# 1NC Shell - Alternative

#### Transportation Infrastructure policymaking is based on ablenormative sociocultural attitudes

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.

#### 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.

#### The alternative is to celebrate collective solidarity. This new form of ethics causes new forms of activism and is key to recognizing violence against disabled people in our everyday lives

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. 614-615, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition , CNM)

Our analysis has tragically revealed a propensity for violence against disabled children ingrained in the relationships, institutions and cultural acts of our time. We worry that as contemporary economic conditions increase feelings of stress, disempowerment and poverty then these socio-economic conditions may well increase the violence of disablism. To tackle this violence means not simply targeting those few ‘evil souls’ responsible for hate crimes against disabled people but deconstructing and reforming the very cultural norms that legitimise violence against disabled people in the first place. Zˇ izˇ ek (2008) offers us some hope for subverting this culture of violence. A key contribution lies in exposing the emptiness of a culture in which disabled children and their families continue to be disavowed. Zˇ izˇ ek calls for a new ethics, following Levinas, of ‘abandoning the claim to sameness that underlies universality, and replacing it with a respect for otherness’ (Zˇ izˇ ek 2008: 47). Instead, we need:

to celebrate collective solidarity, connection, responsibility for dependent others, duty to respect the customs of one’s community – instead of Western Capitalist culture’s valuing of autonomy and liberal freedom (Zˇ izˇ ek 2008: 123).

These ethics can feed directly into disability activism, forms of education, health and social welfare and professional practice, which collectively work together to reduce violence against disabled people. This vision resonates with an ideal proposed by Finkelstein (1999a, 1999b) in his notion of the profession allied to the community (PAC). In contrast to professions allied to medicine, PACs refer to services and professionals that respond to and are led by the aspirations of disabled people and their representative organisations. Developing a PAC could bring into a production a ‘virgin field of theory and practice through which professionals are re-engaged with the aspirations of disabled people’ (Finkelstein 1999b: 3). This virgin field incorporates ideas from critical disability studies and demands professionals invest less time in pathological views of impairment (such as naturally associating challenging behaviour with intellectual disabilities), and more time in challenging the conditions of disablism (including violence). This field would require professionals, for example, to address their own acts of psychoemotional disablism and disavowal which underpin the understandings they hold of the people they are paid to enable. The PAC turns the gaze back at the potential or pitfalls of relational, systemic and cultural responses to disability.

The real problem of disablism is, like most forms of ideology, that the subjective positions of cultural actors remain untouched (Zˇ izˇ ek 2008: 85). Attending to the cultural, systemic, psychoemotional and real elements of the violence of disablism ensures that we become more in tune with the everyday conditions of exclusion that lead, time and time again, to the ontological, cultural, community and physical exclusion of disabled children and their families. This might lead us to connect, respect and show solidarity with disabled children as we all fight for a non-violent life.
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#### Transportation Infrastructure policymaking is based on ablenormative sociocultural attitudes

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.

#### 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.

#### Vote negative to refuse the rhetorical ableist practices of 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.

# Links

## Transportation Infrastructure

### Transportation Infrastructure

#### 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 in terms of disability is based on sociocultural attitudes

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.

#### Transportation infrastructure is built in a way that systematically excludes 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. 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.

### 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 practices exclusion based on able-normative assumptions

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.

### Mobility

#### Rhetorics of mobility & movement reinforce ableism

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).

#### Mobility discourse reinforces the hegemony of the mobile body

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.

#### Mobility is considered the core legal American framework that allows for advancement

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. 1642 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Most of us expect to be able to move around the built environment with ease of access and entry into buildings. For Blomley (1994, page 413), ``rights and entitlement attached to mobility have long had a hallowed place within the liberal pantheon and, as such, mobility is part of the democratic revolution''. For instance, in the United States and Canada, mobility rights are formally enshrined in legislation and mobility is considered as fundamental to the liberty of the human body. As Hobbes (1996, page 57) has argued, ``liberty or freedom, signifieth, properly, the absence of opposition; by opposition, I mean external impediments of motion''. This, then, suggests that movement and mobility are intrinsically `good things'; practices which ought to be propagated as ends in themselves. Others see mobility as a means to an end and a mechanism for opening up opportunities. For instance, Maat and Louw (1999, page 160) assume that ``mobility gives people the opportunity to develop themselves socially and economically'' and Marshall (1999, page 4), who says that ``to be going places is to be getting on'', clearly considers mobility to be a valued commodity.

### Highways

#### Current new systems only encourage inequalities by increasing cost without improving accessibility

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.4, LPS)

New highways exacerbate transportation inequities by increasing transportation costs for these communities and potentially putting jobs and affordable housing out of reach. An equity agenda should favor incentives to fix existing infrastructure and develop vacant or underutilized property within metro areas. Although investment in non-automobile transportation options will undoubtedly benefit people with disabilities, policy makers must nonetheless seek guidance from accessibility experts when selecting projects in which to invest. People with disabilities live in every community, and the growing elderly population shares many of their concerns. Transportation planning must therefore concern more than geography; it must also be about accessibility and maximizing usability. b. Transportation equity projects promote equal employment opportunities Our next major federal investment in transportation will create hundreds of thousands of jobs in the transportation sector. To promote equal job opportunity, the federal government should end requirements that most funds be spent on highways. We must invest in transit options that will enable low-income people to reach a greater variety of job opportunities—including transportation projects in outlying areas.

#### **Lack of accessible 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.

### Cars

#### 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''.

### Bicycles

#### Bicycle advocates re-entrench able-normative oppressions

Winter Snowfall Blog, 12

(June 18, ““Ride a Bike, Asshole!”, or, Ableism is the Tragic Flaw of Bicycle Culture”, <http://thewintersnowfall.wordpress.com/2012/06/18/ride-a-bike-asshole-or-ableism-is-the-tragic-flaw-of-bicycle-culture/>, accessed 7/12/12)

There’s still a problem: not everyone can ride a bicycle. Some people have chronic pain, an illness, or an injury that prevents them from riding. Some people simply don’t have the physical energy to ride long distances. Bicycle-based environmental activism advocates a personal consumer choice to buy and use a specific type of technology, but that personal consumer choice is not an option for everyone because that technology is not a viable tool for everyone. Yet a major part of bicycle culture is a firm belief in the moral superiority of those who use bicycles, and often there is an accompanying belief that it is ok to violently harass those that do not use bicycles. Some people are assholes who think it is great that their SUV’s use oil stolen from murdered brown people in another country and destroy the environment, but what about folks who want justice and a healthy environment but can’t navigate the world they live in without a motor-powered vehicle? Those folks have to deal with limited choices due to disability or an atypical body (or a necessity to go distances that are too far for bicycling), and also have to deal with insulting messages and harassment from bicycle activists telling them that they are irresponsible and less morally valuable.

That ableism is the tragic flaw of bicycle culture. Our culture has other problems, like misogyny, obnoxious snobby dudes in bike shops, racism, and fatphobia, but those problems are incidental and can be overcome. Events like the naked bike ride show that we can create a safe, empowering, and fun space to enjoy riding bikes together. But ableism is integral to how we have constructed a culture around bicycles, it is built into why we think bikes are so important. Questioning ableism threatens the magical world-transforming image we have built around bikes, it threatens to reveal bicycles as just another technology, just another option.

I believe bicycles are unbelievably powerful, they have certainly been indescribably transformative and empowering in my life. I’m not going to give up my commitment to bicycles because of the deeply ingrained ableism, but I also cannot support advocacy that is so hurtful to so many people. I, we, need to radically rethink what to advocate for.

### 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.

### AT: transportation Not Important

#### 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.

#### 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.

## Policymaking

### Ableist Policymaking

#### 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).

#### Policymakers fail to evaluate able-normative practices

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.

## Advantage Links

### Economy - Productivity

#### Focus on “productivity” idealizes the ablenormative body

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)

Ableism tells us what a healthy body means – a normal mind, how quickly we should think and the kinds of emotions that are okay to express. Of course these characteristics then are put out as an ideal. These beliefs do not take account of differences in the ways we express our emotions, use our thinking and bodies in different cultures and in different situations. There is pressure in modern societies for us to show we are always productive (doing sometime useful) and contributing. Ableist belief values certain things as useful and particular kinds of contributions. Disabled people are often seen as a burden, a problem, a drain of the system, making no contribution – or as Hitler said ‘useless eaters’. According to our understanding of Ableism, ‘disability’ refers to people who do not make the grade, are unfit in someway – and therefore are not properly human.

#### The view of the world as a biological system of structures ensures the otherization and subordination of disabled people

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. 602-603, EBSCOhost Health Source Nursing Academic Edition , CNM)

This article explores the multi-faceted nature of violence in the lives of disabled people, with a specific focus on the accounts of disabled children and their families. We start this article with three stories from a project:

It’s finding the people [to look after him] that could actually physically cope with my son. Because if he doesn’t co-operate you have to manhandle him, to get him out of the door and, you know, he’ll be punching you, kicking you (Roberta).

My daughter has a good line in hand-biting and hitting people which really upsets the escort on the mini bus. I think at some point, if she actually manages to get the escort, I think he’ll say, ‘I’m not having that child on my bus ever again’ (Shelley).

I had to restrain my son and he wasn’t very happy about that and so he started hitting me. I was seeing stars and ... and my daughter was bright enough to phone the cops again (Jane).

These accounts appear to support the idea that, for some disabled children at least, violence and impairment are knotted together as a pathological whole. This version of the mad ⁄ bad disabled body is not simply a well worn cultural trope to be found in popular cultural images (see Mitchell and Snyder 2006), but testimony to the dominance of a particular philosophy or epistemology of disability discourse. What is immediately apparent when one starts to research violence and disability is the dominance of functionalism. As Goodley (2010) notes early social and cultural theories of disability were heavily influenced by the structural- functionalist sociologist Parsons (1951), who saw the coherence of the social system as ‘analogous to a biological system – a system of social structures interacting and co-existing as a consensual web of relationships’ (Thomas 2007: 16–17). Functionalism views disability as a product of a damaged body or mind that, ‘struggles to escape the pitfalls of essentialism and biological determinism’ (Donaldson 2002: 112). Functionalism is a position that emphasises the consensual nature of society; it starts and ends with deficient individuals and the maintenance of these individuals and the social order. In this sense, then, we could argue that functionalism underpins ableism: the social, cultural and political conditions of contemporary life that emphasise ability and denigrate disability. Campbell argues that disabled people are pathologised through the ‘production, operation and maintenance of ableist-normativity’ (Campbell 2008: 1). Functionalism serves to maintain the ableist consensus through the othering of disabled people. Following Donaldson (2002: 112), disabled people are discharged from the functionalist clinical episteme as pathological, problem-infused victims who must place themselves in the hands of authorities – such as medicine – in order to follow ‘illness management regimes’. Consequently, good patients ⁄ disabled people are deferent, dependent, compliant and non-violent (Greenop 2009). This dual assessment of problem and compliance to treatment ensures that huge disability industries have grown in the service of functionalism. Medicalisation, psychological therapies and specialist educational interventions have spiraled in terms of their application in the lives of disabled people. Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability, Journal of Learning Disabilities and Offending Behaviour all have published papers that seek to understand, rehabilitate and cure the flawed and impaired individual. A recurring theme within all these publications is a common functionalist trope: the disabled subject that inevitably exhibits challenging behaviour often manifesting itself through violence. Indeed, one could view our accounts presented above as evidence for the hostile and handicapped disabled subject.

### Competitiveness

#### Their preference for competitive, economically productive subjects is rooted in ableist assumptions which reinforce all other forms of oppression

Wolbring, University of Calgary, Assistant Professor Program in Community Rehabilitation and Disability Studies, 10

(Gregor, Asst Prof @ UCalgary, Faculty of Medicine, Dept. of Community Health Sciences, Program in Community Rehabilitation and Disability Studies, Dilemata, No 3, “Human Enhancement through the Ableism Lens”, <http://www.dilemata.net/revista/index.php/dilemata/article/viewArticle/31/46> Accessed: 2/24/11 GAL)

Ableism

1. Ableism is a concept used by the disabled people community and further expanded on by you. What is the contribution of this concept to the enhancement controversy?

The term ableism evolved from the civil rights movements in the United States and Britain during the 1960s and 1970s to question and highlight the prejudice and discrimination people experienced whose body structure and ability functioning was labelled as ‘impaired’ as sub species-typical. Ableism of this flavour was defined as a set of beliefs, processes and practices that favours species-typical normative body structure based abilities and labels sub-normative species-typical biological structures as deficient, as not able to perform as required, as being in need of fixing. The disabled people rights discourse and scholars of the academic field of disability studies (for a list of disability studies programs see (Steven Taylor, 2003)) questions the favouritism for normative species-typical body abilities (Carlson, 2001; Finkelstein, 1996; Mitchell & Snyder, 1997; Olyan, 2009; Rose, 2003; Schipper, 2006; Fiona A. K. Campbell, 2001; Carlson, 2001; Overboe, 2007).

The discourse around deafness and Deaf Culture (Burch, 2000; Abberley, 2003; Chimedza, 1998; Hladek, 2002; Kersting, 1997; Lane & Bahan, 1998; Sparrow, 2005) would be one example where many people expect the ability to hear and see deafness as a deficiency to be treated through medical means whereby many Deaf people do not perceive deafness as a deficiency and hearing as an essential ability. Within the disabled people rights framework ableism was set up as a term to be used like sexism and racism.

However ableism is evident far beyond the species-typical, sub species-typical dichotomy. Ableism is one of the most societal entrenched and accepted “isms” and it exists in many forms such as biological structure based ableism, cognition based ableism, ableism inherent to a given economic system, and social structure based ableism (Wolbring, 2008a). The ableism’s that expects the ability a) to generate a high GDP and be productive and efficient; b) to consume products and c) to be competitive are just three ableism’s outside of the species-typical, sub species-typical dichotomy cherished by many. The favouritism of abilities furthermore contributes to other isms such as racism, sexism, cast-ism, ageism, speciesism, anti-environmentalism and other ism’s (Wolbring, 2008f).

# 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.

### 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.’

### 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).

### Violence

#### 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.

### Quality of Life

#### Community access k2 quality of life

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. 6-7 accessed 7-8-12](http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook%20pg.%206-7%20accessed%207-8-12) BC)

Think about the community of people in your life. What if you unexpectedly became ill, or were in a car accident that required months of recovery? Not being able to participate in your community and having to unexpectedly change your daily routine can have a detrimental impact on your life, because some form of loss has occurred. We imagine that your community would surround you in difficult times, but there is much more involved in the big picture of life when a disability is involved. The roles you have as a mother, father, child, sibling, professional, etc. will often change. Transitioning from a hospital setting back into home as you know it can be challenging, because your definition of “normal” has changed, perhaps dramatically. Getting back into the real world (jobs, school, leisure activities) is even more difficult if independence with everyday tasks (e.g., getting dressed, showering, etc.) is compromised.

 Maybe you’re in the baby boomer generation, of which 10,000 of you are turning 65 every day. You want to be involved in as much as you can, for as long as you can, right? Age happens, and when the effects of age suddenly makes you realize that it might be unsafe or that there is a possibility of running into unforeseen situations when you venture outside of your home, it’s easy to give up.

 We don’t want anyone to be afraid to take part in what brings them the most joy because the design of the community – or how the community functions – might not be welcoming to various needs. This decreases one’s ability to be involved with all sorts of things, and ultimately decreases independence and quality of life.

#### Community access critical to quality of life

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. 25-26 accessed 7-8-12](http://universaldesign.org/universal-design-simplified-ebook%20pg.%2025-26%20accessed%207-8-12) BC)

So why should any of this matter to you? Our lives would not be as satisfying if we weren’t able to go to our favorite bookstore, coffee shop, cute boutiques, get to school or jobs, or spend evenings out with friends. If we were afraid to go places independently, we would just stay at home – or continually need to ask for assistance – because it is easier and/or safer, but not necessarily ideal by any means.

Alert!

If someone doesn’t feel comfortable leaving home, it creates an entirely new set of problems on top of what may already be going on physically or mentally. This includes someone’s social circle shrinking, possibility of depression increasing, and meaningful relationships reducing in number. Communities that are welcoming to many different types of people will increase everyone’s quality of life, and ultimately increase independence for those who struggle with it.

And that’s worth the effort.

It feels good to be welcome. It feels good to be accepted, thought about, and cared for. That’s what makes life more enjoyable.

# Alternative Extensions

### Alt Solves

#### 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.

### Re-examine epistemology of Ableism

#### 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.

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."

### Life Writing

#### 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).

# No Alternative Extensions

#### Our arg 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, but instead vote to refuse the able-normative assumptions of the 1ac

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.

# 2NC Answers To

### AT: Representing Other 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: Postcoloniality Counter K

#### No specific link to claims we have made – this is not exclusive with our alt

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.

## Permutations

### Alternative is a Prior Question

#### The permutation can’t solve, theorizing ableism is a prior question to the formation of the 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)

### AT: Perm – Plan and K in Other Instances

#### Both the politics of mobility and the broader hegemonic normativity need to be combated

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. 1652-1653 accessed 7-6-12 BC)

Law (1999, page 583) suggests that an excavation of the ``practices and meanings related to mobility should not detract us from the politics of mobility''. For disabled people, a politics of mobility is, however, not divisible from broader challenges to, and reformulations of, the hegemonic values and practices of a society which, as Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 609) note, serves to maintain a hierarchy of identities. Such hierarchies essentialise conceptions of disability (as impairment of a particular type), with the effect that the complexities of disabled people's corporeality and experiences (of mobility and movement) are rarely described, acknowledged, nor understood (see, for example, Corker, 1998; 1999; Gleeson, 1999; Hine, 1999; Hine and Mitchell, 2001; Imrie, 1996; 2000b). Not surprisingly, as some respondents intimated, the shifting, indeterminate, and incoherent corporealities of disability are often at odds with the static categories and practices of, for example, producers and providers of transportation services.

## Framework

#### Conceptions of liberal politics 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).

### AT: Topic Education

#### 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.

### AT: Cede the Political

#### Our arg 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.

# Aff Answers

### Framework

#### It is important to analyze ableism from a policy perspective

Watson, The Pew State Policy Initiatives Senior Officer, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, Policy Studies Journal, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” vol. 21(4), Chadwyk Periodicals Archive Online, p. 720, bs)

Disability policy encompasses public policies that affect people with disabilities, either alone or in combination with other groups. As explored in David Pfeiffer's paper in this part, examples of these policies include those governing special education; civil rights statutes; accessible transportation, housing, and public facilities; publicly-funded rehabilitation services; and benefit programs for people with disabilities (such as Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicaid). As evidenced by this list, disability policy when considered in this manner is extraordinarily broad. We ordinarily think of better-known areas of public policy, such as defense or environmental issues, as more diffuse. But all federal agencies must consider disability issues in terms of their own workforce; especially since the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, most federal agencies must also consider it in terms of their substantive work. Most state and local agencies are in the same position. Disability scholars have written analyses of disability issues and programs for centuries—starting with medical practitioners and then gradually adding charitable reformers in the 1800s and rehabilitation experts in the early 1900s. In the 1970s the community of people interested in and affected by disability was transformed by the disability rights movement, whose leaders demanded equal access to all aspects of American society as a basic civil right. Since the movement began, the number and variety of people writing about disability policies has increased substantially. Sociologists are arguing about whether disabled people form their own culture; media experts debate the images of people with disabilities in books, movies, newspaper stories, advertisements, and television shows; historians arc writing about the lives and impact of important people with disabilities; a very few economists arc analyzing the economic incentives of public benefit programs; and advocates are constantly writing critiques of various policies from the perspective of consumers with disabilities.

### No Link

#### Traditional medical discourses of disability are useful in raising awareness and recovering from loss

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Given that the history of colonialism (and its post/neocolonial aftermath) is indeed a history of mass disablement, and that the acquisition of disability may be tied into wider patterns of dispossession—the loss of family, home, land, community, employment—there is a pressing need, as we see it, to resist the too-easy censure of narratives that construct disability as loss. We would caution especially against the blanket rejection and/or critique of medical discourse and medicalized terminology, which may be strategically important when campaigning for resources and raising awareness of (neo)colonial abuses. What individuals in such circumstances experience as loss should not be rendered an invalid response by arguments that fail to recognize the wider contexts and material environments in which disablement occurs.

### Perm

#### Permutation solves

Ho, The College of St. Catherine, Assistant professor of philosophy, 5

(Anita, and a cocoordinator of the Center for Women, Economic Justice and Public Policy, “Mainstreaming Disability: A Case in Bioethics,” 2005, <http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf>, Page 21-22, Date Accessed: 7/7, JS)

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. 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 6 mainstreaming disability “traditional topics” with “disability topics.” Instead, the strategy is to examine or incorporate the disability perspective in these “traditional” topics.

#### **Disability studies & public policy must engage**

Watson, Center for Study of Social Policy Senior Associate, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” Policy Studies Journal, vol. 21(4), p. 721-722, bs)

Looking at the relationship between disability and public policy the other way, the public policy field has viewed disability policies in the same way as it viewed environmental policies in the 1950s and early 1960s, before societal awareness changed: as narrow, technical decisions made by scientific experts about a population of limited importance and impact. To use the ADA example again, the passage of the ADA represents a remarkable political saga, but despite this rich potential for research, mainstream public policy analysts are not familiar with disability politics and so are not aware of the lessons to be learned. A very few well-known public policy experts or scholars have taken up disability policies as a major field of study and have conducted incisive analyses of the wisdom or folly of individual disability programs. However, for disability policy to achieve a level of true significance, the work must go beyond analyzing individual programs to examine what decisions in disability policy say about public policies towards other groups or in other subject areas. Because of this separation between people knowledgeable about disability issues and those knowledgeable about public policy theory, the field of public policy has missed the incredibly rich and varied lessons that decisions in disability policy can teach. And the field of disability policy has missed the benefit of experiences learned in other programs.

#### As long as ableism is separated from public policy analysis, there’s no chance of full solvency

Watson, The Pew State Policy Initiatives Senior Officer, 93

(Sara D., Winter 1993, Policy Studies Journal, “Introduction: Disability Policy as an Emerging Field of Mainstream Public Policy Research and Pedagogy,” vol. 21(4), Chadwyk Periodicals Archive Online, p. 722, bs)

Because of this separation between people knowledgeable about disability issues and those knowledgeable about public policy theory, the field of public policy has missed the incredibly rich and varied lessons that decisions in disability policy can teach. And the field of disability policy has missed the benefit of experiences learned in other programs. The quandaries faced by people designing disability programs or mobilizing the disability constituency are not unique. For example, the voucher concept so controversial in education is also being considered for the publicly-funded rehabilitation system. While the underlying rationale is the same—the public system does not meet everyone's needs and there is curiosity about whether a private, market-driven system would produce better results—other circumstances put a different slant on the debate. As another example, the debate over whether immigrant children should be taught only in English is in some ways similar to the debate over whether deaf children should be taught sign language, oral speech, or some combination of the two. In both situations, a key question is whether the minority population should be forced to learn the language of the majority, or whether the majority should be expected to accommodate the needs of the minority. Other examples explored in this two-part symposium include the following: Jean Campbell (in the second part) explores the unintended consequences of public policy. In this case, her subject is people with mental illnesses under the ADA, but the lessons could apply to a variety of situations. Jean Flatley McGuire (in the second pan) explores an issue familiar to many involved in social movement politics: holding together a diverse coalition in order to pass controversial legislation. In an article that challenges conventional wisdom on media and public policy, Joseph Shapiro (in the second part) talks about the disability movement's disdain for media coverage as a tool for achieving their goals. Interestingly, this strategy bears some similarity to the new media strategy demonstrated in the 1992 presidential election. Issues of resource allocation and consumer control all have permeated past programs, particularly in the welfare system. Margaret Nosek and Carol How land's paper in this part illustrates this question for the personal assistance services program. All the issues relevant to other minority populations in the United States are relevant for people with disabilities; for example, the rise and progress of the civil rights movement. Recognizing the problems faced by older civil rights movements and applicable public programs can help the disability movement avoid them. My paper in this pan explores the similarities between the women's movement and the disability movement and examines how they illustrate the new policymaking philosophy of the Clinton administration. As Frank Bowe points out in this pan, telecommunications policy for people with disabilities illustrates the constant question in public policy of user fees—should a party using a service bear the extra cost, or should it be distributed among a larger group? The next step in the evolution of disability policy must be a conscious cross-fertilization among disability scholars and public policy experts; to that end, we include wonderfully specific papers by Gerben DeJong and Daniel M Fox (both in the second part) on building this capacity. This cursory description illustrates the vast potential of this field to inform other public policy debates, and vice-versa. It is our hope that the papers in this symposium will be used not only in research and curriculum on disability policy, but also in research and pedagogy that explore the larger issues in the public policy discipline.

### Alt Can’t Solve

#### The social model of “disability” and persons with disadvantages have no political implications

Samaha, Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, 7

(Adam M. “What is the Social Model of Disability?” The University of Chicago Law Review, Volume: 74, No. 4, Fall 2007, P. 2, LPS)

A social model of disability relates a person's disadvantage to the combination of personal traits and social setting. The model appears to have had a profound impact on academics, politics, and law since the 1970s. Scholars have debated the model's force but its limitations are more severe than have been recognized. This Article claims that the model, like all social construction accounts, has essentially no policy implications. Its impact depends on normative commitments developed by some other logic, such as membership in the disability rights movement or adherence to versions of libertarian, utilitarian, or egalitarian theory that are triggered by the model's causation story. At the same time, a normative framework within which the social model is relevant may suggest not only policy goals but an institutional design. These points are illustrated by recent controversies involving genetic screening, cochlear implants, and sign language communities. Contrary to impressions left in the law literature, the social model has nothing to say about the proper response to such developments, although the model might have a mediated influence on our sense of the best decisionmakers.

#### There is no connection between the social model of “disability” and social change

Samaha, Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, 7

(Adam M. “What is the Social Model of Disability?” The University of Chicago Law Review, Volume: 74, No. 4, Fall 2007, P. 23 LPS).

The simplicity of the social model helps account for its jarring effect on any conventional wisdom that portrays disability as a personal tragedy. Indeed the model has been credited with inspiring change in many forms. Parts of the Americans with Disabilities Act3 (ADA) in dicate that social settings must be revised to make individual traits less disabling. Reasonable accommodation for employees is an example,4 as is the qualified duty to make certain places accessible to mobility impaired people.5 A federal district court recently used similar principles to hold that U.S. paper currency violates the Rehabilitation Act.6 The complaint is that our denominations, unlike many foreign bills which vary in size and texture, are not readily distinguishable to blind people.7 In the same basic spirit, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in December 2006. The Convention stresses the "importance of accessibility to the physical, social, economic and cultural environment ... in enabling persons with disabilities to fully enjoy all human rights and fundamental freedoms."8 Academics have indicated that the social model is a normative basis for such measures.9 Despite the apparent connection between the social model and social change, there just is no necessary relationship there. That is the central claim of this Article. Although the social model is one way to define disability and a field of inquiry, it is not a disability policy. It is unclear whether plaintiffs will settle for expedited development of new portable electronic bill-reading devices. 8

### Representing Others Turn

#### Speaking is inevitably trapped within one’s own conception of universal truth. Claiming to represent others in suggesting prescriptive actions merely continues domination through upholding existing systems of power. Only allowing local action can solve.

Hendricks, British Columbia Professor, 2K

(U of British Columbia, “Foucault’s Prophecy: The Intellectual as Exile,” <http://www.manitowoc.uwc.edu/staff/awhite/christ00.htm>, Date Accessed: 7/13, JS)

As “agents” of the régime of truth, intellectuals can easily speak as if, and be received as if, they are providing others with universal, timeless truths. This is problematic, according to Foucault, because rather than being the absolutes they are said to be, claims to universal truth are contingent and historically developed. By speaking as if s/he has access to universal truths, therefore, the intellectual contributes to a system wherein contingent notions are treated as if they are necessary and unchanging. Foucault argues that those claims and knowledges that have come to have the status of universal or “scientific” truth, have achieved that status at least partly through power struggles, through tactics of coercion whereby competing claims and knowledges are “filter[ed], hierarchise[d] and order[ed] . . . in the name of some true knowledge and some arbitrary idea of what constitutes a science and its objects” (Foucault 1980d, 83). By speaking truths as if they were universal and timeless, the intellectual tends to support the continuing domination through power of “some arbitrary idea of what constitutes a science.” Foucault criticizes such intellectual activity, arguing that it works to “contribute to the functioning of a determinate system of power that . . . must be criticized” (Foucault 1991, 157).[http://www.uwmanitowoc.uwc.edu/staff/awhite/christ00.htm - \_ftn6](http://www.uwmanitowoc.uwc.edu/staff/awhite/christ00.htm#_ftn6) Another problem with the universal intellectual prophet is that s/he may use his/her authority as an “agent” of the régime of truth to compel others to work against it (e.g., by telling them that “true goodness and justice” requires that they engage in resistance against particular practices of power). Foucault criticizes such intellectual prescriptions, due to both practical and ethical concerns. First, the universal intellectual’s suggested tactics for resistance may not be as effective as those devised by the individuals who are directly involved in particular struggles. Foucault contends that relations of power are multiple and heterogeneous, and work differently at different locales; and therefore resistances to power are most effective if they address it on a local, specific level (Foucault 1980d, 99; 1990, 95-96). The intellectual who makes universal, global pronouncements as to what must be done to resist relations of power within the régime of truth may therefore be offering ineffective advice: “global, totalitarian theories” have a “hindering effect” on “the efficacy of discontinuous, particular and local criticism” (Foucault 1980d, 80). There are also ethical worries lying behind Foucault’s injunction against intellectual prophecy and prescription. One of these is expressed by Gilles Deleuze in a published conversation with Foucault entitled “Intellectuals and Power.” Addressing Foucault, Deleuze states: “In my opinion you were the first . . . to teach us something absolutely fundamental: the indignity of speaking for others” (Foucault 1977a, 209). It seems that for Foucault and Deleuze, in the act of speaking for others there is something ethically problematic, as if those others were not to be given the responsibility (and dignity) of speaking and acting for themselves. Foucault himself expresses a somewhat different ethical concern in an interview: “[I dream of the intellectual who] contributes to the raising of the question of knowing whether the revolution is worth it . . . it being understood that they alone who are willing to risk their lives to bring it about can answer the question” (Foucault 1996d, 225). Foucault’s tone here suggests that the prophesying intellectual could send out calls to action that impact others in dangerous and perhaps even life-threatening ways; and the decision as to whether or not to act and how must, therefore, be left to those who will be carrying out resistance.

#### The k is a perfect erasure of the other; they craft an image of the other in terms of their own systems of knowledge. This image inevitably overwhelms the other and denies them any sort of individual subjectivity.

Alcoff, Syracuse Philosopher Professor, 95

(Linda, Professor of Philosophy, Women's Studies and Political Science @ Syracuse University, “The Problem of Speaking for Others,” http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html. JS)

This is partly the case because of what has been called the "crisis of representation." For in both the practice of speaking for as well as the practice of speaking about others, I am engaging in the act of representing the other's needs, goals, situation, and in fact, who they are, based on my own situated interpretation. In post-structuralist terms, I am participating in the construction of their subject-positions rather than simply discovering their true selves. Once we pose it as a problem of representation, we see that, not only are speaking for and speaking about analytically close, so too are the practices of speaking for others and speaking for myself. For, in speaking for myself, I am also representing my self in a certain way, as occupying a specific subject-position, having certain characteristics and not others, and so on. In speaking for myself, I (momentarily) create my self---just as much as when I speak for others I create them as a public, discursive self, a self which is more unified than any subjective experience can support. And this public self will in most cases have an effect on the self experienced as interiority. The point here is that the problem of representation underlies all cases of speaking for, whether I am speaking for myself or for others. This is not to suggest that all representations are fictions: they have very real material effects, as well as material origins, but they are always mediated in complex ways by discourse, power, and location. However, the problem of speaking for others is more specific than the problem of representation generally, and requires its own particular analysis. There is one final point I want to make before we can pursue this analysis. The way I have articulated this problem may imply that individuals make conscious choices about their discursive practice free of ideology and the constraints of material reality. This is not what I wish to imply. The problem of speaking for others is a social one, the options available to us are socially constructed, and the practices we engage in cannot be understood as simply the results of autonomous individual choice. Yet to replace both "I" and "we" with a passive voice that erases agency results in an erasure of responsibility and accountability for one's speech, an erasure I would strenuously argue against (there is too little responsibility-taking already in Western practice!). When we sit down to write, or get up to speak, we experience ourselves as making choices. We may experience hesitation from fear of being criticized or from fear of exacerbating a problem we would like to remedy, or we may experience a resolve to speak despite existing obstacles, but in many cases we experience having the possibility to speak or not to speak. On the one hand, a theory which explains this experience as involving autonomous choices free of material structures would be false and ideological, but on the other hand, if we do not acknowledge the activity of choice and the experience of individual doubt, we are denying a reality of our experiential lives.[9](http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html#footnote9)

### Compassion Turn

#### **Accepting Difference does the exact opposite**

Roberts, Baylor University, Masters thesis in Communication, 7

(Jeff, *The Rhetorical Structure of Disability: Bridging the Gap Between What is ‘Spoken’ and What is ‘Said’ with Song - Over-Signifying with Personhood Against the Backdrop of Disease-Centric Discourse,* [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff\_Roberts\_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx07R2Oqb2EBg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff_Roberts_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx) , Pg. 6-7, FFF)

Just as disease-centric discourse creates these attitudes, imageries and actions rooted in notions of viral difference and hatred, it seems that any action towards people with disabilities conveyed in disease-centric discourse is premised on a notion of viral difference. Viral difference manifests itself not only in the actions and attitudes stemming from disease-centric discourse, but also in the rhetorical structure of diseasecentric discourse itself and its general deployment. Actions which place a primacy on difference and its domestication in the acts of “acceptance of difference” are often justified as acts of “compassion,” yet acts premised on such notions can never truly overcome difference, nor can they recognize and appreciate the alterity of the other necessary for ethical encounters. Deployment of disease-centric discourse represents and independent rhetorical act which, in the words of Emmanuel Levinas, “thematizes” disability as difference allowing difference to obscure alterity and unique otherness by “standing in” for the individual subject in all encounters. In other words, difference in terms of disability subsumes the entirety of the person by reducing the individual to a mere condition of difference, as Lois Shepherd (2006) explains:

On the other hand, however, focusing on the condition carries the risk of what Levinas calls "thematization." If the condition stands in for the person in evoking the right ethical response, i.e., compassion, then the condition may stand in for the person in other respects as well. In other words, the condition is the person, and thus we need to know nothing more about the person than the existence of the condition . . .

A compassionate response that focuses on the condition of a person in a way that permits us to see her in terms of a theme can result in unfair prejudice and discrimination. Even when less noxious results follow, such a response inappropriately shortcuts the more intense inquiry that is required to determine the needs and desires of that individual and can prevent the ethical response that is due . . .

. . . A compassionate response that thematizes a person as disabled can cause an underestimation of what that person can achieve and can thereby cut off opportunities for success, expression, respect, and self-worth. It can also result in alienation of people with disabilities as others cannot see beyond the apparent physical condition. The emphasis that advocates for people with disabilities place on language captures this concern that the focus of attention is properly placed on the person rather than the condition; advocates encourage the use of terms such as "person with a disability" rather than "the disabled person" so that the person comes first. (para.8.)

#### **Acceptance of difference dooms the struggle for equality**

Roberts, Baylor University, Masters thesis in Communication, 7

(Jeff, *The Rhetorical Structure of Disability: Bridging the Gap Between What is ‘Spoken’ and What is ‘Said’ with Song - Over-Signifying with Personhood Against the Backdrop of Disease-Centric Discourse,* [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff\_Roberts\_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx07R2Oqb2EBg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=37&ved=0CGkQFjAGOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbeardocs.baylor.edu%2Fxmlui%2Fbitstream%2Fhandle%2F2104%2F5086%2FJeff_Roberts_Masters.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ei=hUL3T52RN4SlrQH1j6iLCQ&usg=AFQjCNHd4PB3kECHEjVxxEx) , Pg.7-8, FFF)

Founding action towards people with disabilities upon notions of difference, placing a primacy on difference particularly in the context of incorporation, domestication, and acceptance of such difference, dooms the struggle for equality to failure. “Over recent centuries all forms of violent otherness have been incorporated, willingly or under threat of force, into a discourse of difference which simultaneously implies inclusion and exclusion, recognition and discrimination (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 129).” Once the Native American “savage” became “accepted” under U.S. law as “human,” or rather a different type of human, it was not long until viral hatred forced new boundaries of difference to be erected, and segregation of such difference to be enacted in the form of the reservation. Where the “savage” or “monster” is never understood, or assimilated, remaining radically exotic to the oppressive guise of society, when “accepted” by society on the basis of “difference” viral racism allows only two options for the future: assimilation or extermination (Baudrillard, 1993). Similarly, modern medicine has facilitated society with an understanding of disability, allowing it to accept the “different” or “disabled” person under law as “human,” more specifically a “disabled human” in which is different from “normal” individuals, but none the less similar. “Madness, once its exclusionary status had been revoked, was caught up in the far subtler toils of psychology (Baudrillard, 1993, p. 129).” As soon as society began to understand and consequently attempt to “accept” the “monster” other, the other traded its quality of foreign “monsterness” for qualities of “feebleness,” with the social acceptance of the others difference, the “monster” soon became the “mongoloid.” “Difference” annihilated the subaltern subject by making all that was foreign and radically exotic within easy reach of societal understanding. With a compassion rooted in pity, and fear founded upon difference, society became locked into a mode of interaction with disability, and the individuals’ disability located itself within, which mandated oppression in the spirit of viral hatred.

### Postcoloniality Counter K

#### Westernized interpretations of Disability fail turns case – we must start from a postcolonial kritik of disability analysis

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Instead of imposing a hegemonic model of disability, then, and assuming that disability will function in comparable ways across disparate cultural texts and contexts, contemporary materialist postcolonial criticism gives us the tools to take particular, situated experiences as the starting point for disability analysis, enabling acts of criticism emerging from and informed by (rather than applied to) 'cultural locatedness' in the first instance. Christian Flaugh's article in this issue, for example, traces disability's role within the writings of Negritude, which necessarily involves attending to the details of linguistic and cultural difference inherent in the francophone Caribbean. In endorsing this method we echo the anthropologists Benedicte Ingstad and Susan Reynolds Whyte who, in Disability in Local and Global Worlds ([2007](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b29), reviewed in this issue), seek to orientate disability research "in the direction of greater differentiation and specificity" (5) instead of the pursuit of overarching disability models. "We are interested in people's own experiences of what is disabling in their world rather than in some universal definition" (11), they write—a sentiment that resonates with the increasing emphasis on lived experience in the humanities-based scholarship of Siebers and Snyder and Mitchell. A focus on situated experience, then, forms the impetus of the articles in this special issue, which contribute to the globalization of Disability Studies precisely through their understandings of specific localities.

#### Narratives of postcolonial disability reorient understanding of disability

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

It is clear to both of us that there are significant questions at stake when considering the multiple forces that come together when we talk of disabling postcolonialism. The temptation to conceive of and express colonial processes and their consequences—postcolonial resistance, anti-colonial nationalism, the development of independent states—using metaphors of disability is all too obvious. The idea that both disability and postcolonialism are, at heart, connected to questions of power is, of course, not misplaced. But it is an error to subscribe to a reading of such notions that thinks predominantly of the power relations involved here in terms of easy models of health, illness, absence, loss, pathology, charity or victimhood, to name just the most recognizable of such categories. As all the contributions to this issue show, these assumptions and tropes haunt the discussion of disability in postcolonial contexts, but as they also show, the details within representations and narratives of postcolonial disability reorient, in a fundamental fashion, our understanding of such disability.

### Postcoloniality Link Booster

#### The K is not globally universifiable

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Disability scholarship that has considered the value of a revisionist global dimension has often asserted the potential of such work in terms of enquiries and questions. "What do we talk about when we talk about global bodies?" asks Robert McRuer in the Epilogue to Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability ([2006](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b10)). His answer, in part, is to recognize that such talk involves movement beyond Euro-American subjects and methods, that the process of globalizing disability might mark a move toward the "extension or completion" of the project that seeks the widest possible integration of disabled lives and experiences into majority cultures (201). At the same time, however, McRuer notes that this kind of thinking creates an idea of global bodies that "also comes with its dangers," observing that "[w]hen a field covers a larger terrain and purports to be about everything . . . there is always the danger that trumping, transcending, and even colonizing will displace the more urgent work—especially urgent in these times—of coalition" (201-202), a point equally true of Postcolonial Studies of course. Overall, McRuer's ruminations on what the global nature of Disability Studies might be open up a number of highly suggestive avenues—a further complication of cosmopolitanism and global neoliberal institutions, an idea of "disposable domesticity" (203)—that invite future work. His intervention in Crip Theory, though, is still best seen in terms of such an invitation, an acknowledgement that more needs to be done.

The same could be said of the cultural model of disability more generally, particularly as it is expressed in the formative work of Sharon Snyder and David Mitchell. In their Cultural Locations of Disability ([2006](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b26)), the very idea of 'location' is one with obvious appeal to a postcolonial scholarship aiming to highlight specific located examples of disability in cultural contexts, whether that is within colonial processes of classification or post-independence renegotiations of citizenship. When Snyder and Mitchell claim that "[t]he definition of disability must incorporate both the outer and inner reaches of culture and experience as a combination of profoundly social and biological forces," we see—in the space given here to "culture and experience"—the promise of a productive model allowing for the cultural difference of postcolonial disability to find its expression (7). Yet, for all of the attractiveness of the shape of the thinking here, the work which might go on in any global cultural location of disability remains something gestured towards, and "cultural locations" appears more as a phrase than an actual paradigm. The conclusion to Cultural Locations of Disability moves towards thinking through the issues of the location of Disability Studies [End Page 224] as a subject (its final mini-chapters are on the institutionalization of Disability Studies and the development of research practices, 194-203) and, while we find such a focus useful, it does not embrace the full potential that the term "cultural locations" might suggest.

### Postcoloniality Ext. - K Alt Fails

#### Disability must be culturally defined - westernized interpretations limit understanding

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

A vital step toward such analysis is the recognition that key Disability Studies concepts, including minority identity, normalcy, and the relationship between impairment and disability, are contingent on cultural difference and may be challenged by situated critical reading practices. In a variety of postcolonial contexts, culturally specific beliefs about embodiment, ontology, communal identity and belonging continue to shape disability experiences. For example, [End Page 228] many indigenous communities do not identify with individualist models of impairment; in some American Indian cultures, for instance, "[t]he determination of 'normalcy' in health or wellness is dependent on whether or not the individual is in balance with all her relations" (Lovern), including a balance with the natural world. For Maori in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the individuality of impairment is similarly downplayed; "health is viewed as an interrelated phenomenon rather than an intra-personal one," meaning that "Maori are more likely to link good or bad health with interpersonal and inter-generational concerns" ([Durie, 71, 2](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b7)). The presence of indigenous or local 'cultural models' of health and disability demonstrates that drawing generalized conclusions about the ways in which postcolonial cultures experience disability cannot account for either the ontological or the material conditions which are formative in constructing disabled lives.

#### Disability studies need to diversify from the dominant postcolonial narrative

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

Sinha's deliberately provocative construction of his protagonist using animalistic analogies points to another challenge generated by postcolonial disability writing: the need to diversify the terms of our formal analysis. The exposure, problematization, dismantling and deconstruction of oppressive representational practices—and metaphor in particular—remains an incredibly powerful tool within humanities-based disability research, but in thinking about metaphor, we agree with Amy Vidali's suggestions that criticism should "[refrain] from policing metaphor" and instead "[invite] creative and historic reinterpretations" (34) of figurative language. This process surely has to include the varying cultural inflections that attach meaning and resonance to impairment, as is evident in Rachel Gorman and Onyinyechukwu Udegbe's discussion of (neo) colonial violence in recent African fiction in their article here.

While disability is frequently used, problematically, as a metaphor for the 'damaged' or abject postcolonial body politic, there are many semantic permutations to disability representation. Disability metaphors may be meaningful not just as "crutch[es]" ([Mitchell and Snyder, 49](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b12)) in the telling of some 'other' tale of postcolonial experience, but as part of foundational cultural and historical disability narratives; the depiction of scars in narrative accounts of slavery is [End Page 233] just one conspicuous example of this. The situated reading practices we are proposing aim to highlight how particular disability experiences can shape cultural histories and are written into artistic and representational practices. Centrally, this involves consideration of what analogies might signify to the (disabled/postcolonial) community they represent and how they function within a particular literary form and cultural logic, rather than the wholesale dismissal of metaphor as damaging, ableist or stigmatizing. Ralph Savarese's identification of 'postcolonial neurology' in his article here is provocative evidence of how creative cross-fertilizations between disability and postcolonial metaphors can service the most radical disability agendas. The idea of the 'postcolonial brain', with its challenge to the assumptions that come with the terms postcolonialism or neurology, is, we feel, exactly the kind of productive criticism that can come when postcolonial and disability thinking are allowed to meet with an openness toward their possible interactions.

It is this sense of the radical and possible that draws us back to Edward Said and ideas of democracy and 'participatory citizenship'. For Said, near the end of his own life and still pursuing the need for a radical engagement with culture, participation meant both the production of criticism and the possibility of democratic agency. "Critique," he wrote, "is always restlessly self-clarifying in search of freedom, enlightenment and more agency, and certainly not their opposites." Working within such terms, he observed, "means situating critique . . . as a form of democratic freedom and as a continuous practice of questioning and accumulating knowledge" (Humanism and Democratic Criticism, 73, 74). Such statements, we feel, help us to understand that the knowledge we seek to bring to bear on thinking about postcolonial disability requires the scrutiny of such "continuous questioning" if it is to be of benefit. And they also remind us that, in the widest possible sense, 'participation' allows for the formation of a full and inclusive idea of citizenship, one radical and yet everyday in its appreciation of the real value of disabled lives.

#### Post-Colonial Non Euro-American Critic provides a better metaphor for combatting expression

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

But, useful as they are, guiding frames still need specifics, and for all that the force of Said's thinking might inspire ideas about the connections between disability and the postcolonial, it is clear that his valorization of humanism will not work across the huge variety of global contexts in which disability is a social and cultural experience. These problems highlight once again the limits of grand theorizing that have bedevilled Postcolonial Studies since the 1980s and doubtless will shadow the attempted development of Disability Studies as the subject seeks to expand beyond its traditional Euro-American base. Mark Sherry has warned of the dangers of abusing the "rhetorical connections" that exist between disability and postcolonialism. "Neither disability nor postcolonialism," Sherry writes, "should be understood as simply a metaphor for the other experience; nor should they be rhetorically employed as a symbol of the oppression involved in a completely different experience" (94). Following on from this, those practitioners of disability scholarship who have sought to place disability within a global or postcolonial context, or have used the languages of identity politics in a manner common to much postcolonial writing, have often struggled with their accounts of the differing kinds of 'experiences' that Sherry highlights here.

#### Social application of local aspects of disability key to understanding

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

The majority of disability scholarship has emerged from traditions that emphasize local aspects of social application. In Europe and the U.K. especially, such work has stressed the processes of law and governance, with a resulting focus on such issues as community-based social services. In the U.S., where a discourse- and humanities-based model has played a greater part in the development of Disability Studies, it has nevertheless been the case that American examples have predominated. In both instances, there has been an understanding that such models may well have application in non-Euro-American contexts (claims for the social model, for example, assert that it can adapt to the local variants of other cultures), but there has been a singular lack of specificity as to the detail of such applications, especially as they might take into account the nature of cultures shaped by colonization and its consequences. It is this question of applicability that concerns us in this special issue. In aiming to develop strategies for postcolonial disability analysis, we aspire toward future scholarship in which the nuanced methods we find in much Euro-American-focused disability criticism are replicated in work on global disability.

#### Narratives of postcolonial disability reorient understanding of disability

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

It is clear to both of us that there are significant questions at stake when considering the multiple forces that come together when we talk of disabling postcolonialism. The temptation to conceive of and express colonial processes and their consequences—postcolonial resistance, anti-colonial nationalism, the development of independent states—using metaphors of disability is all too obvious. The idea that both disability and postcolonialism are, at heart, connected to questions of power is, of course, not misplaced. But it is an error to subscribe to a reading of such notions that thinks predominantly of the power relations involved here in terms of easy models of health, illness, absence, loss, pathology, charity or victimhood, to name just the most recognizable of such categories. As all the contributions to this issue show, these assumptions and tropes haunt the discussion of disability in postcolonial contexts, but as they also show, the details within representations and narratives of postcolonial disability reorient, in a fundamental fashion, our understanding of such disability.

#### Analysis not rooted in Euro-American Disability studies are key – comparative cultural perspective key

Barker & Murray, English Professors University of Birmingham, University of Leeds 10

[Clare Barker, Stuart Murray, Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies Volume 4, Number 3, 2010 “Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism,” accessed 7-13-12 BC]

We feel it is time to move beyond the gesturing toward a future in which non-Euro-American disability stories, of all kinds, might be understood. We believe that the detailed analyses contained within the articles in this issue correct the conditional frame of such gestures. Furthermore, to return to McRuer's question, we can start to think through what is involved in a concentration on "global bodies." In so doing, we would like this introduction to build on what we see as the one recent intervention in disability scholarship that does engage with the specifics of globalized disability, namely Michael Davidson's notion of "the work of disability in an age of globalization" (168) in Concerto for the Left Hand: Disability and the Defamiliar Body ([2008](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_literary_and_cultural_disability_studies/v004/4.3.barker.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b4)). Like other scholars, Davidson asks the pertinent questions—"[w]hat might a critical disability studies perspective bring to the globalization debate?"—but he also offers a working through of some potential answers. Noting that disability "unsettles a global panacea for health and human welfare," he asserts that it also "defamiliarizes [End Page 226] the seemingly inexorable pattern of capital movement, information exchange, and market integration by which globalization is known" (171, 169). Following this, Davidson's concentration on poverty and the distribution of wealth, and his assertion of the need "to reevaluate some of the keywords of disability studies . . . from a comparative cultural perspective" (172), gives detail (in his accounts of 'development' themes in recent film, or narratives of international organ sales and transplants, for example) to the shape of disability theorizing in global contexts.