nearly died when he told me. I was just speechless and he was like, ‘Are you alright mum?’ and I said, ‘I’ll be fine, just give me a minute’ (Gayle).

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its transportation infrastructure investment for Universal Design.

### Contention Three – Solveny

#### Transportation funding is key to sustained equity

The American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(May 2012, AAPD, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” <http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf>, p. 5, accessed 6/30/12, YGS)

Equity in transportation is an important civil rights issue. It is critical to the independence of people with disabilities and their ability to contribute economically, socially, and politically. The ADA prohibits discrimination based on disability and requires accessibility in public transportation. In the past two decades since passage of the ADA, some progress has been made; however transportation options for people with disabilities remain unacceptably limited. More efforts must be made to ensure that people with disabilities have access to affordable and reliable transportation. We therefore make the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS The disability and broader civil rights community must continue to work together for a transportation system that meets the needs of ALL individuals in the United States. As Congress considers legislation related to transportation, it should keep in mind the following recommendations: Funding • Dedicated funding for public transit is critical—most federal funding currently favors cars and highways, missing a whole segment of the nation. • Funding should support the state of good repair— letting our infrastructure fall apart impedes the mobility of millions of people in the U.S. • Funding should allow for operating assistance in addition to capital expenses to assist in paying the operating and administration costs of providing transit service.

#### Universal Design can meet the needs of everyone

Scott Pruett community-based therapeutic recreation, Sarah Pruett, occupational therapist, 12

(Scott & Sarah Pruett, April 23, 2012 “UniversalDesign: Simplified.” [http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook pg. 14-15 accessed 7-8-12](http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook%20pg.%2014-15%20accessed%207-8-12) BC)

The same concept applies to the design of places, products, and programs. If there are multiple approaches for access to a location, different ways of using a product, or various ways to adapt a program, then people aren’t going to be excluded because they are different than the primary demographic that something was initially designed for.

All we are saying here is that the design can meet the needs and desires of people with different abilities. Sometimes some adaptation will be required, and that’s okay. It doesn’t have to be complicated, and it doesn’t have to be expensive. Flexibility can even come naturally.

Example: consider the widespread popularity of smartphones. The technology inherently offers flexibility of use. Many smartphones have the options to increase text sizes for easy reading, or have components inside that vibrate to alert a user who isn’t looking at the device. Even touch screens that require less effort to manipulate than buttons do offer increased ease-of-use for everybody.

That’s flexibility. That’s one way to ensure that people don’t get left out, even if you don’t have to try very hard.

#### Universal design re-conceptualizes able-normative assumptions

Scott Pruett community-based therapeutic recreation, Sarah Pruett, occupational therapist, 12

(Scott & Sarah Pruett, April 23, 2012 “UniversalDesign: Simplified.” [http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook pg. 8-9 accessed 7-8-12](http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook%20pg.%208-9%20accessed%207-8-12) BC)

Universal design doesn’t place focus on people with disabilities. Instead, it recognizes that no one has the same definition of “normal.” Universally designed places, products, and programs inherently offer access, use, or participation to the greatest number of people, regardless of their level of ability.

The idea of acknowledging that “normal” can be interpreted differently by anyone is pretty revolutionary. We’re accustomed to seeing the world through our eyes, not someone else’s. That’s okay. What’s not okay is creating labels for others that may struggle with something that the majority of people don’t have an issue with. This is the crux of what creates a victim mentality in someone who then might feel categorized as disabled – or simply different – just because of a mental or physical imperfection.

Our mission is “to promote increased independence and quality of life for people of all abilities at home and in the community.” We have absolutely no desire for people to feel that they are victims of disability because of mental or physical issues that are out of their control to change. Instead, we want to see people empowered to tackle life, regardless of their imperfections.

As a member of society, you have the ability to empower others by infusing universal design into the things you work on or are a part of. As more and more places, products, and programs offer increased access, use, or participation to the greatest number of people, those with lessthanperfect lives will naturally feel welcome – and less “different” – alongside everyone else.

## Inherency

### Transportation Investment

#### Transportation investment must account for differences

The Leadership Conference Education Fund, ‘11

(The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Civilrights.org,* “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity,” March, 2011, <http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.protectcivilrights.org%2Fpdf%2Fdocs%2Ftransportation%2F52846576-Where-We-Need-to-Go-A-Civil-Rights-Roadmap-for-Transportation-Equity.pdf&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNGFs-krxTNtM1Fek7A1GuTA--2uOQ>, Accessed: 7/3/12,P.3, LPS)

Transportation Policy Priorities for Civil and Human Rights Organizations Today’s transportation infrastructure perpetuates public health problems, environmental damage, and unequal opportunity. Although our nation will continue to be primarily dependent on automobiles for the foreseeable future, we also must invest in equitable alternatives that will benefit our economy, environment, and underserved communities. As we consider how to rebuild and rethink our transportation policies, we must make decisions with civil and human rights considerations in mind. This means that advocates must mobilize to educate and advocate for a shared vision of transportation equity. a. Transportation equity provides people with multiple transportation options Creating and maintaining affordable and accessible transportation options are priorities. Ending the disproportionate investment in car-based transit must be a centerpiece of the transportation equity agenda. Highways and streets without space for non-motorized traffic isolate those without access to cars and people with disabilities, force low-income people to overspend on transportation and forego other necessities, and contribute to pedestrian fatalities. Civil and human rights advocates should encourage investments in “multi-modal” forms of transit, including sidewalks, bike lanes, and dedicated street and highway lanes for rapid bus transit that can connect urban and low-income people to jobs. In addition, our transportation policy should expand and improve service for people who depend on public transportation, including older adults, people with disabilities, people in rural areas, and low-income people.

### Surface Transportation

#### Surface transportation has issues now

American Association of People With Disabilities, 12

(American Association of People with Disabilities, The Leadership Conference Education Fund, "Equity inTransportation for People with Disabilities," n. pag, www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf accessed 6-31-12, CNM)

Bus services have improved significantly under the ADA. Universal design features such as low-floor buses with ramps, larger destination signs, floor markings, additional grab bars, audible stop announcements, and monitors that show upcoming stops have greatly enhanced accessibility. However, many transit agencies still fail to comply with the ADA requirement to announce bus stops, which greatly affects individuals with visual and cognitive disabilities. Some rely on automatic stop announcement systems, which often are problematic. Additionally, problems persist with the maintenance of accessibility equipment such as lifts, and with securing mobility equipment such as wheelchairs and scooters. In some cases, drivers do not stop for people with disabilities. Drivers need more training on securing equipment, calling out stops, and following procedures regarding passengers with disabilities.

Over–the-road buses—large buses elevated over a luggage compartment, which are often used for tours and travel— can also be problematic for people with disabilities. These types of buses frequently pick up passengers at curb stops rather than at stations. Although large companies generally tend to comply with accessibility requirements, smaller companies often ignore them.

Train travel has also improved, yet still imposes certain obstacles. With regard to previously existing rail systems, the ADA only requires that key stations be made accessible. Key stations include transfer rail stations, major interchange points, stations where passenger boardings exceed average boardings, and stations serving major activity centers. In cities that have subways, commuter rails, or other systems built before the ADA took effect, including some large East Coast systems such as Boston and New York, there are few accessible stations. Requiring only key stations to be made accessible, rather than incrementally making all existing rail stations accessible, has led to gaps in accessibility. Furthermore, it is difficult to agree on a “key” station. Any station is key to those who use it.

A significant barrier on some rail systems is a lack of elevators or the failure to maintain elevators in working order and to inform riders when they are out of service. Issues with platform accessibility also continue to deter individuals using mobility assistive devices from accessing rail systems. Overly wide gaps between the train and the platform can be problematic. While newer systems have been built with minimal gaps, older systems have larger gaps that can make transportation prohibitive. Stop announcements for people with visual or cognitive disabilities are often unreliable, when agencies fail to test systems regularly, monitor them closely, and make changes necessary to ensure that they function properly.

### Lack Accessible Transportation

#### In the status quo, there are millions of people with disabilities that can’t obtain transportation - Non-accessible public transit causes institutionalization

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg. 13, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

A national study conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics in 2002 found that 6 million people with disabilities have difficulties obtaining the transportation they need.1 Research in the year 2000 conducted by the Harris Poll and funded by the National Organization on Disability established that nearly one-third of people with disabilities report having inadequate access to transportation.2 Behind these statistics are many personal stories of lives severely limited by the lack of transportation. Some people with disabilities who are willing and able to work cannot do so because of inadequate transportation. Others cannot shop, socialize, enjoy recreational or spiritual activities, or even leave their homes. And some individuals with disabilities who need medical services must live in institutions due solely to the lack of safe, reliable transportation to needed medical services.

#### Lack of SQ Disability infrastructure Now

Transportation and mobility play key roles in the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity in the disability community. Affordable and reliable transportation allows people with disabilities access to important opportunities in education, employment, health care, housing, and community life. Because our nation’s investments in transportation infrastructure have disproportionately favored cars and highways, those who cannot afford cars or do not drive cars often lack viable transportation options. People with disabilities—particularly in rural areas— need accessible, affordable transportation options that bring employment, health care, education, housing, and community life within reach.

#### Disabled people are more likely to have inadequate transportation

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(American Association of People with Disabilities, The Leadership Conference Education Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” <http://www.aapd.com/resources/publications/transportation-disabilities.pdf>, accessed 7/13/2012, bs)

Unfortunately, adults with disabilities are twice as likely as those without disabilities to have inadequate transportation (31 percent vs. 13 percent). 1 Of the nearly 2 million people with disabilities who never leave their homes, 560,000 never leave home because of transportation difficulties. 2 Leaving people out has real costs to the nation. Keeping people with disabilities at home keeps them out of jobs, away from shopping, and out of community life, and it prevents them from making valuable contributions to our society as individuals, as workers, as consumers, and as taxpayers.

### Need Better Access

#### Persons with visual disabilities require better access to travel-related information

Golledge, UC Santa Barbara Professor of Geography, 96

Reginald G.; C. Michael Costanzo, UC Santa Barbara Department of Computer Science Lecturer; and James R. Marston, UC Santa Barbara Department of Geography Assistant Researcher, 1/1/1996, California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways, “The Mass Transit Needs of a Non-driving Disabled Population,” <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5rk1121g>, p. ii, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

The blind and visually impaired, in this country, represent a significantly large group of disabled persons who also need help with transportation modifications. The good news, uncovered in this survey, is that their needs do not seem to require anywhere near the massive outlays required by the adaptations for wheelchair users. What we found was that the blind and visually impaired do not need many physical adaptations to existing equipment and infrastructure. Traveling for visually impaired people means moving through a world lacking many or all of the visual cues that sighted travelers, and many transit providers, take for granted. The absence of visual cues such as bus stop signs, bus numbers and street signs are the main barriers to equal access to transportation reported in this study. This group’s main need is simply more and better INFORMATION. 1. The single most important characteristic of public transit use for blind and vision impaired people is not related to hardware improvement but rather to improving access to information. 2. The type of information most needed consists of: (a) Brailled or large print timetables and schedules, produced in a usable format. (b) Larger signs on transit vehicles to identify their routes. (c) Information at transit stops regarding whether or not a vehicle has just passed and wait time for next vehicle; most prefer some type of auditory message. (d) Clearer PA systems in terminals and on board vehicles. (e) Announcements of stops - either mechanical or verbal. (f) Auditory messages and signals at lights when change of vehicle or route necessitates crossing the street. (g) Talking Signs on transit vehicles and in terminals, accessed by sonic or radar receivers. (h) Joint auditory/tactile information in terminals (e.g., talking tactual maps on devices such as NOMAD). (i) Transit HOT LINES with human operators, not touch-tone access to pre-recorded messages, voice-mail, or computerized query systems: the latter are universally disliked. 3. Survey results indicate that improving information access should relieve many of the frustrations blind and vision impaired people experience when having to use public transit. 4. Auditory messages are needed to complement the abundance of visual messages currently available to sighted travelers. 5. For relatively little outlay, it may be possible to improve the attractiveness of public transit for this group. 6. Since many members of the disabled population travel free, economic factors and standard economic reasoning about travel mode is largely irrelevant. 7. Our respondents indicated that they needed more information about services for disabled travelers, that transit information was not always easy to obtain and that it was not always easy to understand and use. 8. Some of these needs can be addressed simply with better enforcement of existing procedures. Our respondents heaped praise on the local bus drivers for their assistance with their required stops, but a common theme was that bus stops and streets were not always announced, leading to missed stops and confusion. Also mentioned was the poor quality of announcements at the hub terminal. Both of these concerns could be addressed with stricter enforcement of existing regulations, or if needed, a taped announcement, either manual or automatic. 9. Another problem that is easily addressed is that seats reserved for disabled, located near the door and the driver, were not always available for their intended patrons. Again stricter enforcement of existing rules would alleviate this problem. Our blind and visually impaired travelers also rated the telephone hot-line, with human operators, as very valuable. Some travelers, however, were not aware of this service. 10. When asked to rate difficulties when using transit the problems were not with entering or exiting, paying the fare or other design issues. The most difficulty was rated for lack of information issues like knowing which bus to enter, knowing their location on a moving bus and dealing with transfers and crossing the street. More easily provided information was shown by their desire for timetables in suitable format, large print or Braille, available onboard. The few technological helps they desired are certainly not as costly as infrastructure or equipment retrofitting. They showed a preference for auditory prompts at terminals and bus stops giving bus numbers and times of arrival of the next bus. Given the inability of many in the general public to read or understand transit schedules, these investments in auditory information systems would likely increase ridership in the total population. High preference was also shown for “talking signs,” identifying output from a bus or sign that is transmitted to a hand held auditory device. They also indicated concern when crossing streets and therefore requested auditory traffic signals. These requests are the only technological aid requested that would be used only by the visually impaired.

### Lack Rural Transportation

#### Lack of Funding for Rural Disability High Now

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(5-8-12“Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.4, accessed 7-1-12, JC)

Rural communities face even greater barriers to accessible transportation. A significant lack of funding to rural communities means that public transit in general, let alone accessible transportation, is often in very short supply. At least 12 million individuals living in rural communities, or 41 percent of the rural population, live in counties with no public transportation.5 Rural residents with disabilities and those who serve them report that the lack of transportation is one of their most significant and persistent problems.6 Minimal or nonexistent transit services in rural areas severely curtail the mobility of people with disabilities and keep them from jobs, medical appointments, community life, and independence.>

### Para Transit

#### Many problems with paratransit services in the status quo

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(AAPD, Leadership Conference Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.2, accessed 6-30-12, CAS)

One of the biggest changes under the ADA is the requirement to provide paratransit services in areas where mass transit is available to provide people with disabilities who could not use mass transit with another alternative. Paratransit is an alternate mode of transportation, most often provided by minibuses, which provides door-to-door shared rides upon request by eligible users. Paratransit use has soared in the past 20 years, along with its costs. However, users in many cities experience significant problems with their paratransit systems, including problems with service quality and capacity limitations. Specific Pa r a t r a n s i t s e r v i c e i s c ru c i a l fo r those individuals who rely on it to get around. Failure of paratransit to show up or to provide effective service not only causes frustration but can also cause missed health ap p o i n t m e n t s a n d e m p l oy m e n t problems for those who need to get to work. Problems include: restrictive eligibility criteria; unfair trip denials; tardiness or failure to show; slow service en route; inefficient and unfriendly telephone reservation systems; inaccurate information; failure to respond to complaints; lack of training for drivers; drivers’ lack of respect for users; and punitive cancellation policies.

#### **Due to lack of funding, paratransit services have tightened availability for riders, denying their rights**

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg. 12-13, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

Paratransit ridership has soared under the ADA, and costs have similarly expanded. Although far more individuals are being served, riders in many cities continue to experience significant and complicated problems using their local paratransit systems. Many transit agencies have tightened their eligibility procedures in an attempt to get a handle on costs and on paratransit dependence by riders who could use the fixed-route system. But not all transit agencies are observing best practices in their eligibility screening, sometimes causing problems when service is denied.

Some paratransit systems are still plagued by trip denials. As a result, riders are unable to obtain the next-day rides guaranteed them by law. The way denials are calculated can mask their true impact. Many paratransit riders experience great problems with the timeliness of the service— vehicles arrive sometimes too early, often too late, and riders cannot reach their job sites, medical appointments, and other important engagements when they need to. Other problems can include long telephone hold times and the lack of subscription service for regular riders. Sometimes, this lack of subscription service stems from transit agencies’ misunderstanding of the ADA regulation.

These problems are compounded as some transit agencies cut back paratransit service to the ADA-required minimums, sometimes creating difficult transportation barriers for people with disabilities that are not necessarily violations of the ADA. Some paratransit systems have punitive no-show and late cancellation policies, or fail to comply fully with riders’ rights in these areas. Some have tried using paratransit as a feeder service, without the necessary structure and supports to make feeder service successful. Many of these difficulties can be caused by multifaceted operational problems, for which best practice solutions are suggested in each section of this report.

Some transit agencies provide travel training and other incentives to attract paratransit riders to the fixed-route service. While these programs can be very successful, they also have their share of difficulties. Other solutions to paratransit problems are discussed in this report, including equalizing pay between fixed-route and paratransit drivers, pursuing service quality goals in contracting rather than accepting the lowest contractor bid, and developing special methods of serving individuals who need dialysis or who have dementia.

### Buses

#### Bus services require more improvements

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(AAPD, Leadership Conference Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.2, accessed 6-30-12, CAS)

Bus services have improved significantly under the ADA. Universal design features such as low-floor buses with ramps, larger destination signs, floor markings, additional grab bars, audible stop announcements, and monitors that show upcoming stops have greatly enhanced accessibility. However, many transit agencies still fail to comply with the ADA requirement to announce bus stops, which greatly affects individuals with visual and cognitive disabilities. Some rely on automatic stop announcement systems, which often are problematic. Additionally, problems persist with the maintenance of accessibility equipment such as lifts, and with securing mobility equipment such as wheelchairs and scooters. In some cases, drivers do not stop for people with disabilities. Drivers need more training on securing equipment, calling out stops, and following procedures regarding passengers with disabilities.

### Trains

#### **There aren’t enough accessible train stations**

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg. 14, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

Train travel has improved greatly for people with disabilities, but the ADA’s limited key station requirement has meant that some of the large, old East Coast rail systems, in particular, have few accessible stations. A significant barrier on some rail systems is the failure to maintain elevators in working order and to inform riders when elevators are out of service. The gap between the train and the platform, and the second-rate accessibility of mini-high platforms on commuter rail systems, still impose barriers.

#### Train travel has gaps in accessibility

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(AAPD, Leadership Conference Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.2, accessed 6-30-12, CAS)

Train travel has also improved, yet still imposes certain obstacles. With regard to previously existing rail systems, the ADA only requires that key stations be made accessible. Key stations include transfer rail stations, major interchange points, stations where passenger boardings exceed average boardings, and stations serving major activity centers. In cities that have subways, commuter rails, or other systems built before the ADA took effect, including some large East Coast systems such as Boston and New York, there are few accessible stations. Requiring only key stations to be made accessible, rather than incrementally making all existing rail stations accessible, has led to gaps in accessibility. Furthermore, it is difficult to agree on a “key” station. Any station is key to those who use it.

#### Amtrak was supposed to be 100% compliant with The Americans with Disabilities Act regulations

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(AAPD, Leadership Conference Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.2, accessed 6-30-12, CAS)

Some of the biggest issues with ADA compliance involve Amtrak, the government-owned passenger train company that provides inter-city service across the U.S. Under the ADA, Amtrak was supposed to have been 100 percent ADA compliant (i.e. accessible) within 20 years of passage of the ADA, or by July 2010. However, only about 20 percent of its stations are compliant. In the past 20 years, Congress has severely underfunded Amtrak, which has done little to improve accessibility. Furthermore, Amtrak has found that it does not actually own many of its stations, so it must rely on other entities to make them accessible, which often does not happen. Several court cases have addressed the various issues that people with disabilities face with accessibility at Amtrak stations and on its trains.

### Accessible Right of Ways

#### **Enforceable standards are insufficient now**

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(5-8-12, American Association of People with Disabilities, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” <http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf>, p.4, accessed 7-1-12, LH)

Safe and accessible rights-of-way are essential elements of community life. Rights-of-way include streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, curb ramps, crossing signals, street parking, and other public infrastructure, and are crucial to viable transportation for people with disabilities. The lack of enforceable standards under the ADA remains a problem, and people with disabilities in communities across the country continue to face barriers such as inaccessible bus stops, intersections without curb ramps, street crossings and pedestrian signals that are not audible to individuals with visual disabilities, and barriers such as telephone poles blocking sidewalks. If people with disabilities cannot even get down their streets, they will be unable to connect to other forms of transportation. Congress is currently considering “complete streets” legislation that would address the issue of public rights-of-way and make streets safe and accessible to everyone.

### Demographics Increase Need

#### **Demand for accessible transportation is increasing- demographic trends**

Ellis, KFH Group, Senior Transportation Planner, et al., 10

(Elizabeth, Jana Lynott, AARP, Policy Advisor, Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP, Strategic Policy Advisor, KFH Group is an organization that acts as consultants to the transit industry,

April 2010, AARP Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, p. 2, accessed 6-30-12, LH)

Demographic trends indicate that demand for public transportation—in particular, specialized services—will grow. From 2007 to 2030, the population aged 65 and older is projected to grow by 89 percent, more than four times as fast as the population as a whole, which is expected to grow by around 20 percent. 2

The next generation of older adults is expected to be healthier than the current one on average, and disability rates appear to be declining. But the sheer growth in population means many more older adults and more persons with disabilities will need transportation to remain in their community settings.

#### The amount of persons with disabilities is increasing- increasing mobility is proving difficult

Dr. Iezzoni, MD Institute for Health Policy, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Dr.Freedman, PhD Department of Health Systems and Policy, School of Public Health, University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, 8

(Lisa I and Vicki A, Journal of the American Medical Association, “Turning the Disability Tide: The Importance of Definitions” January 23, 2008, <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=1149278>, Accessed: 7/7/12, LPS).

Forty million to 50 million individuals in the United States now live with potentially disabling conditions. According to the Institute of Medicine (IOM), this number will likely increase substantially in coming decades.1 Aging baby boomers will fuel much of this growth as this enormous cohort enters age ranges with the greatest disease and disability risks. Although rates of some serious limitations among elderly individuals have declined,2 sobering reports warn of higher rates of potentially impairing conditions among children3 and working-age adults.4 These latter trends are multifaceted with diverse contributors, including major therapeutic breakthroughs that now save lives of severely impaired individuals who would once have died and increasing prevalence of overweight and obesity among youth and young adults, along with associated problems such as diabetes. As recent reports suggest, overweight and obesity cause particular concerns not only because they are associated with increased mortality risks,5 but also because they increase the risk of functional limitations.6 – 7 Such predictions carry an aura of inevitably; even baby boomers cannot escape the march of time. Fears that trends will erode individuals' independence and ability to participate fully in daily life, as well as increase medical and caregiving costs, raise the stakes. Can the United States counter the forces that may significantly swell the numbers of individuals living with disability? Various sectors have mobilized to do just that, with varying levels of success. These include the National Institutes of Health, which has provided billions of dollars for research to reduce mortality and morbidity; the health care delivery system, which provides acute, chronic, and palliative care services; and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention along with other public health efforts targeting health promotion and maximizing wellness.1 ,7 However, the United States has not yet concentrated its collective resources—its people, public policies, institutions, communities, and dollars—to avert the impending wave of population disability.1 Finding a basis from which to start this massive mobilization presents a daunting challenge. As have others,1 we argue that devising strategies to confront disability must first start by defining disability. Definitions implicitly connote goals, which in turn suggest potential solutions and targets for action. When it comes to preventing or deterring disability, this definition matters.

### AT: ADA Solves - No Compliance

#### Despite ADA improvements, agencies won’t follow comply with their regulations

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg. 13-14, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

The ADA has significantly expanded service for people with disabilities on publicly funded transit bus and rail systems, but there are many gaps in ADA compliance that create significant obstacles. Many transit agencies fail to comply with the ADA requirement to announce bus stops, to the great disadvantage of many visually impaired and cognitively disabled people in particular. Some transit agencies have relied on automatic stop announcement systems on the bus, which are not always problem-free. Additionally, problems persist with the maintenance of accessibility equipment, such as bus lifts, and with bus drivers simply passing by people with disabilities who are waiting to ride. Wheelchair and scooter securement are too often inadequate.

### AT: ADA Solves - No Enforcement

#### Due to lack of enforceable standards, barriers block access to bus stops, and other commodities

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg. 15, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

Accessible streets, sidewalks, and other public infrastructure are crucial to viable transportation for people with disabilities The lack of enforceable standards under the ADA remains a significant problem, as communities across the United States erect barriers, including inaccessible bus stops, intersections without curb ramps or with improperly constructed ramps, street crossings and pedestrian signals that are inaccessible to visually impaired people, and phone poles and other barriers blocking sidewalks.

## Solvency

### Funding

Funding low – specialized transportation is key to mobility and equity

Ellis, et al., KFH Group’s Senior Transportation Planner ‘10

(Elizabeth, KFH Group, transportation corporation, Jana Lynott, American Association of Retired Persons’ Strategic Policy Advisor, Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP’s Strategic Policy Advisor, April, AARP Public Policy Institute, “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, p. 3-4, accessed 6/30/12, YGS)

Funding for all public transportation— traditional public transit as well as specialized transportation—should be increased. Traditional fixed-route transit plays an important role in the mobility of many older adults, persons with disabilities, and persons with low income, and increasing investment allows transit agencies to continue efforts to serve them better. Transit agencies’ purchase of accessible buses and operation of special neighborhood routes are just two of the many investments that directly benefit people with mobility limitations. Increasing investment also allows transit agencies to continue specific efforts to serve older riders. A 2007 survey found that virtually all public transit agency respondents provide special services for older adults, including reduced and free fares, travel training, and flexible routes. 19 But many people in the three target population groups rely upon specialized services, such as door-through-door service for riders who are frail or those with disabilities (services beyond ADA paratransit) and late-night shuttles to low-density suburban locations to enable low-wage workers to access jobs (these are often unproductive routes for fixedroute operators). Given the increasing numbers in these groups, it will be essential that Congress increase funding for specialized services.

### Universal Design

#### Universal Design Solves Segregation

Scott Pruett community-based therapeutic recreation, Sarah Pruett, occupational therapist, 12

(Scott & Sarah Pruett, April 23, 2012 “UniversalDesign: Simplified.” [http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook pg. 15-18 accessed 7-8-12](http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook%20pg.%2015-18%20accessed%207-8-12) BC)

Impartiality expands on the idea of flexibility. Being impartial is an intentional effort to create a design for a place, product, or program that isn’t specific for one demographic. This means that there isn’t a requirement for a person to have certain abilities to access, manipulate, or understand something.

Think about the places we go. Universal design removes segregation, which believe it or not, still exists today. People should not be forced to take an alternate route to navigate a location, or maybe sit in a designated area, just because of a physical disability. “Accessible” entrances or paths are helpful, sure, but they are segregating and stigmatizing, often drawing attention to one’s limitations. Why? Think about who gets the privilege of using them: people who are different from the majority.

The basis of universal design is understanding that everyone has a different definition of “normal,” and then finding ways to make things work the same way for the greatest number of people. This means building in provisions that extend the same function, required effort, ability to be understood, safety, security, and privacy to anyone. Places, products, programs – the idea behind it is still the same.

The easy association to make here is access for wheelchairs, which is probably the best starting place when being welcoming to those with physical disabilities. Think about it. If your space can accommodate a wheelchair, which means having a step-less entry, routes that don’t have an unsafe approach (i.e., too steep of a slope and/or uneven surfaces), and plenty of room to move around without bumping into things, then there’s a pretty good chance that people who fatigue easily or rely on support from other mobility devices (e.g., walkers, canes) will have no problem with access.

It’s not just about getting inside, though. Think about how things can be reached, seen, and used, no matter if someone is sitting down or standing up. People with visual or hearing impairments may need different cues to help them figure out where to go and what to do. Individuals with cognitive impairments may benefit from staff members who understand that it might take a little longer to process information, or know that the amount of sensory stimuli can have an effect on communication styles. The list can go on and on, but universal design will address most all of these issues if applied well.

Now, there are bound to be some questions going through your mind about impartiality. We don’t hold the position that everything has to be impartial, specifically when it comes to programs (for example, competitive events or sports). There are some things in life that people participate in because they’ve spent a lot of time developing a specific skill that other people haven’t. We commend that, and certainly don’t discourage it. However, if you’re going to offer something – anything – to the public, we want you to truly consider how the design can be impartial, welcoming the greatest number of people.

### Focus on Access Solves

#### Focusing on Access allows people to examine why the disabled are excluded from places

Wheelchair Dancer 11

(3-28-12, “[Closing Fissures/Blogging Against Disablism](http://cripwheels.blogspot.com/2011/04/closing-fissuresblogging-against.html)”, <http://cripwheels.blogspot.com/2011/04/closing-fissuresblogging-against.html>, accessed 7-6-12, FFF)

I often discuss my ideas, fears and concerns in community.  When I raised this particular question, one wise friend suggested talking about access.  Access changes how we think about the problem.  Instead of looking at the failures or successes -- by which I mean capabilities, capacities, abilities, or, even functions (not that any of these terms are any less problematic -- of an individual body, access enables us to ask whose bodies is our society able to accommodate and why.  Who do we choose to exclude from public spaces, public activities and why?  A focus on access takes away the question of physicality and looks to the structural mechanisms that make it possible for people with some kinds of impairment to be less welcome in their world than others.

### AT: transportation Not Important

#### Transportation infrastructure key to civil rights re-evaluation and re-thinking- empirics prove

The Leadership Conference Education Fund, ‘11

(The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Civilrights.org,* “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity,” March, 2011, <http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.protectcivilrights.org%2Fpdf%2Fdocs%2Ftransportation%2F52846576-Where-We-Need-to-Go-A-Civil-Rights-Roadmap-for-Transportation-Equity.pdf&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNGFs-krxTNtM1Fek7A1GuTA--2uOQ>, Accessed: 7/3/12,P.1, LPS)

Transportation and mobility play key roles in the struggle for civil rights and equal opportunity. Historically, issues related to transportation were integral to the civil rights movement—embodied in the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the Freedom Rides—yet, the civil rights implications of transportation policies have been largely ignored until recent years. Civil and human rights concerns must inform current decisions about where to build highways, the right way to expand transit, and how to connect people with jobs and community resources. The purpose of this paper is to highlight an important opportunity for all segments of society to participate fully in the debates around our nation’s transportation policy to ensure no community is left behind.

### AT: Not Cost Effective

#### Cost effectiveness shouldn’t be the primary goal of programs

Ellis Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Committee on Paratransit,

Lynott Senior Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute, and Fox-Grage Strategic Policy Advisor AARP Public Policy Institute 10

(Elizabeth Ellis, Jana Lynott, and Wendy Fox-Grage, AARP Public Policy Institute Insight on the Issues 39, April 2010 “Policy Options to Improve Specialized Transportation,” <http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/ppi/liv-com/i39-specialized-transportation.pdf>, pg. 13, accessed 6-30-12 BC)

Programs need to tell their story; to demonstrate the human side of their achievements. At the same time, they need to use the powerful management tools of data and performance measures to assess their internal operations. Assessments must include cost measures, which should be used in appropriate ways. For some program reviewers, cost measures may be attractive for peer reviews and comparisons among programs. However, because of the differences among programs and the environments in which they operate, cost measures alone should not be used to measure program effectiveness.

# Ableism Advantage Ext.

## Impacts

### Ableism

#### Ableism privileges normative conceptions of embodiment

Cowley, Syracuse University, doctoral candidate in Special Education and Disability Studies, 12

(Danielle, “Life Writing, Resistance, and the Politics of Representation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Eli Clare's ‘Learning to Speak’”, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 6, Number 1,

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v006/6.1.cowley.html>accessed 7/8/12, sl)

Clare's poetic narrative draws our attention to the cultural model of ableism (Linton 9). Ableism privileges the normative body at the same time that it misrepresents the disabled body. It is grounded in notions of normalcy and centers [End Page 88] the nondisabled experience and body while relegating people with disabilities to the margins as dependent and weak. Normalcy emerged in the nineteenth century, coinciding with industrialization, the development of statistics, beliefs of scientific progress, and the birth of the eugenics movement (Davis 4). With the emergence of normalcy, variation from an ideological norm is considered deviant or abnormal (4). As a result, bodies, actions, and ways of being or doing that conform to dominant society's understanding of normalcy are afforded cultural capital and a privileged status (Linton 24).

The construction of normalcy brings about severe implications for people with disabilities. According to Lennard Davis, a hegemonic idea of the body (8) was established through normal curves, classification symbols, and strict definitions of what constitutes a normal body. The normal body is defined as an able-body conforming to Western standards of beauty, fitness, strength, independence, and intelligence (Garland-Thomson 8). Clare describes this marginalization of disabled bodies as acts of thievery ("Stolen Bodies," 363). The bodies of marginalized individuals are stolen through assumptions, biases, prejudice, media representations, film, and so on. Thievery occurs through explicit acts of oppression, such as laughter, stares, or hateful remarks. It also occurs through the systemic ways in which various institutions, including education, the media, and government figuratively, socially, and geographically segregate people with disabilities and deny them a worthy and competent status.

### Oppression Impact

Ableism operates as master trope illuminating the fundamental tactic of oppression—the naturalization of social inferiority as biological difference

Siebers, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism, 9

Tobin, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, Lecture, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdisabilities.temple.edu%2Fmedia%2Fds%2Flecture20091028siebersAesthetics_FULL.doc&ei=LWz4T6jyN8bHqAHLkY2LCQ&usg=AFQjCNGdkDuSJkRXMHgbXqvuyyeDpldVcQ&sig2=UCGDC4tHbeh2j7-Yce9lsA>, accessed 7/7/12, sl)

Oppression is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves “groups,” and not “individuals,” means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority—what some call “in-built” or “biological” inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics—not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed.

One additional thought must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. “Racism” disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. “Sexism” disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. “Classism” disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. “Ableism” disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature.

As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority—and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression—the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.

### Value to Life

#### Social structure unfairly favors certain forms of existence and the medical view of disability neglects the oppressive nature of the social structure. Medical View destroys value to life

Ho, University of British Columbia, professor of applied Ethics, 5

(Anita, 4-1-05, The Graduate School, Syracuse University, “Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability in the University Classroom and Curriculum,” http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf, accessed: 7-5-2012, p.23, CAS)

In the reading packet that my student wished she did not have to purchase, I included articles and discussions from the disability perspectives that help to challenge the ways we understand various concepts. While we still discussed “traditional” topics, we paid special attention to how these topics are often framed in the mainstream debate, including decisions about which voices are heard and marginalized respectively. For example, in our discussion of genetic testing, we examined how debates of autonomy and quality of life are often tied to the medical view of disability that neglects the oppressive nature of the social structure. These debates usually ignore various social and political implications that prenatal genetic diagnosis and selective abortion might have on people with disabilities. Our readings from various disability perspectives helped us to challenge the way we thought about parenting, “harm” to future generations and quality of life. We easily incorporated the disability perspective into our discussion of euthanasia. When I took a poll at the beginning of the class, every student indicated that Dr. Kevorkian, who was convicted of second-degree murder for giving a lethal injection to a terminally ill man, did nothing morally wrong. As a philosopher who was used to discussing diverse perspectives, I was stunned by the absolute agreement among the students. When questioned, many students explained that sometimes one’s quality of life could be so bad that death was preferable. Some cited examples from the hospitals or nursing homes where they worked with patients who were permanently paralyzed, terminally ill and/or in constant severe pain. I asked these students whether they thought these patients’ lives were not worth living. Some of them nodded; others indicated that they simply would not want to live in such a state. They initially held the view that there could be objective and/or “medical” ways to determine one’s quality of life, and were relieved that most of the articles in our textbook presented similar views. Most students initially had difficulty accepting the possibility that life with disabilities can still be fulfilling, or that social attitudes and availability of resources may be more relevant to the quality of life than “medical” conditions. However, after reading articles from the disability perspectives and discussing various actual cases related to euthanasia and disability (Larry McAfee, Elizabeth Bouvia, Tracy Latimar, etc.), some students began to acknowledge that the ways they considered futility, ethics of euthanasia, withdrawal of treatment and resource allocations were affected by their ablebodied assumptions about well-being. They started to recognize how the social structure continues to unfairly favor certain forms of existence over others. One student, who thought one of her patients would be better off dead than alive in her current state, told me after class that she was embarrassed about her ignorance.

She was worried that her negative attitude might have affected the way that her patient thought about her life. It is unfortunate that I have not been able to find a textbook that truly embraces diverse perspectives. It appears that I will once again be using an additional reading packet for my next biomedical ethics class. After all, we cannot have a full understanding of various ethical implications of genetics and euthanasia without the disability perspective. Hopefully, one day all “mainstream” editors will realize the importance of diverse perspectives and will eliminate the need for an “extra” reading packet. As I said, disability is not an “additional” topic, but an important part of our everyday existence.

#### Ableism justifies constant killing and devalues life.

Vicky, writer and educator, 3/9/12

[Vicky, writer and educator who works with people who have mental health problems and/or intellectual disabilities, March 9, 2012, Bethlehem Blogger, “Resistance: which way the future?,” http://bethlehemblogger.wordpress.com/2012/03/09/resistance-which-way-the-future/#more-1056, accessed 7/8/12, JTF]

The knowledge also enriched my understanding of the drama, which ends on a mocking note. Someone (presumably Elise) has tried to rescue the selected patients by putting a sharp object in the way of the bus wheels, but a mum with a pram knocks it out of the way as she strolls blithely down the road. The bus drives off with its cargo. Cynicism was like an aftertaste in my mouth: even if Elise had been able to put the bus out of commission with this feeble gesture, surely there would have been other buses. But hearing the actors in conversation with one another made me realise that the title of the installation didn’t just refer to Elise’s efforts. “Most disabled people, me included, don’t really have a voice. But most disabled people in Germany, under Hitler, under euthanasia, had no voice, absolutely no voice at all,” the actor Jamie Beddard commented, a voiceover helping the audience to follow his impaired speech. “And as an artist and as a disabled person, I’ve got a responsibility to unleash some of their voices.” His colleague Sophie Weaver said with angry defiance, “They weren’t individuals to anyone else. They were just…a collection of people that…weren’t worthy of life. Why does somebody believe that I should be killed basically for being who I am? Kind of, how dare somebody make that kind of choice about my life?”

The defiant questions aren’t rhetorical. There are still plenty of people who are prepared to make that choice about the lives of others. Four years ago the learning disability charity Mencap launched its campaign Death by Indifference, which profiled people with learning disabilities who had died in British hospitals as a result of medical neglect (sometimes deliberately inflicted). “After Daisy died, we discovered that staff were fully aware that Daisy’s life was in danger,” one mother wrote. “They did not try to save her, they just documented her decline. This was not an accident, and it wasn’t the case that they did not realise how ill she was. They told us they had ‘misjudged her quality of life’.” After Daisy’s death, a doctor told her parents, “It’s almost like losing a child, isn’t it?”

That was Britain in 2005. A few weeks ago, in Britain 2012, two specialists in bioethics published a paper arguing for ‘post-birth abortion’. They singled out disabled babies for special mention. The concept of mercy killing has been with us for a long time, and it’s not going away. Even people who balk at the idea of euthanasia for disabled babies share the ideas that lead down this path, such as the belief that such lives are tragic and pitiful. Think of the disability that it would most frighten you to develop, and ask yourself: do you honestly see people with that condition as having the same potential to live fully, like you?

The day we visited [the killing centre], there were school children there. They were obviously learning about this part of history. They were laughing and joking with each other. But with us being there they didn’t look at us. There was a real awkwardness there and it was very strange to experience that they didn’t want to look at us or acknowledge us…

- Sophie Weaver

Resistance: Which Way the Future? is a testament to the fullness of disabled lives. The third and final part of the installation featured many disabled people telling personal stories of discrimination, prejudice, and what it means to resist. Their faces weren’t shown; we listened to their stories whilst looking at a photo montage of people who were killed in T4. As the installation drew to a close, the tellers began to weave their stories into a broader tapestry. “Solidarity is a case of familiarity. To feel familiarity you need to know people…We need allies (non-disabled people) to notice when we’re missing. This isn’t just about disabled people. This is about society.”

The interesting thing about these stories was that the tellers were invisible. Had they been featured on the screen, audience members would inevitably have been looking for signs of the disability. Is this person deaf, does she use a wheelchair, is he mentally ill? People have all sorts of assumptions about disability, and they interpret what they hear in the light of what they see. A person who isn’t visibly disabled must not have it that bad, really, while a quadriplegic is a ‘hero’ and an ‘inspiration to us all’. Disabled people end up being typecast as welfare scroungers, objects of pity, children in adult bodies, suffering angels, objects of contempt, personal heroes on the basis of how non-disabled people judge them. As the disabilities of these speakers were never shared, you couldn’t pigeon-hole them. You could only listen.

When you are disabled, you get used to non-disabled people passing judgment on your body and brain. Because of this, sometimes you start to feel as though you have no right to yourself at all. The chilling and logical conclusion of such appropriation is the dissection room in the T4 killing centre, where gold fillings were harvested and bodies of pathological interest sliced up. The people who inhabited those bodies had become just so much property. But this appropriation happens in a myriad other ways before it reaches the point of murder. I remember talking with a group of disabled women who had been sexually assaulted (an experience that is frighteningly common within the disabled community) and hearing one woman explaining why she had never told anybody before: “I think I thought it was reasonable at first…you see, I’ve never felt like my body really belonged to me…”

This appropriation starts to happen long before it reaches the point of sexual abuse, or physical violence, or verbal bullying. It begins with the casual judgments in the street: “Ugh, how awful, I wonder how his mother copes.” It begins when your teacher takes you to one side and kindly explains that she doesn’t think it would be a good idea for you to help with the art display, as it needs to look its best for parents’ evening and you’ll only mess it up. It begins when a landlady hears about your condition and tells you hastily that her property ‘wouldn’t be suitable at all’, changing her stance to a belligerent, “We don’t have any rooms left,” when you tell her that you’ve researched the place and you know it fits your needs. It begins when a potential employer decides that you just wouldn’t cope with the job you’ve applied for, solely on the basis of your impairment and what she thinks it means. When you are disabled, you don’t test out your own capabilities; you get told what they are. And maybe you start to believe the limitations that are imposed on you. Even when you realise that these are utter crap, you often can’t do much about it, because you don’t have enough power on your own.

### Bare Life

#### Constructing a body as disabled makes it unthinkable and places it in the category of bare existence

Campbell, Griffith University, 9 (Fiona Kumari, 2009, “Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness,” page 11-12, Date Accessed: 7/7, JS)

Inscribing certain bodies in terms of deficiency and essential inadequacy privileges a particular understanding of normalcy that is commensurate with the interests of dominant groups (and the assumed interests of subordinated groups). Indeed, the formation of ableist relations requires the normate individual to depend upon the self of ‘disabled’ bodies being rendered beyond the realm of civility, thus becoming an unthinkable object of apprehension. The unruly, uncivil, disabled body is necessary for the reiteration of the ‘truth’ of the ‘real/essential’ human self who is endowed with masculinist attributes of certainty, mastery and autonomy. The discursive practices that mark out bodies of preferability are vindicated by abject life forms that populate the constitutive outside of the thinkable (that which can be imagined and re-presented) and those forms of existence that are unimaginable and therefore unspeakable. The emptying (kenosis) of normalcy occurs through the purging of those beings that confuse, are misrecognisable or as Mitchell (2002, p. 17) describes as ‘recalcitrant corporeal matter’ into a bare life (see Agamben, 1998) residing in the/a zone of exceptionality. This foreclosure depends on necessary unspeakability to maintain the continued operation of hegemonic power. For every outside there is an inside that demands differentiation and consolidation as a unity. To borrow from Heidegger (1977) – in every aletheia (unveiling or revealedness) of representation there lies a concealedness. The visibility of the ableist project is therefore only possible through the interrogation of the revealedness of disability/not-health and abled(ness), Marcel Detienne (1979) summarises this system of thought aptly:

[Such a] . . . system is founded on a series of acts of partition whose ambiguity, here as elsewhere, is to open up the terrain of their transgression at the very moment when they mark off a limit. To discover the complete horizon of a society’s symbolic values, it is also necessary to map out its transgressions, its deviants (p. ix).

Viewing the disabled body as simply matter out of place that needs to be dispensed with or at least cleaned up is erroneous. The disabled body has a place, a place in liminality to secure the performative enactment of the normal. Detienne’s summation points to what we may call the double bind of ableism when performed within Western neo-liberal polities. The double bind folds in on itself – for whilst claiming ‘inclusion’, ableism simultaneously always restates and enshrines itself. On the one hand, discourses of equality promote ‘inclusion’ by way of promoting positive attitudes (sometimes legislated in mission statements, marketing campaigns, equal opportunity protections) and yet on the other hand, ableist discourses proclaim quite emphatically that disability is inherently negative, ontologically intolerable and in the end, a dispensable remnant. This casting results in an ontological foreclosure wherein positive signification of disability becomes unspeakable.

I’ve always believed that within tragedy, there is incredible life and emotion. So my condition is not something I think of as sad; I think it’s something so beautifully human. It doesn’t make me less of a human being. It makes me so rich . . . I see my life as an active experiment; to grasp at greatness I must risk failure. I put instinct before caution, ideals before reality and possibility before negativity. As a result, my life is not easy but it’s not boring either. (Byrnes, 2000)

Disability cannot be thought of/spoken about on any other basis than the negative, to do so, to invoke oppositional discourses, is to run the risk of further pathologisation. An example of this is the attempt at desiring, or celebrating, disability that is reduced to a fetish or facticity disorder. So to explicate ourselves out of this double bind we need to persistently and continually return to the matter of disability as negative ontology, as a malignancy, that is, as the property of a body constituted by what Michael Oliver (1996, p. 32) refers to as, ‘the personal tragedy theory of disability.’

### Bare Life - Extensions

#### **Ableism creates the worst forms of bare life**

Campbell, Griffith University, 8 (Fiona Kumari, 2008, “Refusing Able(ness): A Preliminary Conversation about Ableism,” M/C Journal, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2008), <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/index.php/mcjournal/article/viewArticle/46/0>, Date Accessed: 7/2, JS)

In a similar vein, Veronica Chouinard defines ableism as “ideas, practices, institutions and social relations that presume ablebodiedness, and by so doing, construct persons with disabilities as marginalised … and largely invisible ‘others’” (380). In contrast, Amundson & Taira attribute a doctrinal posture to ableism in their suggestion that “Ableism is a doctrine that falsely treats impairments as inherently and naturally horrible and blames the impairments themselves for the problems experienced by the people who have them” (54). Whilst there is little argument with this presupposition, what is absent from the definition is any mention of ableism’s function in inaugurating the norm. Campbell and Chouinard’s approach is less about the coherency and intentionalities of ableism; rather their emphasis is on a conception of ableism as a hub network functioning around shifting interest convergences. Linton defines ableism as “includ[ing] the idea that a person’s abilities or characteristics are determined by disability or that people with disabilities as a group are inferior to non-disabled people” (9). There are problems with simply endorsing a schema that posits a particular worldview that either favours or disfavours dis/able-bodied people as if each category is discrete, self-evident and fixed. As I will argue later, Ableism sets up a binary dynamic which is not simply comparative but rather co-relationally constitutive. Campbell’s formulation of ableism not only problematises the signifier disability but points to the fact that the essential core of ableism is the formation of a naturalised understanding of being fully human and this as Chouinard notes, is articulated on a basis of an enforced presumption that erases difference.

Whether it be the ‘species typical body’ (in science), the ‘normative citizen’ (in political theory), the ‘reasonable man’ (in law), all these signifiers point to a fabrication that reaches into the very soul that sweeps us into life and as such is the outcome and instrument of a political constitution: a hostage of the body (Foucault). The creation of such regimes of ontological separation appears disassociated from power. Bodies in this way become elements that may be moved, used, transformed, demarcated, improved and articulated with others. Daily the identities of disabled and abled are performed repeatedly. An ethos of compulsory abled-bodiedness as McRuer puts it, “showcase[d] for able-bodied performance” (93) pursuant to the incessant consuming of objects of health, beauty, strength and capability. In the next section, the dividing practices of ableism are considered in more detail.

### Root of Identity – Based Oppressions

#### Ableist thought attaches stigmas to different races and minorities, allowing for exclusion and devaluation.

Siebers, University of Michigan English professor, 8

[Tobin, professor of English at the University of Michigan and director of the Program in Comparative Literature and of the Global Ethnic Literatures Seminar, 2008, University of Michigan, “Disability Theory,” http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015082696892, pgs. 5-6, accessed 7/7/12, JTF]

The presence of disability creates a different picture of identity—one less stable than identities associated with gender, race, sexuality, nation, and class—and therefore presenting the opportunity to rethink how human identity works. I know as a white man that I will not wake up in the morning as a black woman, but I could wake up a quadriplegic, as Mark O'Brien did when he was six years old (O'Brien and Kendall 2003). Ablebodiedness is a temporary identity at best, while being human guarantees that all other identities will eventually come into contact with some form of disability identity. In fact, a number of disability theorists have made the crucial observation that disability frequently anchors the status of other identities, especially minority identities. David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder argue that "stigmatized social positions founded upon gender, class, nationality, and race have often relied upon disability to visually underscore the devaluation of marginal communities" (1997, 21). Douglas Baynton reveals that discrimination in the United States against people of color, women, and immigrants has been justified historically by representing them as disabled. These oppressed groups have gained some ground against prejudice, but when their identities are tied to disability, discrimination against them is justified anew. Disability marks the last frontier of unquestioned inferiority because the preference for able-bodiedness makes it extremely difficult to embrace disabled people and to recognize their unnecessary and violent exclusion from society.

### Internalized Oppression

#### Internalized oppression causes systematic impacts for disabled individuals

Reeve PhD student Lancaster University 6

(Donna Reeve, September 20, 2006 Department of Applied Social Science, Lancaster University, Disability Studies: Research and Learning “‘Am I a real disabled person or someone with a dodgy arm?’: a discussion of psycho-emotional disablism and its contribution to identity constructions,” <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/events/disabilityconference_archive/2006/papers/reeve2006.pdf> pg. 3 accessed 7-3-12 BC)

I am talking about this subject today because I feel that its long-term, insidious effects are often underestimated. It can have significant effects on the self- esteem and confidence of people with impairments and because of the way in which it operates at an unconscious level, it is particularly difficult to challenge and change.

#### The normative-ableist language and actions have created a notion of false consciousness for people who identify as disabled

Lang, Overseas Development Group Senior Research Associate, 1

(Dr. Raymond, January, 2001, University of East Anglia, Overseas Development Group, “THE DEVELOPMENT AND CRITIQUE OF THE SOCIAL MODEL OF DISABILITY,” http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lc-ccr/lccstaff/raymond-lang/DEVELOPMMENT\_AND\_CRITIQUE\_OF\_THE\_SOCIAL\_MODEL\_OF\_D.pdf, accessed: 7-8-12, CAS)

Charlton also maintains that the majority of disabled people have been so psychologically oppressed by society that their oppression has become internalized. As a result, they have developed a Marxian notion of “false consciousness”, whereby they come to believe that they are less capable than others. Consciousness can be defined as an awareness of oneself in the world. It is a process of awareness that is influenced by social conditions, chance and innate cognition. With regard to “false consciousness”, as a lethal mixture of self pity, self-hate and shame, this state of awareness can: - “… prevent people with disabilities from knowing their real selves, their real needs, and their real capabilities and from recognizing the options they in fact have. False consciousness and alienation also obscure the real source of oppression. They cannot recognize their self-perceived pitiful lives are simply a mirroring of a pitiful world order. In this regard people with disabilities have much in common with others who have internalized their own oppression”. (Charlton, J. 1998:27)

### Psycho-emotional Violence Outweighs

#### Psycho-emotional violence against disabled people is the worst form of violence – it’s violence against their being and existence

Goodley, Manchester Metropolitan University Professor of Psychology and Disability, and Runswick-Cole, Manchester Metropolitan University Research Associate, 11

(Dan and Katherine, no full date given, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, "The violence of disablism," 33:4, p. 607-608, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition , CNM)

Critical disability studies have engaged with the psychological and affective aspects of disablism. In Britain, the work of Thomas (1999, 2007) and Reeve (2002, 2008), has crucially intervened in materialist sociological accounts of disablism by drawing attention to the ‘barriers in here’ experienced by disabled people (Reeve 2008: 1). Against a wide understanding of structural inequalities, psycho-emotional disablism interrogates the experiences between disabled people and disabling society. This interrogation has identified direct and indirect forms of discrimination:

Direct forms can be found in discriminatory interactions, acts of invalidation, patronising responses of others and hate crimes such as the destruction of group symbols and hate literature (Sherry 2000, 2010). Recent crime statistics from Britain suggest that 25% of disabled people report being victimised (Roulstone and Balderston 2009). Indirect forms may be due to the side effects of structural disablism or unintended actions, words or deeds. The psycho-emotional refers to the impact of these ingredients of disablism on the ontological security or confidence of disabled people (Thomas 1999). A key psychic reaction to such hostility is internalised oppression: the re-injuring of self through internalising discriminatory values (Marks 1999), lowering self-worth and lessening a sense of intrinsic value (Thomas 2007) (Goodley 2010: 90).

Zˇ izˇ ek (2008: 60) describes this as ontic violence: a violence against being or existence: ‘there is a direct link between ontological violence and the texture of social violence (of sustaining relations and enforced domination)’ (Zˇizˇek 2008: 61). Interpersonal forms of violence threaten to determine the ‘very being and social existence of the interpreted subject’ (Zˇ izˇ ek 2008: 62). The following narratives represent, for us, potent examples of psycho-emotional or ontic violence:

The administrators of the Facebook page for supporters of the Every Disabled Child Matters campaign (see http://www.edcm.org.uk for details of the campaign), have twice had to remove comments from the page full of hatred towards disabled children and their families. Although the comments have been removed swiftly and the people who made them reported and banned from Facebook, it is hard to understand why someone would feel the need to take the time to join as a fan of the campaign and write an offensive message on the wall of the site. (Katherine’s ethnographic notes)

So they [autism outreach teachers] went in with, you know the suggestions of how to do this – and one of the things was, ‘Well it becomes apparent that we don’t understand when Sam’s distressed or upset or anxious, maybe if we introduced a one to five scale, that’s a simple way that he can communicate to us that he’s feeling stressed’. How did it go? Sam told the learning mentor he was at four and was approaching five, her response was, ‘Well how do you think I feel? I’m at a ten’. Can you believe that? I ... honestly ... I nearly died when he told me. I was just speechless and he was like, ‘Are you alright mum?’ and I said, ‘I’ll be fine, just give me a minute’ (Gayle).

#### Psychoemotional violence can be the result of culture

Goodley, Manchester Metropolitan University Professor of Psychology and Disability, and Runswick-Cole, Manchester Metropolitan University Research Associate, 11

(Dan and Katherine, no full date given, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, "The violence of disablism," 33:4, p. 609, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition , CNM)

In the formalised routine of professional assessment this mother is incited to articulate an abnormal version of her child. Parents have reported to us many times that often it is less effort and more convenient to explain their children’s health, demeanour, comportment or behaviour in terms of culturally acceptable disability discourses than to offer more enabling alternatives. While parents do resist – as we can see in this account above – it is often easy to explain away the ontological make-up of their children in terms of sticky labels such as ‘oh, he’s being autistic’ or ‘forgive him, he’s ADHD’ or ‘it’s his impairment’, because these are culturally acceptable and expected ways of describing the ontologies of disabled children. Indeed, as Reeve (2002, 2008) and Thomas (1997, 2007) have noted, these cultural discourses (‘out there’ in the social world) inform internalised conversations about disability (‘in there’ of the psychological worlds of disabled children and their families). These cultural expectations threaten to promote ontological attacks on disabled people: viciously othering and marking the beings of disabled children and their families. The responses of non-disabled others to disabled children and their families described in the accounts above are not responses of demonic, violent, bad nor evil others. They are responses perfectly compatible with a culture of disablism that pathologises difference, individualises impairment and maintains ableism. This culture appears to equate proper care for disabled children with that of full time mothering. This culture places educational, health and social care professionals who work with disabled children in often low paid, high pressured and exacting conditions of employment. This culture has clear sight of what makes for normal childhood and what constitutes abnormality. Our view, then, is that these accounts of psychoemotional violence take place in cultures and systems. We follow Zˇ izˇ ek’s (2008: 53) point that attending only to subjective violence – enacted by social agents or evil individuals – ignores the more systemic roots of violence. We move our analysis up a notch to systemic violence.

### Violence

#### Violence against people with disabilities reflects the violent culture of society as a whole.

Goodley, Psychology and Disability professor and Runswick-Cole, Psychology Research Associate; Manchester Metropolitan University, 11

[Dan Goodley, and Katherine Runswick-Cole, 2011, Sociology of Health & Illness, “The violence of disablism,” volume: 33, http://s3.amazonaws.com/files.posterous.com/temp-2011-07-13/GqxdylmeDalzCndgChbxDDcxwyiuwnrwbamIgnyileElnygJjxsGoxovmCby/goodley\_and\_runswick\_cole\_violence.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJFZAE65UYRT34AOQ&Expires=1341100909&Signature=n5u9enn1d%2FUFUCp0ipKdk8RJXM8%3D, pg. 3, accessed 6/30/12, JTF]

Shakespeare’s reﬂexive account captures the multi-faceted nature of the violence of disablism. He asks, when does hate crime begin and bullying stop? How can we separate ignorance and hatred? Is violence against disabled people deeply ingrained in the psyches, social relationships and cultural practices of members of contemporary society? In this article we consider the ways in which violence against disabled people – speciﬁcally children and their families – reﬂects a trenchant dimension of culture; in this case disablist culture. Drawing, in part, on Zizek’s (2008) book Violence, we come to the conclusion that violence experienced by disabled children and their families says more about the dominant culture of disablism, and its effects upon the subjectivities of people, than it does of the acts of a few seemingly irrational, mad, bad or mean violent individuals. Those that enact violence against disabled children should be understood in ways that recognise that the being of people is a sociosymbolic or culturally formed being (Zizek 2008: 62). Disabled people experience violence because of contemporary society’s deeply held contradictory discourses about disability. While Shakespeare (2010), did not want to think that the protagonists of hate crime could be so vile, we did not want to think that acts against disabled children reﬂected common circulating practices of a contemporary culture of disablism. Sadly, accounts from our research suggest that we were wrong

#### Hatred and violence are the result of ableist social structure

Goodley, Manchester Metropolitan University Professor of Psychology and Disability, and Runswick-Cole, Manchester Metropolitan University Research Associate, 11

(Dan and Katherine, no full date given, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, "The violence of disablism," 33:4, p. 604, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition , CNM)

This article is timely in light of growing media reports of violence against disabled adults and children (Sherry 2000, 2010). At its most extreme, violence against disabled people results in hate crime, a socio-political act that is finally being acknowledged. A number of high profile cases of disabled adults and young people1 led the disability studies scholar Tom Shakespeare to write:

David Askew’s tragedy follows the deaths of Raymond Atherton, Rikki Judkins ... Fiona Pilkington, Christine Lakinski ... over the last few years. Each of these individuals was targeted because they were vulnerable and disabled, exploited, humiliated, and finally killed. Looking again at the evidence, and thinking more deeply about the problem, I realise how mistaken I was to trivialise hate crime. It’s not just a matter of bullying. It’s not something that people can just ignore or laugh off. It is a scourge on our society. We are members of a community where the most vulnerable people live in fear of their lives and where they are being terrified on a daily basis by the bored or the loutish or the dispossessed. I think my mental block arose because I did not want to believe that human beings could be so vile. I was wrong (Shakespeare 2010, unpaginated).

Shakespeare’s reflexive account captures the multi-faceted nature of the violence of disablism. He asks, when does hate crime begin and bullying stop? How can we separate ignorance and hatred? Is violence against disabled people deeply ingrained in the psyches, social relationships and cultural practices of members of contemporary society? In this article we consider the ways in which violence against disabled people – specifically children and their families – reflects a trenchant dimension of culture; in this case disablist culture. Drawing, in part, on Zˇ izˇ ek’s (2008) book Violence, we come to the conclusion that violence experienced by disabled children and their families says more about the dominant culture of disablism, and its effects upon the subjectivities of people, than it does of the acts of a few seemingly irrational, mad, bad or mean violent individuals. Those that enact violence against disabled children should be understood in ways that recognise that the being of people is a socio- symbolic or culturally formed being (Zˇ izˇ ek 2008: 62). Disabled people experience violence because of contemporary society’s deeply held contradictory discourses about dis⁄ability. While Shakespeare (2010), did not want to think that the protagonists of hate crime could be so vile, we did not want to think that acts against disabled children reflected common circulating practices of a contemporary culture of disablism. Sadly, accounts from our research suggest that we were wrong.

#### All forms of violence against the disabled are intertwined

Goodley, Manchester Metropolitan University Professor of Psychology and Disability, and Runswick-Cole, Manchester Metropolitan University Research Associate, 11

(Dan and Katherine, no full date given, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, "The violence of disablism," 33:4, p. 605-606, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition, CNM)

In the article we explore four types of violence; real, psychoemotional, systemic and cultural. Each of these overlap with one another in ways that are correlated with three broad elements of disablism: the psyche, society and culture (Goodley 2010: 2). The psychological experience of violence acknowledges the complex ways in which the social and cultural world is produced through individuals. The psyche recognises the tight knot of the person and the social word, the self and other people, the individual and society. Societal and cultural forms of violence are reproduced through processes of domination, ideology and oppression that shape the inner world of our psyches. Cultural, social and psychical forms of violence against disabled people reflect often subtle, mundane and everyday encounters with disablism.

### Civil Rights

#### Transportation is back as a major civil rights issue

**The Leadership Conference Education Fund**, **‘11**

(The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Civilrights.org,* “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity,” March, 2011, <http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.protectcivilrights.org%2Fpdf%2Fdocs%2Ftransportation%2F52846576-Where-We-Need-to-Go-A-Civil-Rights-Roadmap-for-Transportation-Equity.pdf&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNGFs-krxTNtM1Fek7A1GuTA--2uOQ>, Accessed: 7/3/12,P.2, LPS)

Today’s focus is not on getting a seat at the front of the bus but on making sure the bus takes us where we need to go. --Angela Glover Blackwell, Founder and CEO, PolicyLink By the numbers: $9,498: average annual cost of owning a car.1 33 percent: portion of low-income African Americans without access to automobiles.2 25 percent: portion of low-income Latinos without automobile access.3 12.1 percent: portion of low-income Whites without automobile access.4 80 percent: portion of federal transportation funding dedicated to highways.5 2 Our civil rights laws bar employers, federal, state, and local governments, and public accommodations from discriminating in access to health care, employment opportunities, housing, education, and voting. Although our laws promise to open doors to opportunity, this is a hollow promise for people who are physically isolated from jobs, schools, stores that sell healthy food, and health care providers. As our metropolitan areas have expanded and jobs and services have become more diffuse, equal opportunity depends upon equal access to affordable transportation. Transportation investment to date has produced an inhospitable landscape for low-income people, people with disabilities, seniors, and many people in rural areas. People of color are disproportionately disadvantaged by the current state of transportation. The cost of car ownership, underinvestment in public transportation, and a paucity of pedestrian and bicycle-accessible thoroughfares have isolated urban and low-income people from jobs and services.

### Health Care

#### Adequate specialized transportation key to standard of living and value to life

The Leadership Conference Education Fund, ‘11

(The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Civilrights.org,* “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity,” March, 2011, <http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.protectcivilrights.org%2Fpdf%2Fdocs%2Ftransportation%2F52846576-Where-We-Need-to-Go-A-Civil-Rights-Roadmap-for-Transportation-Equity.pdf&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNGFs-krxTNtM1Fek7A1GuTA--2uOQ>, Accessed: 7/3/12,P.3, LPS)

The high cost of transportation also forces low-income families to limit spending for other basic needs, including out-of-pocket health care expenses and nutritious food. Access to nutritious food is a particularly important issue in rural areas, where commerce and services are spread over large distances. It is important to address this now: our obesity epidemic is particularly grave in the rural south, home to many of the so-called “fattest states” in America.8 For many people with disabilities, traveling by car (or transporting their children by car) is not an option, regardless of whether they can afford it. Because many individuals with disabilities have increased health care needs—such as physical therapy, medication monitoring, and other medical services—isolation from providers can have a profound impact on quality of life, health, and safety. Accessible transportation options— such as plentiful sidewalks with crosswalk modifications for the visually impaired, buses, and rail—can make the difference between health care access or isolation both for adults and for the children in their care. Isolation from health care providers has serious consequences for education and future opportunity: A child who enters school with an undiagnosed vision or By the numbers: Americans in the lowest 20 percent income bracket, many of whom live in rural settings, spend about 42 percent of their total annual incomes on transportation, compared to 22 percent among middle-income Americans.6 “Imagine being an 80 year-old dialysis patient waiting for the bus for three hours—this happens in today’s America, and it hurts people.” -National Association of County and City Health Officials II

#### Lack of specialized transportation infrastructure leads to adverse health issues

**The Leadership Conference Education Fund ‘11**

(The Leadership Conference Education Fund, *Civilrights.org,* “Where We Need to Go: A Civil Rights Roadmap for Transportation Equity,” March, 2011, <http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.protectcivilrights.org%2Fpdf%2Fdocs%2Ftransportation%2F52846576-Where-We-Need-to-Go-A-Civil-Rights-Roadmap-for-Transportation-Equity.pdf&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNGFs-krxTNtM1Fek7A1GuTA--2uOQ>, Accessed: 7/3/12,P.23, LPS)

Because many people with disabilities do not have the option to drive cars, lack of access to other modes of transportation disproportionately harms them. Similarly, seniors and people in rural areas often have limited transportation choices. This is the civil rights dilemma: Our laws purport to level the playing field, but our transportation choices have effectively barred millions of people from accessing it. Traditional nondiscrimination protections cannot protect people for whom opportunities are literally out of reach. a. Transportation policy affects access to health care Low-income people and people of color disproportionately lose out on educational and work opportunities due to health problems. Inadequate access to transportation has exacerbated health disparities, forcing many low-income patients to miss appointments—often worsening their medical problems. Lack of transit options also wastes resources by forcing some patients and providers to pay for taxis and other expensive services.7

### International Modeling

#### The American disability rights movement has influenced other movements internationally

M. Stein, P. Stein, Harvard Law Project on Disability, 7

(Michael Ashley, Penelope J.S.,6/18/2007, “Beyond Disability Civil Rights,” Hasting Law Journal, <http://www.hpod.org/pdf/beyond-cr.pdf>, Volume: 5, p. 6, accessed 7/4/12, CAS)

As an antidiscrimination statute, the ADA entitles people with disabilities to be treated equally to the general population.

The American disability rights movement has strongly influenced its international counterparts to mobilize for equality as expressed through the social model’s precepts. The results are demonstrated by the 1980s passage of United Nations proclamations and soft laws.

 Perhaps the most notable among these is the Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities. None of these measures, however, are legally binding.

Encouraged by the ADA’s passage, international advocates have increasingly sought legally binding domestic approaches to protect disabled citizens. Frequently, they have drawn on the ADA’s provisions as a template. In consequence, many of these statutes are grounded in antidiscrimination theory. Yet despite its popularity as a framework one must approach the ADA as an exemplar with a good deal of caution.

# 2AC Answers To

### AT: Social Model Bad

#### Our argument supposes a relational social model, acknowledges the interaction between body, self and the social

Campbell, Griffith Law School Faculty, 9

(Fiona Kumari, Griffith University Australia, “Disability Advocacy & Ableism: Towards a re-discovery of the disability Imagination”, Keynote Address, 2nd Strengthening Advocacy Conference, Nov 17-18, <http://griffith.academia.edu/FionaKumariCampbell/Papers/118483/Disability_Advocacy_and_Ableism_Towards_a_re-discovery_of_the_disability_Imagination>, accessed 7/6/12 sl)

From the perspective of political activism, the necessity to have a theory of disability before deciding strategies of political action was well understood as early as 1975 by the Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation UPAIS in the UK whose minutes of a debate between 2 advocacy groups produced a document called The Fundamental Principles of Disability. They decided that disability should not be understood medically as a broken down body, mind or heart, rather society and the way that it is organized had something to do with us becoming disabled ….

Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society. ... To understand this it is necessary to grasp the distinction between the physical impairment and the social situation, called "disability", of people with such impairment. Thus we define … disability as the disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by a contemporary social organization which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from participation in the mainstream of social activities. …Disability is therefore a particular form of social oppression.(UPAIS, quoted in Oliver 1995: 16 – 17)

I have not so much rejected this model as extended it through my work in Studies in Ableism and adoption of a model out of Europe called the Relational model of Disability. First to the relational model… the French concept of disability (‘situation de handicap ’) defines… disability as a confrontation between the ability of a person and situations she encounters in life” ‘macro-situations’, such as work or schooling, or ‘micro-situations’ such as cutting meat or using the keyboard of a computer. The disabling situations are not only structural and material, they are also(especially) cultural (Hamonet, 2006, 1, cited in Campbell,2009). The model moves beyond abilities and limitations and embraces our sense of Self acknowledging our own perception of difference in our bodies, thinking or emotions. This notion of disability as a relational concept says that disability is made through our faulty interaction with differences in mentalities and bodies.

The choice of language is no accident – what we have in that description is a process ripe with tension, a pushing through of impairment in its encounter with the environment. The environment includes the spiritual & emotional life of the disabled person as we try to negotiate our sense of self in a world that is uncomfortable and negative about disability. It is hard to be positive about oneself (and disabled people as a group) when disability is seen as a form of harm or is harmful!

#### Social model is not static, but an evolving concept, there arguments don’t like to our aff

Lang, University of East Anglia, Senior Research Associate Overseas Development Group, 1

(Dr. Raymond, January, “The Development And Critique Of The Social Model Of Disability”,

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lc-ccr/lccstaff/raymond-lang/DEVELOPMMENT_AND_CRITIQUE_OF_THE_SOCIAL_MODEL_OF_D.pdf>, p. 32-4, accessed 7/7/12, sl)

This paper has so far outlined the genesis and subsequent development of the social model of disability, as well as highlighting some of the difficulties that are inherent in its universal application across cultural settings. The social model of disability continues to evolve and develop. John Swain and Sally French (2000), building upon the intellectual work described above, have outlined an “affirmation” model of disability, which seeks to “celebrate the difference” that characterise the lives of disabled people. It is therefore contended that disabled people can be “proud” the fact that they are different from the majority of the population. Swain and French begin their analysis by rejecting the tragedy conception of disability as purported by the medical model. They proceed by maintaining that it is not possible to make a stark distinction between those who are disabled and those who are not, since all people, to some extent have a degree of impairment, but do not necessarily encounter the negative consequences of disability.

Those who where spectacles to compensate for low vision are a case in point. Neither can a stark distinction be maintained between those who encounter oppression and those who do not, for it is possible disabled people themselves to be oppressors, by having racist, homophobic or sexist attitudes. They further contend that the social model of disability has clearly shown how contemporary society has oppressed and discriminated against disabled people. However, in contrast the majority of most disability studies theorists, they maintain that the vast majority of disabled people accept the analysis of the social model. They have candidly stated:-

“The social model was borne out of the experiences of disabled people, challenging the dominant individual models espoused by non-disabled people. Nevertheless, it is our experience that many non-disabled people readily accept the social model, albeit superficially and at a very basic conceptual level. Non-disabled people can generally accept that a wheelchair-user cannot enter a building because of steps. ... Non-disabled people are much more threatened and challenged by the notion that a wheelchair-user could be pleased and proud of the person he or she is” (Swain J. and French, S. 2000:570).

Ascribing to the notion of an affirmative model of disability questions the analysis of early variants of the social model, since it is argued that the adoption of the precepts of the latter does not necessarily result in a non-tragic view of disablement. Swain and French again state: “While the social model of disability is certainly totally incompatible with the view that disability is a personal tragedy, it can be argued that the social model, in itself, underpinned a non-tragedy view. First, to be a member of an oppressed group within society does not necessarily engender a non-tragic view. There is, for instance, nothing inherently non-tragic about being denied access to buildings. Secondly, the social model disassociates impairment from disability. It, thus, leaves the possibility that even in an ideal world of full civil rights and participative citizenship for disabled people, an impairment could be seen as a personal tragedy” (Swain, J. and French, S. 2000:571).

Swain and French further develop their thesis by stating that, in contrast to the tragic view of disablement, the occurrence and onset of an impairment can result in an improvement of the quality of lives an individual disabled person. Examples are given of disabled people being able to “escape” the underlying social oppressive practices and structures that characterise some societies. Thus, disabled people may indeed be liberated from the responsibilities in the realms of sexual relations, responsibility within the domestic household, and may be more attuned to comprehend the oppression encountered by other minority groups. The above demonstrates that it is possible for disabled people is inculcate and project a positive identity, thereby celebrating the diversity and richness of the lives that they invariably lead. In summarising the philosophy of an affirmative model of disability. Swain and French stated:-

“The affirmative model directly challenges presumptions of personal tragedy and the determination of identity through the value-laden presumptions of nondisabled people. It signifies the rejections of presumptions of dependency and abnormality. ... Embracing an affirmative model, disabled individuals assert a positive identity, not only in being disabled, but also in being impaired. In affirming a positive identity, disabled people are actively repudiating the dominant view of normality. The changes for individuals are not just transforming of consciousness as to the meaning of ‘disability’, but an assertion of the value and validity of life as a person with impairment”. (Swain, J. and French, S. 2000:578).

Swain and French conclude their analysis by stating that embracing an affirmative view of disablement in fact strengthens the political leverage of the disability movement. Disabled people can not only look towards a future society devoid of structural, environmental and attitudinal barriers, but one that can “celebrate difference and values people irrespective of race, sexual preference, gender, age and impairment” (Swain, J. and Fench, S. 2000:580).

### AT: You Aren’t Disabled

#### Need challenges by those who identity and those who don’t

Reeve PhD student Lancaster University 6

(Donna Reeve, September 20, 2006 Department of Applied Social Science, Lancaster University, Disability Studies: Research and Learning “‘Am I a real disabled person or someone with a dodgy arm?’: a discussion of psycho-emotional disablism and its contribution to identity constructions,” <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/events/disabilityconference_archive/2006/papers/reeve2006.pdf> pg. 8 accessed 7-3-12 BC)

Internalised oppression and the experience of the hierarchy of impairment are forms of psycho-emotional disablism which impact on the emotional well-being of people with impairments.

There is a dire need to challenge hierarchies of impairment held by both disabled and nondisabled people – particularly within organisations of disabled people at a time when the disabled people’s movement in the UK is at a very low ebb.

How/when people identify as disabled is affected by impairment and the psycho-emotional dimensions of both disablism and impairment.

Braidotti’s ‘nomadic subject’ offers a valuable theoretical approach for considering ‘disability identities’, in particular the multitude and sheer creativity of ways that people with impairments negotiate their disability identities.

The feminist nomadic subject described by Braidotti is a political project. As such she stresses a need for action at the level of identity, of subjectivity and of differences between women and sees politics as being about bonding, coalitions and non-exclusionary interconnections.

These are areas which should be of particular interest to disability studies and the disabled people’s movement because they generate a much more inclusive view of who is seen as, and who might see themselves as a ‘disabled person’.

#### Confronting the temporality of our ableism shifts understanding of social justice

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

(Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 355-356 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Some of us have hereditary traits that register socially and culturally as disabilities. Some of us become disabled naturally through aging, coercively through warfare, and accidentally through misfortune—whether the disabling incident occurs during the passage through the birth canal (when cerebral palsy can occur), at the industrial workplace, or in the course of everyday life. No one emerges self sufficient from the womb, no able-bodied person can be sure that she will continue to be able-bodied throughout her later years, and there is no guarantee that any of us will escape disabling encounters with the world. In this sense, no one is ever more than temporarily able-bodied. The designation temporarily able bodied invites us to consider different sorts of vulnerability, different points of frailty, as features of our common lot and accordingly to shift our understandings of flourishing, social justice, and embodiment.

### AT: Representing Others Bad

#### Their arguments don’t apply to us and risk never being able to address issues

Humphrey, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, The Open University UK, 2000

(Jill C., Disability & Society, Vol. IS, No. I, “Researching Disability Politics, Or, Some Problems with the Social Model in Practice”, Proquest, p. 79)

In spite of all this, the reasoning behind the claim that non-disabled researchers have no rights to represent disabled people is still flawed on various counts. Firstly, there is a danger that activists conflate political and intellectual representations—for example, as a researcher I sought to elaborate a theoretical representation of self-organisation which would capture my interviewees1 narratives with accuracy and adequacy, but I was not directly seeking to 'represent' any group in any political forum. Indeed, even some disabled people have insisted upon retaining a distinction between their roles as activists and academics in the service of integrity and independence (see Shakespeare, 1996b). Secondly, there is also a danger of demarcating sameness from otherness in such a way that everyone is potentially misrepresented—for example, physically impaired people are simply not the same as learning disabled people, and indeed otherness-qua-uniqueness is written into our personalities and biographies. Even if a researcher experienced the same impairment as his or her research subjects, s/lie would need to be attuned to the otherness of the other, and any presumptions of sameness in experiences or world-views would eclipse the alterity of the other as well as the validity of the research (see Kitzinger and Wilkinson, 1996).

Thirdly, there is a growing appreciation among critical researchers that the exposure and eradication of oppressions needs to be multidirectional and multidimensional. For example, feminists are increasingly recognising that they need to engage directly and critically with men if the prism of sexism is to be unlocked (e.g. Stanko, 1994) and some men are making a journey through gender studies in ways that allow them to interrogate not only men and masculinity but also feminist standpoints and scriptures (e.g. Liddlc, 1996). Fourthly, the essentialist paradigm which insists upon the ethical and epistemological superiority of like-researching-like is being bracketed. As a black researcher. Phoenix (1994) has encouraged her white colleagues to participate in interviewing black people on the grounds that the black-to-black interview scenario reifies identities and reduces outcomes, and that if 'race' is a variable in knowledge-production, then the deployment of researchers with different 'racial' identities will open up more possibilities for understanding. Indeed, there are already examples in disability studies of a hearing person researching deaf culture (Harris, 1995) and hearing and deaf researchers working together with deaf people (Jones & Pullcn, 1992), which demonstrate that cross-cultural dialogues arc capable of illuminating aspects of each world which may otherwise have been hidden to 'insiders'. This must surely be at the heart of the emancipatory paradigm in its quest to empower disabled people and re-educate their non-disabled others.

### AT: Using Disability for the Ballot

#### Matters more the kind of research we do rather than the other teams’ perception of our relationship to disability

Humphrey, Faculty of Applied Social Sciences, The Open University UK, 2000

(Jill C., Disability & Society, Vol. IS, No. I, “Researching Disability Politics, Or, Some Problems with the Social Model in Practice”, Proquest, p. 80)

An emancipatory paradigm places all researchers into dilemmatic position, albeit this will be inflected by their identity as disabled or non-disabled. The dilemma for the non-disabled researcher is that s/he has become a kind of trope in some sections of the disability movement—a symbol of all that is wrong with the disabling society—which detracts attention from deeper problems which might be better tackled by a broader 'working together' process. If this is the case, then the problem could be compounded by attempts to re-work the divide between disabled versus non-disabled researchers. Mike Oliver (1996) applied the Gramscian schema of organic versus positional intellectuals to this divide, arguing that disabled people engage in disability studies for its own sake and in the service of the movement, but the contributions of non-disabled people are outgrowths of their academic positions and signposts to their career advancement. Whilst acknowledging that these contributions are often valid and valuable, he suggests that non-disabled researchers are less likely to be 'committed' to the movement and more prone to 'distortions' so that sooner or later they may 'sell out' (p. 169). My own experiences would cast doubt over this spectre—pursuing disability research and writing as a 'non-disabled' person undermined my credibility and delayed my employability as a sociologist, and I was repeatedly advised to gear publications to 'mainstream' journals in the course of formal interviews and informal conversations alike, with my interest in disability issues received with incredulity. It might be more helpful to follow Connolly's (1996) argument that what matters is not so much 'who' is doing the research in terms of their ascribed characteristics, but rather 'who' they are in terms of their own integrity and reflexivity, 'what' kind of research they are undertaking in terms of their epistemological and methodological orientations, and 'why' they are doing it in terms of their biographical and political profiles.

### AT: You Aren’t Disabled - Universal Woundedness

#### Rather than focusing on a universalization of health, we should take up a universal “woundedness”

DeShong, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Liberal Arts and Sciences coordinator, Associate Professor 7

(Scott, 2007, “The Nightmare of Health: Metaphysics and Ethics in the Signification of Disability”, symploke, Volume 15, Numbers 1-2, Pg.271-272, Project Muse, accessed 7-1-12, FFF)

The claim of disability is thus a critical signification of ability, a response not simply to the articulation of ableism but moreover to alterity traced in ability, to the im/possible signification of ability and ability of signification. As such, the claim is concerned less with disability than with ability, less with articulable action or difficulty than with the metaphysics of subject and world by which the ontology of abilities becomes framed.5 Lennard Davis writes that the study of disability has taken up a “dismodernist” emphasis that forms a critique of modern tendencies of normalization and ontologization of human life. He is critical of the “universalization” of naturalized notions such as health and wholeness, a universalization that involves what should seem strange, what Georges Canguilhem identifies as strange: the odd, indeed anomalous marginalization of such pervasive aspects of human life as illness, pain, difficulty, and error. For Davis, at the heart of disability studies is a critique of the signification by which human nature tends to emerge as centered on universalized notions of subjective health, wholeness, and integrity. (2002a, 29-32)

Davis proposes that we think of a universal “woundedness,” implying that we would decenter the ontology of health.6 This is not to think that all life tends to fall into illness or error, in a falling away from health that would involve naturalizing a relationship between health and illness that reinforces the centrality of health. Rather, it is to place error per se primary, not error or illness articulated in any specific way but rather non-articulated error, as alterity. What is universalized is disunity, disintegration, perhaps better termed omniversal or multiversal, although better still, such terms emerge under erasure, the universalizing not a denaturing but de/naturing: this is not to naturalize the unnatural and vice-versa but to engage the notion of nature itself. The casting of woundedness as primary emphasizes the alterity in and of the wound—or the woundedness in and of alterity, neither term determining the other—prior to any ontology of subject, world, and performance. There is woundedness or trauma before wounding or event, before the origin of any context or agency of infliction. Before nature, there is woundedness, before origin; or rather, since we have no access to such primary and excessive woundedness, as nature emerges, it emerges wounded, emerging in de/naturing, whereby the nature that we must recognize and express, we cannot. Thus, woundedness or trauma exceeds and precedes the emergence of signification as well as the emergence of health and ability.

#### **The universalization of woundness implies we are all disabled by injustice and oppression of various kinds**

DeShong, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Liberal Arts and Sciences coordinator, Associate Professor 7

(Scott, 2007, “The Nightmare of Health: Metaphysics and Ethics in the Signification of Disability”, symploke, Volume 15, Numbers 1-2, Pg.272-273, Project Muse, accessed 7-1-12, FFF)

We never can grasp or conceive of what Maurice Merleau-Ponty refers to as the “flesh” (1968, 139), what Hortense Spillers refers to as the “zero degree” of living “tissue” (67-68), which might be considered the site of pain or other experience yet which lacks any articulation as body, any management in terms of discourse or culture.7 Nor can we ever speak fully or purely. Yet as the body must inevitably emerge, it emerges with trauma and in trauma, as does the logos—the word, the logic, the organization of the body and the psyche, the physiological and the psychological. To reiterate, the universalization of woundedness not only means imagining all bodies and psyches as fragmented, insufficient, or disabled primarily, but moreover, it means thinking that insufficiency and fragmentation are themselves primary to the emergence of the body or psyche: that the natures of body and psyche are not to be imagined without recognition of the broken signification by which we can imagine at all, signification traced by alterity that denatures health and wholeness. Davis writes that it is too glib to say simply “we are all disabled” without the expansion that “we are all disabled by injustice and oppression of various kinds” (2002a, 31-32). The bodies and subjectivities implied by “we” and “all” are inflicted by various socioculturally articulated forces, inflicted indeed in “our” very taking up of body and subject (and in the assumption of their coextension), such that all socioculturally signified ability is oppressively regulated from its articulation. Yet the more significant point is that, in embodiment itself and in subjectivity itself, the very possibility of health and ability entails an imperative of non-foreclosure that places difference before articulation, so that embodiment and subjectivity can only emerge entailed by illness. Health as (socioculturally) articulated is always oppressive, while in the context of signifiability itself, health is im/possible.

# K Answers

## Perm – Universal Design

### Permutation – Do Both

#### Combination of Macro & Micro-political resistance spills over into broader political change

Mitchell & Snyder, Temple University, 10 (David and Sharon, “Disability as Multitude: Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 2, 2010, Project Muse, Date Accessed: 6/30, JS)

Democracy and Disability A true democracy based on variation cannot be collapsed into a totalizing essence/identity/unity. Based on their multiple formulas of difference, disability organizations help to expose transcendence as a false dream of market compensation. If we conceive of disability as a material expression of variation, then embodied difference may be recognized as a paradigm for true democracy. Specifically, those made expendable by late capitalism on the basis of a congenital or acquired incapacity serve as an active recognition that normalization functions as little more than a façade that disguises humanity's defining heterogeneity. A "truer" disability-based model of social production is better understood as the interdependency of intense singularities working for common goals—rather than the obverse which is the functioning logic of capitalism: intense singularities suppressed by common goals and imposed by corporations upon those who produce products and profits from which they do not adequately benefit.

Politicized alternative disability-based social organizations have tended to situate their counter-discursive productions at both the macro and micro levels of experience. At the micro-level differences proliferate and disability dedicates itself to unearthing the lack of duplication from one body to another; at the macro level disability draws together socially debilitating experiences (i.e. lack of employment, ouster from sexual circuits of interaction, exclusionary architectural standards, etc.) and identifies the degree to which global oppression operates on disabled people across cultural contexts. As a result, bands of disabled people have produced viable alternatives to the consumptive models of capital and the expulsion of bodily imperfection in order to envision a meaningful contrast of lifestyles, values, and investments adapted to life as discontinuity and contingency. This is a material, albeit thoroughly subjective, realization of the World Social Forums rallying slogan A Different World is Possible. [End Page 192]

#### Must engage in micro & macro level politics

Imrie University of London Geography Professor 2000

(Rob Imrie, January 6, 2000 Environment and Planning A 2000, volume 32, Disability and discourses of mobility and movement <http://www.envplan.com/abstract.cgi?id=a331> pg. 1644 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Indeed, as Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 604) argue, ``the information that animates the world is dominated by non disabled bodies, by a specific hegemonic form of carnality which excludes as it constructs''. These send out specific signals or codes which favour the corporeal status of nonimpaired people, or at least do little to facilitate the independent ease of movement of people with physical and mental impairments.(5) This, for Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 606), is indicative of ``a subtle interplay of micro and macro relations of power'', where specific design features, for example, prioritise forms of movement based on the bodily needs of the neutered body (which is devoid of physical and mental impairments). In this sense, intercorporeal encounters between the hegemonic world of the mobile body and disabled people tend to reinforce the former's sense of presence and the latter's sense of absence, in other words a recognition of disabled people being there but being unable to interact with the social or physical structures which surround them. It is, in Leder's (1990) terms, a projection of the absent body or bodies which ``dys-appear'' when confronted with the embodied norms of everyday life [see Paterson and Hughes (1999) for an amplification of these points].

## Feminism

### Perm

#### Only the permutation can solve -

Siebers, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism, 9

Tobin, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, Lecture, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdisabilities.temple.edu%2Fmedia%2Fds%2Flecture20091028siebersAesthetics_FULL.doc&ei=LWz4T6jyN8bHqAHLkY2LCQ&usg=AFQjCNGdkDuSJkRXMHgbXqvuyyeDpldVcQ&sig2=UCGDC4tHbeh2j7-Yce9lsA>, accessed 7/7/12, sl)

The appearance of lesser mental and physical abilities disqualifies people as inferior and justifies their oppression. It is now possible to recognize disability as a trope used to posit the inferiority of certain minority populations, but it remains extremely difficult to understand that mental and physical markers of inferiority are also tropes placed in the service of disability oppression. Before disability can be used as a disqualifier, disability, too, has to be disqualified. Beneath the troping of blackness as inbuilt inferiority, for example, lies the troping of disability as inferior. Beneath the troping of femininity as biological deficiency lies the troping of disability as deficiency. The mental and physical properties of bodies become the natural symbols of inferiority via a process of disqualification that seems biological, not cultural—which is why disability discrimination seems to be a medical rather than a social problem. If we consider how difficult it is at this moment to disqualify people as inferior on the basis of their racial, sexual, gender, or class characteristics, we may come to recognize the ground that we must cover in the future before we experience the same difficulty disqualifying people as inferior on the basis of disability. We might also recognize the work that disability performs at present in situations where race, sexuality, gender, and class are used to disqualify people as physically or mentally inferior.

#### Disableism is interlocked with class, race, gender, and sexual oppression.

Webber, psychotherapist, and Bezanson, Brock Univeristy Associate Professor of Sociology, 8

(Michelle and Kate, 5/30/2008, Canadian Scholars’ Press, “Rethinking Society in the 21st Century: Critical Readings in Sociology,” <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=oC2-vku8DcAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA32&dq=%22ableism%22+%22gender+oppression%22&ots=Y7wzDOwmdz&sig=1yFo8_oDxu7uuVPLvVWweJpcwnA#v=onepage&q&f=false>, p. 33, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

Brewer (1993:16) critiques dichotomous/binary oppositional modes of thought which employ either/or categorizations rather than both/and perspectives when theorizing the simultaneity, embeddedness and connectedness of myriad oppressions. An integrative anti-racism approach is based on the principle that myriad forms of oppressions are interlocked and that a study of one such system, racism, necessarily entails a study of class, gender, sexual inequalities, homophobia and ableism (see Mercer and Julien 1988). The complex nature of oppressions, and the interchangeability of the roles of the “oppressor” and “oppressed” in different situations, necessitate the use of an integrative anti-racism approach to understanding social oppression. This approach is informed by the knowledge that individual subjectivities are constituted differently by the relations of race, class, gender, age, disability, sexuality, nationality, religion, language, and culture.

#### Disability studies are intrinsic to understanding feminism, sexuality, gender and critical race studies

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 350-351 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Innovative intellectual formations in the academy—including feminist, postcolonial, sexuality, gender, queer, and critical race studies—have brought energy to work on the body. They have taught us to think the body as a site of excess and surplus, to theorize the extreme body, the mutilated body, the body in pleasure and pain (as James Porter and others have pointed out).1 They counter the medical focus on alterity as a matter of having too little or too much of a body. Different kinds of inter- and cross-disciplinary work on the marked body, moreover, have contributed significantly to each other. Critical race theorists, for example, have pointed to the whiteness of feminism. The ensuing debates have led to work that seeks to demonstrate the constitutive relation between race and gender. These two realms—once considered separate—now refract and image each other. But disability studies reminds us that feminism, sexuality and gender studies, and critical race theory meet at a point of incomprehension when faced with the corporeality of the disabled body.

## Queer Theory

### Perm

#### Queer and disability studies work in mutualistic convergence

Breckenridge, The New School for Social Research Associate History Professor, and Voglerm University of Chicago Professor of Philosophy, 1

(Carol A. and Candace, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Duke University Press, “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Volume 13, Number 3, Project Muse, accessed 7/5/2012 bs)

There are also signs that the time has come to examine the relation between disability studies and queer theory.2 Both seek to elucidate the trouble with the ideal of the normal. Both work to disrupt the picture of the heteronormative family as the fundamental building block of a stable liberal polity, the site of care and nurture for the young, and the sole appropriate object of adult intimate aspiration. In general, however, the one does not read the other. These two fields of knowledge, now operating in parallel, might also operate relationally. They share constitutive sites of convergence organized around the contested regimens of bodily normativity and the normalizing regulation of bodies within a social space. If we think disability as a different kind of drag, a lively conversation may be made possible between queer and crip theorists.

#### Queer and Disability studies work in mutualistic convergence

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 351 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

There are also signs that the time has come to examine the relation between disability studies and queer theory.2 Both seek to elucidate the trouble with the ideal of the normal. Both work to disrupt the picture of the heteronormative family as the fundamental building block of a stable liberal polity, the site of care and nurture for the young, and the sole appropriate object of adult intimate aspiration. In general, however, the one does not read the other. These two fields of knowledge, now operating in parallel, might also operate relationally. They share constitutive sites of convergence organized around the contested regimens of bodily normativity and the normalizing regulation of bodies within a social space. If we think disability as a different kind of drag, a lively conversation may be made possible between queer and crip theorists.

## Race K

### Permutation – Do Both

#### Disability studies are intrinsic to understanding feminism, sexuality, gender and critical race studies

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 350-351 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Innovative intellectual formations in the academy—including feminist, postcolonial, sexuality, gender, queer, and critical race studies—have brought energy to work on the body. They have taught us to think the body as a site of excess and surplus, to theorize the extreme body, the mutilated body, the body in pleasure and pain (as James Porter and others have pointed out).1 They counter the medical focus on alterity as a matter of having too little or too much of a body. Different kinds of inter- and cross-disciplinary work on the marked body, moreover, have contributed significantly to each other. Critical race theorists, for example, have pointed to the whiteness of feminism. The ensuing debates have led to work that seeks to demonstrate the constitutive relation between race and gender. These two realms—once considered separate—now refract and image each other. But disability studies reminds us that feminism, sexuality and gender studies, and critical race theory meet at a point of incomprehension when faced with the corporeality of the disabled body.

### K Links to Ableism

#### Race arguments ignore intertwined history of “disability” and anti-racism

Longmore, professor of history and director of the Institute on Disability, ‘9

 (Paul K.,“Making Disability and Essential Part of American History,” Organization of American Historians Magazine of History, Volume: 23, Issue 3, 2009, P. 16, LPS).

One could go on citing example after example of the impact of “disability” on U.S. society since World War II. Yet despite its importance in America's recent past, the major general overviews of that entire epoch and the important synthetic studies of its particular sub-eras either give disability scant attention or ignore it altogether. These histories recount the civil rights movements to combat racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, and homophobia, but they generally leave out disability prejudice and discrimination and the disability rights movement. When people with disabilities do appear in these accounts they are frequently objects of charity but very rarely civil rights activists (16).The point is that in recent American history, as in all previous eras, disability-related experiences and issues, controversies and campaigns appeared in virtually every social institution and sphere: in lawmaking and policy administration, in professional and institutional practices, and in Americans' understanding about some of their most basic values, values regarding equality and fitness for citizenship, autonomy and appearance, gender and sexuality, progress and the “health” of society. It is time for teachers of American history at all levels to incorporate this significant subject and useful tool in order to deepen our analyses as well as enriching our students' understanding of the American experience.

## Capitalism

### Capitalism - Perm

#### Only the permutation can solve -

Siebers, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism, 9

Tobin, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, Lecture, <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdisabilities.temple.edu%2Fmedia%2Fds%2Flecture20091028siebersAesthetics_FULL.doc&ei=LWz4T6jyN8bHqAHLkY2LCQ&usg=AFQjCNGdkDuSJkRXMHgbXqvuyyeDpldVcQ&sig2=UCGDC4tHbeh2j7-Yce9lsA>, accessed 7/7/12, sl)

The appearance of lesser mental and physical abilities disqualifies people as inferior and justifies their oppression. It is now possible to recognize disability as a trope used to posit the inferiority of certain minority populations, but it remains extremely difficult to understand that mental and physical markers of inferiority are also tropes placed in the service of disability oppression. Before disability can be used as a disqualifier, disability, too, has to be disqualified. Beneath the troping of blackness as inbuilt inferiority, for example, lies the troping of disability as inferior. Beneath the troping of femininity as biological deficiency lies the troping of disability as deficiency. The mental and physical properties of bodies become the natural symbols of inferiority via a process of disqualification that seems biological, not cultural—which is why disability discrimination seems to be a medical rather than a social problem. If we consider how difficult it is at this moment to disqualify people as inferior on the basis of their racial, sexual, gender, or class characteristics, we may come to recognize the ground that we must cover in the future before we experience the same difficulty disqualifying people as inferior on the basis of disability. We might also recognize the work that disability performs at present in situations where race, sexuality, gender, and class are used to disqualify people as physically or mentally inferior.

#### Disability studies are intrinsic to understanding feminism, sexuality, gender and critical race studies

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 350-351 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Innovative intellectual formations in the academy—including feminist, postcolonial, sexuality, gender, queer, and critical race studies—have brought energy to work on the body. They have taught us to think the body as a site of excess and surplus, to theorize the extreme body, the mutilated body, the body in pleasure and pain (as James Porter and others have pointed out).1 They counter the medical focus on alterity as a matter of having too little or too much of a body. Different kinds of inter- and cross-disciplinary work on the marked body, moreover, have contributed significantly to each other. Critical race theorists, for example, have pointed to the whiteness of feminism. The ensuing debates have led to work that seeks to demonstrate the constitutive relation between race and gender. These two realms—once considered separate—now refract and image each other. But disability studies reminds us that feminism, sexuality and gender studies, and critical race theory meet at a point of incomprehension when faced with the corporeality of the disabled body.

#### The binary opposition of “normal” versus “disabled” is a major status quo category of class marginalization and class relations

Longmore, professor of history and director of the Institute on Disability, ‘9

(Paul K.,“Making Disability and Essential Part of American History,” Organization of American Historians Magazine of History, Volume: 23, Issue 3, 2009, P. 11, LPS).

The ideology underlying these attitudes did more than restrict disabled people's job prospects and social careers. Disability, notes historian Douglas Baynton, has served in the modern era as “the primary term in a fundamental binary opposition—‘normal’ versus ‘disabled’,” a major category of social organization, policy formulation, and “cultural signification” (5). That binary informed the “disability category” in employment practices and social welfare policies serving as a tool to manage social and especially class relations (6).

### Capitalism – Alt Can’t Solve Aff

#### Both capitalist and socialist economies privilege ablenormative bodies – only aff intervention and subversion can solve

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

(Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 354 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

What if we invert the conventional wisdom that sees the disabled body as an impediment to mobility (as in the figure of the cripple in Marx) and, hence, both to work and to the circulation of social and economic relations. The inversion would read, by way of example, something like this: Since both capitalist and socialist economies privilege the able body as the basis for the built environment, the able body could appear to interrupt the mobility of the disabled one. Spatially, curbs designed to separate the street from the sidewalk also separate the walker from the wheeled vehicles designed for transportation. The presumed city inhabitant is a walker and not a wheeler. Thus, when curbs interfere with the circulation of wheelers, it can be said that the able body disturbs the mobility of the disabled one.

### Capitalism – Aff Solves the K Impact

#### Disability prompts reconceptualization of resource distribution in order to better embody social justice

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 356 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Anxiety on the part of the able-bodied that their condition is both fortunate and temporary implicitly acknowledges that things can happen to make life much more difficult for them than it is at present—on even the worst, the most impossible, day. The anxiety and the significance of able-bodiedness register the centrality of economic circumstances to disability studies. In the United States, for example, few of us are ever more than a few paychecks away from material devastation. Developing an understanding of social justice informed by disability studies would require us to break frame with much current thought about the distribution of social goods and resources and with the traditional rationales given for various distributive schemes. Whether the “goods” to be “distributed” were educational, nutritional, material, social, or political, we would no longer be able to see the end of social justice as the production of a body politic, each member of which brought a roughly equal share of cognitive, affective, and physical “ability” to the business of the daily reproduction of individual and social life.

#### Ableism affords possibilities of economic justice

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 356 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

Traditional theories of justice always tend to presuppose that the places where wealth is lodged now are places where it belongs, that it was accumulated in some legitimate, vaguely Lockean fashion, and that the way to produce equity is by ensuring that individuals are well equipped to pursue wealth individually. The production of disability through, for example, warfare and conditions of poverty that defy Lockean analysis, the nurture of a heterogeneously able society through liberal reproductive choice, and the victories won through disability activism make disability studies a powerful lever for transforming traditional North American and European work on justice.

#### Ableism provides opportunity to rethink social collectivity

Breckenridge, [New School for Social Research](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_School_for_Social_Research) History, Associate Professor and Vogler University of Chicago, Professor of Philosophy 1

 (Carol A. Breckenridge and Candace Vogler, Fall 2001, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Duke University Press “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism,” Pg. 356 Project Muse accessed 7-2-12 BC)

We need to ask what justice would look like if we assumed that everybody who is here belongs here and that any reasonable image of collective flourishing will take this into account. A first step might be to imagine collectivities—for example, a disabled person and her caregivers—as the bearer of rights, rather than simply to identify a collective’s individual members as rights-bearers. In thinking disability, we have the opportunity to rethink the basis of social collectivity more generally and, through it, both well-being and justice.

## Biopolitics

### No Link

#### Disability culture creates resistance to biopower

Mitchell & Snyder, Temple University, 10 (David and Sharon, “Disability as Multitude: Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 2, 2010, Project Muse, Date Accessed: 6/30, JS)

Marketing Imperfect Identities Nearly all of capitalism now finds itself pitched toward imperfection as the standard with product supplementation as the solution—diuretics, impotency, indigestion, mobility aids, depression, manias, hearing loss, vision correction, chronic fatigue, etc. The body has become a multi-sectional market; whereas Fordist capitalism cultivated divided worker populations by hierarchicalizing the assembly line; postmodern capital divides us within our own bodies. We are now perpetual members of an audience encouraged to experience our bodies [End Page 190] in pieces—as fractured terrains where the "bad" parts of ourselves are multiple. Whereas disabled people were trained to recognize their disabled parts as definitely inferior, late capitalism trains everyone to separate their good from bad—a form of alienation that feeds the market's penchant for "treating" our parts separately. The body becomes a terrain of definable localities, each colonized by its particular pathologies dictated by the medicalized marketplace. This late capitalist litany of bodily frailties, imperfections, and incapacities gluts advertising networks as the hegemonic product pitch strategy of today. Within this environment disability rapidly becomes synonymous with a humanity that we are all seeking to overcome. The imperfect is our standard.

The rise to legitimacy of "comfort industries" results as the twentieth century closes. We are all subject to disciplinary regimens of the therapies that have now transcended their subordinate position within health science and medicine to become our cultural training gurus. Even more than Medicine, the Therapies have now gone "cultural" and encourage our mass dedication not to perfection but to the infinite pursuit of "improvement." Once relatively isolated disability rehabilitation regimens are now applicable to all citizens, just as all citizens grow increasingly responsible for policing their own well being. Therapy is the market, and the degree to which one resists therapy is the degree to which one resists greasing the market. Refusal of our bodies as perpetual objects of professional labors provides a model of resistance wherein the ways our bodies function does not lead us to fall prey to regimes of standardization. We now find ourselves encouraged not to conform to a general norm but rather condition-based norms that others who presumably share our disability group establish. This is really nothing but a move from a medical model based on an elusive average body to a therapy-based norm of an elusive average disabled body.

Today late capitalism thrives on the production of "new spaces" for exploitation—the promotion of the exotic as a strategy of consumption rather than

 the promise of the homogeneous amid locales of difference. The body itself has become an outpost for this strategy. An "intensive interior" is now cannibalized as new "erogenous zones" of intervention. To combat this tendency, disability culture rises as a counter-valuing mechanism; one that cannot afford to mistake its own artificial productions as more "natural," but rather, following Hardt and Negri, as a self-acknowledged product that seizes the biopolitical terrain as revisable. "Non-productive bodies" work a revolution within the conception of worker subjectivity. The non-productive body is not simply a body incapable of working within the narrow standardization efforts of capitalism, but rather, as Hardt and Negri explain, it represents "the way some deviants perform differently and break the norms" in doing so (Multitude, 200). These differences [End Page 191] may result in a rigid exclusion from dominant economic networks but they continue to produce and, in turn, be produced: thus, postmodernism may be generally described as a culture of manufactured sentience: one that wires the life of feeling and flesh directly into the circuitry of prosthetic supplementation (i.e. prosthetics from sip 'n puff systems to Xbox cyber realities).

### Permutation

#### Creates political resistance to violent biopolitics

Mitchell & Snyder, Temple University, 10

(David and Sharon, “Disability as Multitude: Re-working Non-Productive Labor Power,” Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 2, 2010, Project Muse, Date Accessed: 6/30, JS)

While such developments arrive, inevitably, with their own contradictions, they also provide opportunities for re-thinking disability, not only as socially but also as materially produced subjectivities. In turn, people with disabilities produce their own alternative navigations that provide opportunities for both analyzing their further integration within networks of late capitalism (that which Michael Hardt calls "affective labor"), and also attendant modes of resistance to dominant models of consumption, family, sexuality, labor, functionality, etc. In other words, this article is an initial foray into ways in which we might actively think disability into the picture of the production of social networks, forms of community, and biopower. For as Hardt explains, the two orders of engagement are not mutually exclusive: In the production and reproduction of affects, in those networks of culture and communication, collective subjectivities are produced and sociality is produced. Even if those subjectivities and that sociality are directly exploitable by capital. This is where we can realize the enormous potential in affective labor. (Affective Labor)

We want to begin thinking about new horizons of disability in a multicultural, transnational, and post-imperialist world. To apply the prefix post- to these [End Page 180] historical movements is not to suggest their "end." Each continues a dynamic legacy of exploitation, travesty, and domination that reverberates in the aftermath of a lengthy period of military and cultural subjugation. However, like other dynamos (the term Henry Adams used to represent the churning engine of industrial capitalism at the end of the nineteenth century) they must come to rest of their own inertia or metamorphose into a new hegemonic amalgam: one made of the scraps of the old imperial machine and alternative formations of resistance now co-opted; a newly minted, prostheticized, even if ultimately compromised social organization. As Hardt and Negri argue, rather than feeling doomed about the saturation of imperial power through networks of capitalism we might also see room for potential: "The immediately social dimension of the exploitation of living labor immerses labor in all the relational elements that develop the potential of insubordination and revolt through the entire set of laboring practices" (Empire, 29).

International movements of disabled persons have managed to cultivate forms of insubordination within global capitalism by leveraging pressure for social equality and accessible public commons with reference to other movements demanding similar objectives. In 2000 a group of disabled women in South Korea protested a dangerous lift by setting up tents in an underground subway; a Bosnia-Herzegovina disabled student-led campaign made pedestrians aware of curb cuts for wheelchair users by painting them bright yellow; and a Russian disability group blocked entrance to the Moscow underground rail system to hinder others from entering as they were excluded due to a lack of alternative forms of ingress. In each of these examples, people with disabilities staged their protests by seeking to produce parallel experiences of exclusion in others who took their own ease of entry in public spaces for granted. Global disability movements have waged their campaigns around concepts of universal access to collective areas while also calling attention to the dwindling existence of the commons under neoliberal privatization schemes.

The creativity of these civil disobedience tactics turns exclusions on their head. In Marxist terms, disability protest makes people who are not identified as disabled see the world as if through a camera obscura. They use the production of temporary inaccessibility for non-disabled users in order to point out the daily impediments faced by people with disabilities. Even in the midst of protesting structural barriers disabled activists are narrated as "fragile" and as taking unnecessary chances with their already too fragile health. However, as Mike Davis points out in Planet of Slums (2006), a proper systemic analysis needs to invert the terms of this recognition by placing the blame for vulnerability in its appropriate place: "'Fragility' is simply a synonym for systematic [End Page 181] government neglect of environmental safety" (125). Additionally, within disability collectives we find alternative discourses to consumption, standardization, and belonging that offer important possibilities for collective political action on a global scale.

Theories about new forms of political resistance bear a great deal of significance for Disability Studies and global disability movements. This is not only because the forms of political resistance now operative might allow a new assessment of disability bio-politics on a global scale (witness the recent passage of the 2006 United Nations charter on global disability rights), but because international disability movements may serve as key examples of Hardt and Negri's controversial formulation of postmodern militancy: The multitude designates an active social subject, which acts on the basis of what singularities share in common. The multitude is an internally different, multiple social subject whose constitution and action is based not on identity or unity (or, much less, indifference) but on what it has in common. (Multitude, 100)

Within this definition of coordinated yet non-unified insurgencies, Hardt and Negri have most consistently cited the Zapatista movement and the "spontaneous" uprisings of protestors during meetings of the G8. The sociology of these resistance groups reveals the participation of members who do not align themselves primarily on the basis of foundational social identities such as race, class, ethnicity, or gender. Rather, contemporary resistance movements bring with them alternative values of living that oppose corporatist, consumptive models of everyday life. They specifically attack late capitalist culture in terms of "the productive dimension of biopower" wherein lifestyles of over- and under-consumption operate as false universals (Empire, 27).

It may seem strange to cite disability movements in the context of a definition of multitude that is not based on identity. After all, disability seems to mark a horizon of contemporary identity-based politics based on variable bodily capacities, appearances, and experiences of stigma developed without common community institutions or practices of everyday life. For Negri, "the multitude is the power of the singularities that are brought together within cooperative constellations; and the common precedes production" ("Kairos," 215). This characterization better captures the productive multiplicity that characterizes movements of disabled people's goals at a micro and, ultimately, macro level.

# Disadvantage Answers

### 2AC – Aff Solves all Impacts

#### Aff is a prerequisite to the DA impact – Only interrogating ableism can solve all their impacts

Wolbring, biochemist, bioethicist, disability/vari-ability/ability studies scholar, and health policy and science and technology governance researcher at the University of Calgary, 7

(Gregor, member of the Center for Nanotechnology and Society at Arizona State University; Part Time Professor at Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, Canada, Innovation Watch, “NBICS, Other Convergences, Ableism and the Culture of Peace,” April 15, 2007

<http://www.innovationwatch-archive.com/choiceisyours/choiceisyours-2007-04-15.htm>, accessed 7/9/12)

Will the report and language of the culture of peace move people to intervene in the nanoscale science and technology arms and military products race that is already developing? (4) So far, policies around new and emerging technologies have failed to establish a culture of peace, poverty reduction, sustainable development, and dialogue among civilizations. Why is that?

I think ableism is at the root of or at least is a major contributing factor to why we do not make much progress in these domains. Many ‘isms’ converge in the concept of ableism, and one has to deal with ableism if one wants to achieve among other things a culture of peace, poverty reduction, a better situation in low income countries, equity and equality for women and other marginalized groups, sustainable development, and a dialogue among civilizations.

The Convergence Concept of Ableism

Ableism is a set of beliefs, processes and practices that produce -- based on our abilities -- a particular understanding of ourselves, our body, and our relationship with others of our species, other species, and our environment. It includes being judged by others. Ableism exhibits a favouritism for certain abilities that are projected as essential while labelling real or perceived deviations from (or lack of) these ‘essential’ abilities as a diminished state. This leads or contributes to the justification of a variety of other isms (5-7).

Every ism has two components: something we cherish and something we do not. The first, second or both parts may be emphasized.

Ableism reflects the sentiment of certain social groups and social structures to cherish and promote certain abilities such as productivity and competitiveness over others such as empathy, compassion and kindness (favouritism of abilities) (5-7). Ableism and favouritism of certain abilities is rampant today and throughout history. Ableism shaped and continues to shape areas such as human security (3) and social cohesion (8), social policies, relationships among social groups and between individuals and countries, and relationships between humans and non-humans, and humans and their environment.(6) Ableism is one of the most societally entrenched and accepted isms and one of the biggest enablers for other isms (e.g. nationalism, speciesism, sexism, racism, anti-environmentalism, consumerism, GDPism, superiority-ism….). Ableism related to productivity and economic competitiveness is the basis upon which many societies are judged, and it is often seen as a prerequisite for progress.

The direction and governance of science and technology and different forms of ableism have always been inter-related.

Ableism will become more prevalent and severe with the anticipated ability of new and emerging sciences and technologies:

to generate human bodily enhancements in many shapes and forms with an accompanying ability divide and the appearance of the external and internal techno poor disabled; (5)

to generate, modify and enhance non-human life forms;

to separate cognitive functioning from the human body; and

to modify humans to deal with the aftermath of anti-environmentalism.

We can already observe a changing perception of ourselves, our body, and our relationships with others of our species, other species and our environment. New forms of ableism are now appearing which are often presented as a solution to the consequences of other ableism based isms (transhumanization of ableism, for example) (5;6). The cognitive enhancement of animals is now seen by some as a way to eliminate certain forms of speciesism. (2) Transhumanization of the human body may be seen as a solution for coping with the climate change. This could become popular if we reach a point where the severe consequences of climate change can no longer be prevented.

The Choice is Yours

Judgment based on abilities is so ingrained in every culture that its use for exclusionary or otherwise negative purposes is seldom questioned or even recognized. In fact, groups who are marginalized due to some form of ableism often use that very sentiment to demand a change in status (we are as able as you are; we can be as able as you are with accommodations).

Dealing with ableism is essential if we want to diminish, reverse, or prevent the conflict that may result from the disruptive potential of many nanoscale science and technology products. Without dealing with the tenets of ableism one can not achieve poverty reduction; peace; better living standards (especially for traditionally excluded segments of the population); empowerment of people; dialogue among civilizations; dialogue and integration of mainstream science with traditional, local and indigenous sciences of diverse cultures; diversity; sustainability; and distributive justice. Without tackling ableism, no real and durable sustainable equity and equality for any country, group, or individual will be achieved.

## K of Nuclear War Impacts

### 2AC

#### Seeing war an event obfuscates the continued legacy of state-sponsored violence going on everyday. This ethic prevents mobilization against structural forms of violence that make the outbreak of war inevitable.

Cuomo, Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Cincinnati, 96

(Christine, “War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence”, Hypatia, Vol. 11, Iss. 4, Fall, Proquest)

Theory that does not investigate or even notice the omnipresence of militarism cannot represent or address the depth and specificity of the everyday effects of militarism on women, on people living in occupied territories, on members of military institutions, and on the environment. These effects are relevant to feminists in a number of ways because military practices and institutions help construct gendered and national identity, and because they justify the destruction of natural nonhuman entities and communities during peacetime. Lack of attention to these aspects of the business of making or preventing military violence in an extremely technologized world results in theory that cannot accommodate the connections among the constant presence of militarism, declared wars, and other closely related social phenomena, such as nationalistic glorifications of motherhood, media violence, and current ideological gravitations to military solutions for social problems. Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states lead to crisis-based politics and analyses. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism. Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies concerning war and military violence also enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war." Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns.

#### The DA’s representations of nuclear war and prediction scenarios are an instance of Ableism, causing constant violence to the past and present.

Carrigan, Keele University English Lecturer, ’10

[Anthony, Keele University English Lecturer, School of Humanities, 2010, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 4, Number 3, “Postcolonial Disaster, Pacific Nuclearization, and Disabling Environments,” Project Muse, pgs. 259-60, accessed 7/8/12, JTF]

Part of Barclay’s narrative involves a fictional reconstitution of real-world events from a Marshallese perspective. Prominent among these is the 1954 Bravo bomb test, which was a thousand times more powerful than the Hiroshi- ma and Nagasaki detonations and quickly became “an ecological and political relations disaster” (DeLoughrey, “Radiation,” 475). The bombing turned many islands into toxic exclusion zones, including most notoriously Rongelap, whose inhabitants were not evacuated until two days after the detonation and were consequently poisoned. In Meļaļ, Rujen’s wife and the children’s mother, Iia, is depicted as a Bravo survivor, and both Rujen and Jebro reflect at different times on how she was affected by the blast. Despite being “burned” and experiencing what Rujen terms “other trouble”—a euphemism that highlights the ellipses in both medical diagnoses and personal reckonings with radiation sickness—Iia considered herself one of the lucky ones, never suffering from the thyroid cancers that eventually grew in most of the other children exposed that day, but then she always had that trouble having babies, and sometimes, Jebro knew from hearing what he was not supposed to hear, she had jellyfish babies, what some Marshallese women called monster babies because they looked inside-out, and finally it killed her. (82)

The production of disability—including reproductive disorders and the birth of short-lived “jellyfish babies,” able to breathe but typically lacking “eyes . . . head . . . arms [and] legs” (Keju-Johnson, qtd. in dé Ishtar, 24)—is portrayed as being entwined with the long-term effects of nuclear disaster and the refusal by U.S. authorities to support affected individuals.1 Rujen recalls how, even though “the doctors said [Iia] had recovered” (20), they continued “to examine her” on “their ship” each year, taking blood samples and “once . . . a little piece of bone from her chest,” although they “never said . . . that Iia better not try having any babies” (21). This mystifying process precludes access to official recovery pro- grams, suggesting that refusal to acknowledge ongoing disablement is a planned aspect of this conspicuously man-made catastrophe and buttressing claims by some of Rongelap’s inhabitants in the novel that “they had been poisoned on purpose, so that the Americans could test what happened to people as a result of their bombs” (81). It also corresponds with Mbembe’s theory of necropower, although in this case, rather than being targeted at an external enemy, the abuse of power is directed at people within this American-administrated territory.

For Mbembe, necropower represents a form of (neo)colonial dominance that involves “the generalized instrumentalization of human existence and the mater- ial destruction of human bodies and populations” (14). He argues that the most effective form of necropolitics in a state of ongoing war—a condition which could be applied to the continuous nature of weapons testing in the Marshall Islands—involves “disabling the enemy” (29). His primary focus here is on infrastructure destruction but the statement also applies to the “wounded or slain bod[ies]” (12) addressed throughout his study. The use of such tactics is disturbing from a Marshallese perspective as the local population has been nei- ther officially warred against nor endowed with the subjectivity required to be considered an “enemy” in the first place. This renders them disposable beings, made “guinea pigs,” according to one protestor in the 1970s, “because they are not white but some brown natives in some remote Pacific islands” (“DISTAD”).2 In this light, the U.S. military can be seen as deliberately exploiting the fact that “[d]isabled people are less likely to be included in reconstruction or to be considered within the mainstream of disaster planning” (Priestley and Hem- ingway, 37). By keeping individuals in a state of continuous disablement, this form of necropolitics works to deny personal sovereignty and underwrites the Marshallese population’s instrumentalization as disaster test subjects or human “guinea pigs.”

### Nuclear War K – Ext.

#### Their impact scenarios involve constructing nuclear test sites. We envision scenario after scenario of nuclear wars in order to prepare for the chance of a conflict. However, this is a self-fulfilling prophecy – we constantly expand the scope of our scenarios till they become endless wars.

Carrigan, Keele University English Lecturer, ’10

[Anthony, Keele University English Lecturer, School of Humanities, 2010, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 4, Number 3, “Postcolonial Disaster, Pacific Nuclearization, and Disabling Environments,” Project Muse, pg. 268, accessed 7/8/12, JTF]

Refusing to interpret the atomic bombings of Japan as isolated events and tacitly reconfiguring hibakusha status as inclusive, Akiko renders visible (“recognise,” “seen”) Caleb’s implication in this larger “collective” affected by the onset of “wars of the globalization era” (Zygmunt Bauman, qtd. in Mbembe, 30). Emerging during World War II to find horrific expression in the atomic bombings on Japan, such conflicts “aim to force the enemy into submission regardless of the immediate consequences, side effects, and ‘collateral damage’ of the military actions” (Mbembe, 31). These tactics are endemic across the irradiated Pacific— from the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to the explosively “hot” war in Vietnam—and feature centrally in the novel’s interrogation of the relation- ship between nuclearization and disability.

This link is drawn most clearly by Isaac as he comes to see nuclear destruc-tion as producing a toxic environment that does not allow atomic bombings to be considered past events. Responding to Caleb’s question, “How many died?,” Isaac corrects the grammar while invoking a dramatic irony with respect to his son’s undiagnosed leukaemia when he says: “I don’t know. . . . But we shouldn’t use the past tense. With the effects of radiation, they’ll still be dying” (254). The point is reinforced on a macro level toward the end of the novel when Isaac states: “They say that nuclear weapons kept the peace. . . . They keep us sus- pended at any given moment, an inch from world war, but what we’re left with isn’t peace” (363). This resonates with Mbembe’s contention that “in modern philosophical thought and . . . practice . . ., the colony represents the site where sovereignty consists fundamentally in the exercise of a power outside the law. . . and where ‘peace’ is more likely to take on the face of a ‘war without end’” (23). Isaac’s emigration to New Zealand is prompted by a similar recognition as he attempts to escape “British Ministry of Defence” demands and the “larger, lethal envelope of research and testing,” always in anticipation of “another war that had been searched for and sighted just over the horizon” (255). However, as Akiko’s experiences also show, New Zealand is by no means detached from the broader context of Pacific nuclearization. Rather, its aptness as a setting for the novel’s events is underscored by the state’s role as colonial centre and administrator in the Pacific, which appears causally related to the inadequate and exclusionary attitudes to disabilities produced by regional militarization. Thus, at the point when Isaac becomes fully cognizant of his moral complicity with necropolitical violence, prompting his “break down” in Antarctica, he is confined to a “mental institution” (341), detached from New Zealand society “for an indeterminate time” (28) and branded insane.

#### War is made inevitable by the negative – our imagined nuclear scenarios are akin to the created toxic environments where the disabled are forgotten and rendered disposable.

Carrigan, Keele University English Lecturer, ’10

[Anthony, Keele University English Lecturer, School of Humanities, 2010, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, Volume 4, Number 3, “Postcolonial Disaster, Pacific Nuclearization, and Disabling Environments,” Project Muse, pg. 268, accessed 7/8/12, JTF]

It is this process of state-sponsored incarceration that Caleb rails against in the novel’s climactic finale at an Armistice Day peace rally in 1970. Having attracted the crowd’s attention by covering himself in kerosene and threatening self-immolation, he criticizes the authorities who have “put [my father] away for years because they think he’s crazy . . . [b]ecause they need him to be crazy” (363). This highlights the discrepancy between the macro-“criminality” of necropolitical regimes, which often evade legal censure, and the victimization of individuals like Isaac who are ironically “incarcerated” not on legal but on dubious medical grounds. In contrast with the concealed nature of disability in the text, both Caleb and Troy are written out of the narrative in this spectacular scene. Caleb’s militant anti-war actions endanger Akiko, prompting the onlooking Troy to snatch an armed policeman’s rifle and shoot his brother before entering his own Vietnam-related hallucination, firing indiscriminately until he too is killed by police. While these deaths are linked to the brothers’ inability to extricate themselves from the explosive technologies associated with “wartime masculinity” (DeLoughrey, “Radiation,” 490), they also draw attention to the state’s refusal to integrate and care for people affected by this disabling environment, silently buttressing the culture of disposability that underpins the “wars of globalization.” Condensing the spatially and temporally expansive fall- out of nuclearization in a moment of narrative singularity, Caleb’s and Troy’s individual stories radiate outwards, functioning less as discrete tragedies than as markers of an incomplete process of post-disaster recognition and healing in the nuclear Pacific. This enhances the ambivalence of the novel’s ending in ways that resonate with George’s disclosure in an interview on the composition of Ocean Roads that he found the “mistakes” of the Vietnam War to be “frighten- ingly contemporary,” while the Iraq War “shadowed” his “writing of the book” (Harvey).

### AT: Martin

#### Nuclear war will not cause extinction. There way of thinking is created by exaggeration to justify inaction, fear of death, and exaggeration to stimulate action.

Martin, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, 82

(Brian,” Critique of Nuclear Extinction”, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1982, http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/82jpr.html , pp. 287-300.)

The idea that global nuclear war could kill most or all of the world's population is critically examined and found to have little or no scientific basis. A number of possible reasons for beliefs about nuclear extinction are presented, including exaggeration to justify inaction, fear of death, exaggeration to stimulate action, the idea that planning is defeatist, exaggeration to justify concern, white western orientation, the pattern of day-to-day life, and reformist political analysis. Some of the ways in which these factors inhibit a full political analysis and practice by the peace movement are indicated. Prevalent ideas about the irrationality and short duration of nuclear war and of the unlikelihood of limited nuclear war are also briefly examined. For many people, nuclear war is seen as such a terrible event, and as something that people can do so little about, that they can see no point in taking action on peace issues and do not even think about the danger. For those who have never been concerned or taken action on the issue, accepting an extreme account of the effects of nuclear war can provide conscious or unconscious justification for this inaction. In short, one removes from one's awareness the upsetting topic of nuclear war, and justifies this psychological denial by believing the worst. people involved with any issue or activity tend to exaggerate its importance so as to justify and sustain their concern and involvement. Nuclear war is only one problem among many pressing problems in the world, which include starvation, poverty, exploitation, racial and sexual inequality and repressive governments. By concentrating on peace issues, one must by necessity give less attention to other pressing issues. An unconscious tendency to exaggerate the effects of nuclear war has the effect of reducing conscious or unconscious guilt at not doing more on other issues.

## AT: Environment Impacts

#### Critiquing ableism is pre-requisite to solving foundations of environmental harms

Wolbring, biochemist, bioethicist, disability/vari-ability/ability studies scholar, and health policy and science and technology governance researcher at the University of Calgary, 7

(Gregor, member of the Center for Nanotechnology and Society at Arizona State University; Part Time Professor at Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, Canada, Innovation Watch, “NBICS, Other Convergences, Ableism and the Culture of Peace,” April 15, 2007

<http://www.innovationwatch-archive.com/choiceisyours/choiceisyours-2007-04-15.htm>, accessed 7/9/12)

The disregard for nature that most humans show now might reflect another form of ableism: humans are here to use nature as we see fit, as we are superior to nature due to our abilities. We might treat nature better when we can’t treat it badly anymore, due to the ensuing negative consequences for humans. The second report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released on April 6 predicts the ‘highway to extinction’. A third report outlining potential solutions will be released on May 4.

We might see the appearance of a climate change-driven appeal for a transhumanized version of ableism, where transhumanization of humans is seen as a solution for coping with climate change. This could become especially popular if we reach a so-called ‘point of no return,’ where severe climate change consequences can no longer be prevented.

#### Ableism is intrinsically connected to our relationship to ourselves, other species, and the environment-the rejection of ablenormativity is key to helps us solve for our relationship to the environment-turns their link

Wolbring, biochemist, bioethicist, disability/vari-ability/ability studies scholar, and health policy and science and technology governance researcher at the University of Calgary, 7

(Gregor, member of the Center for Nanotechnology and Society at Arizona State University; Part Time Professor at Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, Canada, *Innovation Watch,* “NBICS, Other Convergences, Ableism and the Culture of Peace,” April 15, 2007, <http://www.innovationwatch-archive.com/choiceisyours/choiceisyours-2007-04-15.htm>, Accessed: 7/8/12, LPS)

Ableism is a set of beliefs, processes and practices that produce -- based on our abilities -- a particular understanding of ourselves, our body, and our relationship with others of our species, other species, and our environment. It includes being judged by others. Ableism exhibits a favouritism for certain abilities that are projected as essential while labelling real or perceived deviations from (or lack of) these ‘essential’ abilities as a diminished state. This leads or contributes to the justification of a variety of other isms (5-7). Every ism has two components: something we cherish and something we do not. The first, second or both parts may be emphasized. Ableism reflects the sentiment of certain social groups and social structures to cherish and promote certain abilities such as productivity and competitiveness over others such as empathy, compassion and kindness (favouritism of abilities) (5-7). Ableism and favouritism of certain abilities is rampant today and throughout history. Ableism shaped and continues to shape areas such as human security (3) and social cohesion (8), social policies, relationships among social groups and between individuals and countries, and relationships between humans and non-humans, and humans and their environment.(6) Ableism is one of the most societally entrenched and accepted isms and one of the biggest enablers for other isms (e.g. nationalism, speciesism, sexism, racism, anti-environmentalism, consumerism, GDPism, superiority-ism….). Ableism related to productivity and economic competitiveness is the basis upon which many societies are judged, and it is often seen as a prerequisite for progress.

### Climate Change

#### Rejection of ablenormativity solves climate change

Wolbring, biochemist, bioethicist, disability/vari-ability/ability studies scholar, and health policy and science and technology governance researcher at the University of Calgary, 7

(Gregor, member of the Center for Nanotechnology and Society at Arizona State University; Part Time Professor at Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, Canada, *Innovation Watch,* “NBICS, Other Convergences, Ableism and the Culture of Peace,” April 15, 2007, <http://www.innovationwatch-archive.com/choiceisyours/choiceisyours-2007-04-15.htm>, Accessed: 7/8/12, LPS)

We can already observe a changing perception of ourselves, our body, and our relationships with others of our species, other species and our environment. New forms of ableism are now appearing which are often presented as a solution to the consequences of other ableism based isms (transhumanization of ableism, for example) (5;6). The cognitive enhancement of animals is now seen by some as a way to eliminate certain forms of speciesism. (2) Transhumanization of the human body may be seen as a solution for coping with the climate change. This could become popular if we reach a point where the severe consequences of climate change can no longer be prevented.

## Economy

### Economics K

#### Economic and social structures of society and hegemony have created the perception of people with disabilities being dependent

Lang, Overseas Development Group Senior Research Associate, 1

(Dr. Raymond, January, 2001, University of East Anglia, Overseas Development Group, “THE DEVELOPMENT AND CRITIQUE OF THE SOCIAL MODEL OF DISABILITY,” http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lc-ccr/lccstaff/raymond-lang/DEVELOPMMENT\_AND\_CRITIQUE\_OF\_THE\_SOCIAL\_MODEL\_OF\_D.pdf, accessed: 7-8-12, CAS)

Oliver continued his analysis by arguing that the economic and social structures of society, in combination with the dominant ideological hegemony, have resulted in disabled people being perceived as “dependent”. Consequently a great deal of the social welfare legislation enacted during the post-war period has compounded this notion. The term “dependency” is used in a two-fold manner. Firstly, welfare states have categorized entire groups of people, of which disabled people are but one, who have become dependent upon the state for the provision of education, health care, as well as financial support. Secondly, in specific relation to disability, attention has focused upon the functional limitations of disabled people who are perceived to be unable to care for themselves.

#### Measurements of economic productivity are able-normative

Wolbring, biochemist, bioethicist, disability/vari-ability/ability studies scholar, and health policy and science and technology governance researcher at the University of Calgary, 7

(Gregor, member of the Center for Nanotechnology and Society at Arizona State University; Part Time Professor at Faculty of Law, University of Ottawa, Canada, Innovation Watch, “NBICS, Other Convergences, Ableism and the Culture of Peace,” April 15, 2007

<http://www.innovationwatch-archive.com/choiceisyours/choiceisyours-2007-04-15.htm>, accessed 7/9/12)

There are different ways to measure the growth of a society. For the longest time, growth in GDP has been favoured, while people-based growth, people-centered and sustainable development, social well-being, and quality of life are still neglected. The NSF DoC NBIC report goal of human performance enhancement is linked to increased productivity and GDP-ism.

GDP is used by economists to judge the ‘positive’ advances of an economy but it can’t be used to judge living standards, social development, social well-being and the level of satisfaction of people in a society have with their lives. It does not show the gaps between haves and have-nots.

The inclination towards a GDP-based measure is slowly changing. While we still measure the success of countries based on yearly GDP, we are also seeing greater use of social indicators to measure the social well-being of citizens. A recent (September 2006) Deutsche Bank research paper highlights nicely why measuring GDP is not enough, and identifies measures that can be used to characterize well-being.

The dimensions of well-being include income, education, health, the role of women, environment, social peace, diversity and welfare. The Deutsche Bank research paper refers to the United Nations’ annual Human Development Index (HDI), the Weighted Index of Social Progress (WISP), the Happy Planet Index (HPI), the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), the Economic Living Standard Index (ELSI), and the National Wellbeing Index which is published by a variety of countries. Korea publishes a comprehensive statistical yearbook which includes 492 social indicators in 13 areas.

According to the research paper, the above measures still do not show how happy people are or how satisfied they are with their lives. It is not surprising that economists predisposed to measuring GDP have different priorities and views of what is needed than people who are focused on social well-being and life satisfaction.

### No Link – Universal Design

#### Adults with disabilities twice as likely to have inadequate transportation and have a huge economic cost to the nation

AAPD A cross-disability association 12

(American Association of People with Disabilities, The Leadership Conference Education Fund, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” [http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf accessed 7-1-12](http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf%20accessed%207-1-12) BC)

Unfortunately, adults with disabilities are twice as likely as those without disabilities to have inadequate transportation (31 percent vs. 13 percent).1 Of the nearly 2 million people with disabilities who never leave their homes, 560,000 never leave home because of transportation difficulties.2 Leaving people out has real costs to the nation. Keeping people with disabilities at home keeps them out of jobs, away from shopping, and out of community life, and it prevents them from making valuable contributions to our society as individuals, as workers, as consumers, and as taxpayers.

### Turn – Universal Design Increases Employment

#### Difficulties with transportation cause employment issues for persons with disabilities

Durant, Department of Transportation Survey Statistician, 3

(Sharon, April 2003, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, “Transportation Difficulties Keep Over Half a Million Disabled at Home,” <http://www.bts.gov/publications/special_reports_and_issue_briefs/issue_briefs/number_03/pdf/entire.pdf>, accessed 7/3/2012, bs)

The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) aimed to balance the reasonable accommodation of citizens’ needs with the capacity of private and public entities to respond. An important focus of the legislation was to provide employment opportunities for, and prevent discrimination against, disabled people. In effect, the ADA strives to eliminate disability as a factor in the rates of employment, education, and income. The data reported in the previous section of this Brief indicate that transportation difficulties may contribute to lower employment rates among people with disabilities. Looking more closely at the disabled population of this country, the Census Bureau reports that nearly 50 million people have a disability. The employment rate for people with disabilities is 57%, compared to 63.9% for nondisabled people. Among those with severe disabilities, the employment rate is about 30%. The mean earnings in 2000 for those with work disabilities was $33,109, about $10,000 less than earnings for nondisabled people of the same age distribution. 1

# Counterplan Answers

### ADA Compliance CP

#### The private sector isn’t regulated by the ADA, and serve only nondisabled passengers

Golden, Policy Analyst at the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, Weiner, Master’s degree in urban planning at Hunter College, 5

(Marilyn, Richard, 6/13, “The Current State of Transportation for People with Disabilities in The United States,” http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CKMEEBYwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ncd.gov%2Frawmedia\_repository%2Fafd954e1\_161b\_4524\_ace5\_38aefac854cc%3Fdocument.pdf&ei=JE\_vT8j6IYfTqgGFoNj2AQ&usg=AFQjCNH6vGnowTrUJprUYm6rtNiynOT6Jw&sig2=aSM0uMdtMj87czIem9-sKQ, Pg. 15, Accessed: 6/30/12, GJV)

Travel by taxicab, depended on by many people with disabilities, can pose real barriers to individuals who use service animals or wheelchairs. Accessible taxicabs generally are not required by the ADA. In the void created by this lack of a legal mandate, most cities have attempted to establish wheelchair-accessible taxi service. These efforts, which are described in all their variety in seven major cities, are hampered by numerous difficulties. Some cities have imposed accessible taxicab mandates without providing the necessary incentives for drivers and cab companies, or without the necessary monitoring and enforcement. Often, accessible taxis are not available in neighborhoods for use by people with disabilities; they are busy providing paratransit rides on contract with the local transit agency, or waiting at the airport for nondisabled passengers with golf clubs and bulky luggage, or even parked and not in use. Services for people with disabilities by Greyhound and other intercity carriers, as well as airport shuttles, social services transportation, and tour and charter services are also explored in this report.

#### ADA won’t solve disability infrastructure

American Association of People with Disabilities, 12

(5/8, “Equity in Transportation for People with Disabilities,” http://www.civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/transportation/final-transportation-equity-disability.pdf, p.4, accessed 7-1-12, JC)

<Twenty years after passage of the ADA, transportation choices for people with disabilities are still limited. The ADA has led to major improvements in transit systems across the United States. However, there are persistent gaps in compliance that continue to create significant barriers for people with disabilities. In addition, because the ADA only addresses public transportation, few transportation options exist for people with disabilities where no public transportation is available. In some areas, such as in rural communities, insufficient funding has left people with disabilities with little or no transportation options. In urban areas, where individuals often rely on accessible taxis, a lack of requirements has meant very uneven progress.>

#### Only people that meet a certain definition of “disabled” are accommodated – persons with disabilities outside the traditional medical model are excluded

Rosenkvist et al., Lund University Department of Technology and Society, 9

(Jenny, Kerstin Wendel, Ralf Risser, Agneta Stahl, and Susanne Iwarsson, Winter 2009, “The Challenge of Using Public Transport: Descriptions by People with Cognitive Functional Limitations,” Journal of Transport and Land Use, vol. 2(1), <https://www.jtlu.org/index.php/jtlu/article/view/97/42>, p. 65-66, accessed 7-6-2012, bs)

Planning for an accessible public transport system for all is a generally agreed necessity (CEMT 2004; Regeringens Proposition 1999/2000:79; SOU 2003:67) but at the same time it is a challenge. In Sweden, urban public transport is provided in a differentiated system to meet the service route traffic with a higher level of service from the driver and shorter distances to bus stops for use by older people and people with functional limitations; and the Special Transport Service, which is a door-to-door service that can only be used by persons with special authorization (Svensson 2003). For a long time, both research and governmental evaluations in Sweden have emphasized the importance of the user perspective and the travel chain perspective when planning for various transport user groups (Olsson 2003; Ståhl 1997). However, both internationally and nationally, planning for accessibility to public transport predominantly focuses on people with visual or physical functional limitations (see Carlsson 2002; Davidsson 2001; Marin-Lemellet et al. 2001; Ståhl and Iwarsson 2007; Waara 2001), while the situation for people with cognitive functional limitations is generally overlooked (Davidsson 2001; Grönvall et al. 2004).

# Topicality

### Substantially

#### The U.S. has at least 51 million persons with disabilities that have a major impact on social life

Longmore, professor of history and director of the Institute on Disability, ‘9

(Paul K.,“Making Disability and Essential Part of American History,” Organization of American Historians Magazine of History, Volume: 23, Issue 3, 2009, P. 12, LPS).

Demographic data alone demonstrate the importance of disability in American history. Current surveys estimate that the U.S. population contains at least 51 million persons with disabilities that have a major impact on life activities. That is about one in six present-day Americans (9). It seems likely that in the past the proportions were that high or higher.

#### Persons with disabilities represent a significant portion of the population – their needs should be addressed alongside the needs of non-disabled travelers

Golledge, UC Santa Barbara Professor of Geography, 96

Reginald G.; C. Michael Costanzo, UC Santa Barbara Department of Computer Science Lecturer; and James R. Marston, UC Santa Barbara Department of Geography Assistant Researcher, 1/1/1996, California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways, “The Mass Transit Needs of a Non-driving Disabled Population,” <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/5rk1121g>, p. 7, accessed 7/5/2012, bs)

Table 2A.1 shows there are more than 43 million disabled people in the United States and that over 3 million are severely vision impaired or legally blind. Preliminary estimates from the 1990 census raise this figure to 50 million. Another 3-4 million suffer severe visually impaired so that they cannot drive or have difficulty reading signs or printed matter. Table 2A.2 shows the functional limitations that the Census Bureau uses to define disability. From the 1990 census, a distinction is made between “mobility” and “self care” disabilities. We will be better able to monitor the impact of disabilities in the future using these two categories, but in this report we concentrate on mobility disability. 1990 Census has two questions on disabilities. In the preliminary findings they show 34 million adults have a functional disability, and for 15 million of these, their disabilities are severe. Fewer people have problems with activities of daily living (8 million, of which 3.9 require assistance). The elderly have a disproportionate share of the disabled (Figure 2A.1). Disability rates are higher for those with low education.