# BFI Ableism Complete

### Strategy Notes

There are a lot of different ways to use this file. At the beginning there are some shells for potential aff’s that most likely won’t be used, but I found the cards, so it may as well be included. Next are some language links. Combine the language link, with an impact card, specifically the Seibers of Woldbring evidence and read it as a plan inclusive counterplan. There’s also a list of other ableist words to be used for the pic and non-violent replacements.

Next is an ableism kritik. This can function in a lot of different ways depending on the alt. There’s a variety of link ev, but some of the most useful are probably under education, law, neoliberalism, the state, and self sufficiency. This isn’t to say that the other link cards aren’t good, but these are the most relevant for this years topic.   
I included some uniqueness cards, which can also be used as links and impacts, these highlight the violence that disabled people face in the school system today.

The alternatives come in several different forms, the best of these is cripistemology. This is a great alternative. In doing so the negative advocates that we should reject normative practices of education and being. This means a lot of things and can operate in a lot of different ways, it means disabled students should strive to fail and reject getting good grades, embrace stimming and other things which are done to appear normal. It also means we should talk about disability in the classroom. It functions in a lot of cool ways which we will talk about more in lectures. I highly recommend you read all the cripistemology cards even the non-highlighted portions to understand this argument. Alternatives such as dwelling with disability, and cripping the classroom are also included and are similar to cripistimology but yet different.

Please never ever ever pretend to be disabled in order to get the ballot. There are specific cards about disability in debate that crip students can read specifically just for them if they would like to talk about how debate is violent towards disabled bodies. If students are interested reading disability identity arguments, I would love to talk to you. There are also a lot of great ways for able-bodied folks to read the arguments in this file and bring important discussions to this space, and by all means you should go for this argument, but some cards should be off-limits like some of the Stevens and Richter evidence.   
  
All the best,   
Wirtjo Leonard

# Shells

### Cripistemology/Failure 1NC

\*The current classroom environment forces students to hide their deviance, any expression of disability is to be put away into the closet, you must be normal. This means that the “monstrosity” of disability is ingrained within crip students in the earliest phases of socialization. To effectively hide yourself at a young age, is to be successful.

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

While placing crip/queer instructors in front of the classroom enables one kind of educational change, the evolving participation of crip/queer students in the classroom also results in critical insights heretofore only marginally realized. If the overwhelming emphasis of today’s inclusion practices rely on receiving a passing mark as synonymous with passing (i.e., approxi-mations of able-bodiedness), DSE’s anti-normative-based instruction emphasis consistently results in more students coming out as crip/queer during the semester. As Tobin Siebers explains, publically held norms of able-bodiedness require masking the disruptive visibility of disability in order to keep its shameful embodiments out of view (97). This practice proves no less common in the normatively inclusive classroom. The approximation of able-bodiedness treats crip/queer embodiments as a matter of stealth differences disguised at the core of passing’s successful performativity. In other words, mitigation of disability treats crip/queer bodies as levels of deviance to be avoided. However, in the alternative parlance of curricular cripistemologies, the avoidance of this trap requires “leaving every child behind.” Accordingly, our findings show that avoiding the myriad stigmas associated with crip/queer bodies results in less desirable educational outcomes. When students spend time leaving behind crip/queer identifiers, they also find their embodied differences further devalued. In fact, the dictates of the normative classroom draw crip/queer students into complicity with a wider social devaluation by teaching them to downplay the existence of alternative lives.

#### **Failure to pass as normal garuntees disabled students the role as a victim of violence in a pedagogical system that wasn’t meant for them. You’re allowed in because what else is the state supposed to do with you**

Perry 2015. Perry, David. "When Teachers Abuse Disabled Children – Pacific Standard." Pacific Standard. December 17, 2015. Accessed April 28, 2017. <https://psmag.com/when-teachers-abuse-disabled-children-79c600fe4e83>. (WL BFI)

Calm response to non-compliance is a necessary part of educating and caring for all children, but the importance of using positive reinforcement takes center stage in situations involving children with disabilities. Neither fear nor pain can force a child to be less disabled or to suddenly become neurotypical. Unfortunately, in many school districts and institutions, the use of restraint, seclusion, and, too often, pain and trauma, have become the default response to disabled children who don’t perfectly obey commands. American schools have become one site of a cult of compliance, a cult that penalizes disabled students most obviously, but in fact puts every child at risk. Three independent reports on restraint and abuse of disabled children — from Florida, Massachusetts, and California, respectively — happened to be released almost simultaneously at the end of last week. They join a litany of other horror stories from 2015 that detail the systematic abuse of disabled children. While the circumstances differ, they coalesce around the same pattern — a refusal to tolerate even the most banal defiance. These reports collectively reveal that too many people charged with protecting our most vulnerable students are failing to do their jobs. Our nationwide circumnavigation of abuse stories begins with ProPublica’s report, “What Happened to Adam?” about an AdvoServ school in Florida. AdvoServ is a private for-profit school serving 700 disabled children and adults in three states. Heather Vogell, author of the ProPublica report, focuses on a young autistic man named Adam. He entered the school when he was 16, and, over seven years, was regularly restrained at Carlton Palms, AdvoServ’s biggest facility. Toward the end of his tenure there, he was restrained 44 times in just two months. His behavior deteriorated and his body bore the marks of painful devices and holds, finally alerting his mother to the situation. Lawsuits have followed. Why did the staff at Carlton Palms restrain Adam so regularly? Vogell writes: “Some restraints occurred in response to what sounded like dangerous behavior…. But others hardly screamed emergency at all. One time, Adam refused to clean up Legos and ended up in mechanical restraints. He was put in them, too, for an incident that began with his smiling and throwing a toy across the room. His ankles were bound after he tossed a dinner bowl and broke it, and after he launched couch cushions across the room.” Even worse, Adam was not an anomaly. Vogell describes allegations contained within a series of lawsuits and criminal investigations, including a boy kicked in the head and choked, residents who were dragged across the floor, and one 14-year-old autistic girl who died. Her name was Paige Lunsford. She was non-verbal, bound to her bed by her hands and wrists as she vomited, day after day, until she died of dehydration in July of 2013. Denied communication devices, she couldn’t even ask for help. The Miami Herald reports that the Department of Children and Family probe of Lunsford’s death was the 140th investigation of abuse or neglect at Carlton Palms. So far, though, nothing has been done, and both ProPublica and the Herald suggest that AdvoServ’s political donations may help shield it. The company has generally donated to Democrats in New Jersey and Delaware, and to Republicans in Florida. When Wellspring Capital, a private equity firm, bought AdvoServ last month, Wellspring’s press release touted “AdvoServ’s historic accomplishments,” adding that “favorable industry dynamics present compelling opportunities to grow our business by caring for, and improving the lives of, more individuals in need.” Wellspring refused to comment on the allegations for this piece. It might be easy to focus just on AdvoServ as a bad private actor with political connections, but that would be a mistake. In Massachusetts, the abuse took place in the public school system. According to the Disability Law Center of Massachusetts, Peck School, in Holyoke, deployed dangerous prone restraints for disabled children on a near-constant basis. Prone restraints involve pressing an individual’s body to the ground, on their stomach. One adult can use body weight to hold the child down while grabbing the child’s arms and pinning them, or two adults can team up, one taking the arms and the other the legs. In all cases, prone restraint of children brings with it the risk of injury or even asphyxiation. Staff at Peck School used the technique casually, to force compliance, despite mounting injuries. Restraint in such schools is often paired with forced seclusion. One teacher placed a child in a locked closet on three occasions and turned off the lights, leading to apparent psychological trauma. Many of Peck’s students specifically struggled with post-traumatic stress disorder; this kind of violence only exacerbates such conditions, even if the use of force grants teachers and staff temporary control. Again, there’s no reason to think Peck is unique. After teachers were caught forcing disabled students into padded closets, the state of Texas recently passed a law making it mandatory for schools to videotape all interactions between staff and disabled students. Video may help with accountability, but it would be better for teachers to stop shoving their students into closets. The third report, from the Center for Public Integrity, details regular restraint, seclusion, and criminalization in the San Bernardino City Unified School District in California, including the restraint of a non-compliant 18-year-old Latino man with Down syndrome, who was subsequently arrested. This study emphasizes the rush to deposit children of color in the school-to-prison pipeline, an issue that the American Civil Liberties Union raised earlier this year as well — right now, the ACLU is helping three Kentucky families sue over the use of restraints on much younger children of color. In August, the ACLU released a video that quickly went viral. It shows a slender eight-year-old boy with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder sobbing as he’s cuffed for “not listening.” The School Resource Officer tells the sobbing boy, “You can do what we asked you to, or you can suffer the consequences.” Claudia Center, senior staff attorney of the ACLU’s Disability Rights Program says: “If you crunch the numbers from the latest data [2011–12], students with disabilities are more than 20 times as likely as students without disabilities to be subjected to physical restraint at school,” including mechanical restraints such as handcuffs and shackles. In a case of multiplying marginalization, disabled children of color are vastly more likely to be restrained than disabled white students. We saw this play out in Virginia, with the arrest of Kayleb Moon-Robinson, a 12-year-old African-American autistic boy, who was charged with felony assault in a series of incidents that began with kicking a trashcan. It shouldn’t be this way. While it’s reasonable to expect neurodiverse children and adults to learn to regulate their behavior to whatever extent is possible, punitive discipline is the worst way imaginable to achieve that goal. Barb Trader, the executive director of TASH, an advocacy organization that uses research to advocate for best practices in supporting people with significant disabilities, says that experts have long known how to support students with behavior difficulties. You don’t punish them; instead, you look beyond the incident of non-compliance for the cause. “There’s always a cause to a behavioral situation,” she says. Trader cited well-developed techniques such as “Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports” or “Trauma Informed Practices” that offer safer and more effective ways of reaching even the most challenging children.

#### These acts of violence have long lasting affects, here is the story of Caley Farinas

Farinas 2016. Farinas, Caley, and Creigh Farinas. "4 Ways Ableism in My Elementary School Left Me Completely Traumatized." Everyday Feminism. April 22, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/04/ableism-elementary-school/>. (WL BFI)

I wake up with nightmares about elementary school. I’m twenty-two years old. I’m a college graduate. I don’t live in the same city as any of the schools I attended, so I’m never forced go past my own schools or bump into my old teachers. However, the trauma I experienced from grade school was so intense that I still wake up screaming some nights. So why this pain still? You’d have nightmares, too, if you experienced the ableist violence, discrimination, targeting, and exclusion of the school system the way I and many disabled people have. Not only was the school system not set up in a way to protect me from the unregulated bias of my teachers and school administrators, but it turned its head the other way when I was treated by other children in a horrifying way. And, unfortunately, both dynamics were the norm, all the way from kindergarten to twelfth grade. I keep hoping things have changed, that it was only bad luck that put me in the path of terrible schools, and that things are far better for disabled kids now. But in truth, even though I went to pretty good schools and despite the fact that over a decade has passed since I was in elementary school, feedback I hear from disabled children and their parents indicates the effects of ableism in the schools really hasn’t changed all that much. Kids are still going through the pain, the terror, and the oppression that I went through so many years ago, and that not only terrifies me – it breaks my heart. So I’m speaking out. I’m pointing out the themes in my experience that I hear echoed in the voices of other disabled people. And I’m hoping that those who work in the schools, or advocate for school-aged children, will listen. Because my school experience is a pretty messed up story, and I never, ever want to see it repeated with anyone else. The traumas that we subject disabled students to — or fail to protect them from — leave long lasting scars. And they teach disabled kids the way they should expect to be treated by the world. The following list of completely preventable acts of ableism that fueled traumatic events I experienced as a disabled kid are some of the deepest scars I bear. I really wish I could say that this was all any disabled student faced, but it’s by no means anywhere close — especially for kids with intersecting marginalized identities and circumstances.

#### Disabled students aren’t even given a chance to learn in their own ways, Current pedagogical practices blatantly **ignore accessible learning avenues. Crip students aren’t even taught to read braille because listening to audio tapes is perceived to be slightly more normal.**

Hehir 2002. Hehir, Thomas. "Eliminating Ableism in Education." Harvard Educational Review 72, no. 1 (2002): 1-33. doi:10.17763/haer.72.1.03866528702g2105. (WL BFI)

Applied to schooling and child development, ableist preferences become particularly apparent. From an ableist perspective, the devaluation of disability results in societal attitudes that uncritically assert that it is better for a child to walk than roll, speak than sign, read print than read Braille, spell in-dependently than use a spell-check, and hang out with nondisabled kids as opposed to other disabled kids, etc. In short, in the eyes of many educators and society, it is preferable for disabled students to do things in the same manner as nondisabled kids. Certainly, given a world that has not been designed with the disabled in mind, being able to perform in a manner that is similar to that of nondis-abled children gives disabled children distinct advantages. If efficient ambu-lation is possible, a child who has received the help he needs to walk is at an advantage in a barrier-filled world. Similarly, a child with a mild hearing loss who has been given the amplification and speech therapy she needs may have little difficulty functioning in a regular classroom. However, ableist assumptions become dysfunctional when the educational and developmental services provided to disabled children focus inordinately on the characteristics of their disability to the exclusion of all else, when changing disability becomes the overriding focus of service providers and, at times, parents. Narratives of disabled people and their parents are replete with examples of how changing disability became the focus of their young lives and how such a focus denied them the opportunities taken for granted by nondisabled people. These narratives speak to the deep cultural preju-dices against disability that they had to endure from an early age — that dis-ability was negative and tragic and that “overcoming” disability was the only valued result (Ferguson & Asch, 1989; Rousso, 1984). In No Pity, his history of the disability civil rights movement, Joseph Shapiro (1994) chronicles the dominant cultural responses to disability. One model is exemplified by the poster children of the muscular dystrophy tele-thon, which he refers to as “Tiny Tims” — “the idea that disabled people are childlike, dependent, and in need of charity and pity” (p. 14). Cyndi Jones, a disability activist and former poster child, argues that “the poster child says it’s not okay to be disabled...butitsays if you just donate money the dis-abled child will go away” (p. 14). Marilynn Phillips, a professor at Morgan State University who has studied images of poster children, recalls that the image of the valiant “crippled” child on crutches learning to walk emerged in the mid-1950s. She argues that children like herself who had polio before a vaccine was developed were an affront to the postwar faith in medical tech-nology. Disabled children were now “damaged goods” who had to try harder to deserve charity and respect (p. 15). According to Shapiro (1994), the belief that disability could be overcome led to the rise of the other dominant image of disability: the inspirational dis-abled person, or the “supercrip.” Shapiro argues that this image is deeply moving to many nondisabled people and the press, but is widely regarded as oppressive to most disabled people. The extensive press coverage of a blind man who recently climbed Mt. Everest is a good example of the supercrip im-age. Cyndi Jones argues that, like the image of the poster child, this image implies that a disabled person is presumed deserving of pity — instead of re-spect — until the person proves capable of overcoming disability through ex-traordinary feats (Shapiro, 1994). Both of these dominant stereotypes of dis-ability, “Tiny Tims” and “supercrips,” have at their core ableist perspectives, the failure to accept and value disabled people as they are. I contend that negative cultural assumptions about disability continue to have a negative influence on the education of children with disabilities. The pervasiveness of ableist assumptions in the education of these children not only reinforces prevailing prejudices against disability but may very well con-tribute to low levels of educational attainment and employment. School time spent devoted to activities associated with changing disability may take away from the time needed to learn academic material. In addition, the ingrained prejudice against performing activities in ways that might be more efficient for disabled people but that are different from how nondisabled perform them, such as reading Braille or using sign language, may add to educational deficits. There is considerable emerging evidence that unquestioned ableist assumptions are handicapping disabled

#### In a world that wasn’t built for you

#### **The alternative is to fail.**

#### **To all the crip students we say**

#### **Fail to engage**

#### **Fail to be normal**

#### **Stim to your hearts content**

#### Embrace the awkward looks from those who have been taught to be machines

#### Reject the neoliberal models which tell you that you have to be X

#### Reject the neoliberal models which tell you that you have to be Y

#### Reject the neoliberal models which tell you that you have to be Z

#### Ablebodied notions of accessibility and inclusion will never be meant for you

#### Say no to eye contact

#### Say no to sitting still

#### Interrupt their normative and exclusive practices

#### You the beautiful crip, find love in yourself through your failures

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

Whereas the administrative platform of former President George W. Bush pushed for U.S. educational reforms around the promotion of standardized testing to “leave no child behind,” we, in turn, present an argument for recognizing standardization of curricula as ultimately “leaving every child behind,” or at least promoting a certain type of norm-fulfilling child in whose name most students turn up wanting. This curricular abandonment of difference in the name of assimilation occurs primarily through an incapacity (or, perhaps, unwillingness) to adapt the lessons of systemically in-built accommo-dations and crip/queer content designed to address the range of learning differences comprising today’s classroom demographics. The neoliberal school attempts to resolve the accommodation of disability through downplaying rather than drawing from people’s differences. Through the promotion of active abandonment of crip/queer differences, neoliberal standards guide educational reforms saturated in the questionable values of ableism and normalization. In order to double back on this process, practitioners of curricular cripiste-mologies undertake critical examinations of “compulsory able-bodiedness” (McRuer 31) and “compulsory able-mindedness” (Kafer 16). Thus, what appears on the surface as disabled students’ incapacity to keep up with their normative peers, turns out to be a purposeful failure to accomplish the unreal (and, perhaps, unrealizable) objectives of normalization. Within the multiplying paradoxes of neoliberal inclusionism, crip success is, paradox-ically, to fail to become normate. In The Queer Art of Failure Halberstam advocates a concept of “failure [that] allows us [crip/queer people] to escape the punishing norms that discipline behavior and manage human development with the goal of delivering us from unruly childhoods to orderly and predictable adulthoods” (3). This queer studies inversion of ways to read non-normative lives as failing standards of heteronormative expectations enables crip/queer people to pursue other modes of existence as alternates to sanctioned social roles. These alternative strategies of living pass by largely undetected because educational assessments measure only the degree to which students clear the bar of normalization. By applying this crip/queer deployment of “failure,” curricular cripistemologies undertake pedagogical practices suppressed (or, at least, devalued) by normative neoliberal educational contexts. In adopting a strategically counter-intuitive slogan such as “every student left behind,” then, the critique of inclusionism acknowledges the increasingly disciplinarian nature of public education’s normalizing objectives. Inclusion has taught teachers a dangerous lesson in what appears to be a failed model of adaptation: crip/queer students cannot effectively compete with their non-disabled peers. The pedagogical assessment of the distance that exists between crip/queer and normal students by standardized testing regimes is now part and parcel of the wider cultural abandonment of non-normativity. But what if a “failure to thrive” in pre-determined educational roles is understood as the product of active refusal (that which Halberstam refers to as a “rejection of pragmatism” [89] and Herbert Kohl terms “willed not-learning” [134]) to “fit” disability paradigms reductively dictated by normative institu-tional expectations? We could take seriously the findings of DSE scholars such as Phil Smith, who points out in Whatever Happened to Inclusion? that education has actually lost ground in terms of including students with more significant disabilities in recent years (28). Within this context, the objectives accomplished by public relations-driven educational “creaming practices” proliferate. They operationalize inclusionist claims to success wherein the normative accomplishments of the most “able disabled students” eclipse the struggles of those left behind. Inclusionism, in other words, covers over an unethical promotion of the successes of the few based upon normative standards of achievement for the inadequacies of the many. Within curricular cripistemologies disability metamorphoses from successful normalization into lesser versions of the ableist self into a meaningful alternative site for transforming pedagogical practices and failed social identities. A productive failure whose sites are set significantly higher than neoliberal tolerance allows.

#### The criticism abandons the shame of ones identity. We create new spaces where the deviant body can be celebrated and function as a place for new forms of knowledge and more accessible ways of engaging with the world.

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

The crip/queer classroom produces a more meaningful system of differential values wherein shame about one’s body as inadequate, medicalized, and pathological (the current terms of normalization within inclusionism) are abandoned. In their place, curricular cripistemologies insert the creative alternatives of interdependency, the politics of atypicality, and a more critical assessment of neoliberalism’s founding in(ex)clusions.3 Consequently, curricular cripistemologies encourage the identification of personal expertise with crip/queer lives as a reservoir of knowledge. When the classroom conversation gives credence to the authority of crip/queer experience, crip/queer student subjectivities gradually sense a thaw in the labor required to keep their differences at bay. Instead, they begin actively cultivating personal experiences with alternative ways of being crip/queer into fertile ground for classroom contributions. The transformation can be profound. Students can be witnessed suddenly operationalizing ways of drawing from the authority of their experience rather than removing a formative aspect of their knowledge from conversation. In this manner crip/queer bodies shift from liabilities to be secreted away into active vectors of insight from which one may engage in classroom models of collective understanding. Through such developments, crip/queer subjec-tivities become a way of knowing the world; embodiments akin to other forms of discredited knowing such as femininity, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and so on (yet, importantly, containing all of these differences at the intersection of what makes bodies crip/queer). The non-normatively embodied classroom that emerges within curricular cripistemologies becomes a place in which diversity operates as a nuancing agent of knowledge. This open exploration of subcultural differences in the non-normative classroom provides what David Halperin explains in relation to gay subcultures as “a social space for the construction of different identities, for the elaboration of various types of relationships, for the development of new cultural forms” (67). Likewise, curricular cripistemologies promote the classroom as a place of productive differentiation—both in relation to creating more flexibility within majoritarian norms and within crip/ queer subcultures themselves. In Halberstam’s words, the differential space of crip/queer classrooms fails to cohere into a univocal identity of difference. A curricular cripistemology, in other words, leaves no body behind.

### PIC 1NC

#### Insert Language Link

#### We learn about disability through the language that we use, you cannot separate the arguments that you make with the rhetorical violence bound within them.

Cohen-Rottenberg 2015. Cohen-Rottenberg, Rachel. "10 Questions That Come Up When You're Called Out for Ableist Language – Answered." Everyday Feminism. December 27, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/12/questions-called-out-ableism/>. (WL BFI)

1. ‘Don’t We Have More Important Things to Worry About Than Words?’ I am always very curious about those who believe that words are “only” words – as though they do not have tremendous power. Those of us who use words understand the world through them. We use words to construct frameworks with which we understand experience. Every time we speak or write, we are telling a story; every time we listen or read, we are hearing one. No one lives without entering into these stories about their fellow human beings. As Arthur Frank writes: Stories work with people, for people, and always stories work on people, affecting what people are able to see as real as possible, and as worth doing or best avoided. What is it about stories – what are their particularities – that enables them to work as they do? More than mere curiosity is at stake in this question, because human life depends on the stories we tell: the sense of self that those stories impart, the relationships constructed around shared stories, and the sense of purpose that stories both propose and foreclose. The stories that disability metaphors tell are deeply problematic, deeply destructive, and deeply resonant of the kinds of violence and oppression that disabled people have faced over the course of many centuries. They perpetuate negative and disempowering views of disabled people, and these views wind their ways into all of the things that most people feel are more important. If a culture’s language is full of pejorative metaphors about a group of people, that culture is not going to see those people as fully entitled to the same housing, employment, medical care, education, access, and inclusion as people in a more favored group.

#### **And, discourses are power**

**Bleiker 2000**Ph.D. visiting research and teaching affiliations at Harvard, Cambridge, Humboldt, Tampere, Yonsei and Pusan National University as well as the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology and the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague,(Roland, Popular Dissent**,**Human Agency and Global Politics, Cambridge University Press)

While appreciating these basic assumptions about contemporary global politics, my conceptualisation of transversal dissent embarks on a different path, and this not only because of the problematic statecentric nature around which the structure—agency debate has developed. Instead of articulating issues of agency in relation to structures, my approach relies on what could be called a discourse—agency axis. **Discourses are**, in their broadest meaning, **frameworks of knowledge and power through which we comprehend (and constitute) the world around us**. Because the conceptual range of a discursive approach is broader than that of a structural one, it is better suited to scrutinise transversal struggles. **The notion of structure, especially as applied in international theory, is intrinsically linked to neorealist, statist and spatial perceptions of world politics. But even outside the realist paradigm**, **structures often remain too closely identified with institutional practices**and the type of societal order they sustain. **The notion of discourse, by contrast, encapsulates not only the structural terrains of rules and norms, but also a variety of other aspects, such as language and culture, that interfere with the mutually constituted and transversal production of power and knowledge.** 29  **But posing questions of transversal dissent and human agency in relation to discourses breaks theoretical taboos.** It creates various forms of anxieties. There are possible objections from those who employ the concept of discourse in their work. Neither Heidegger nor Foucault, for instance, nor many of their subsequent interpreters, have dealt with questions of agency in an explicit and systematic way. **This omission has often been equated with an image of the world in which human beings are engulfed by discursive webs to the point that action becomes no more than a reflection of externally imposed circumstances. Towards such interpretations my challenge will consist in demonstrating that it is feasible as well as worthwhile to conceptualise the notion of human agency.** In fact, my analysis will seek to show how **this alleged inability or unwillingness to speak of agency is more often than not a reflection of anti-postmodern polemic, rather than a position that is inherent to or advocated by most authors who have sought to apply a discursive approach to the study of global politics.**

#### **Your use of language transforms the crip being into a monster that must be destroyed**

Cohen 96 [Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, Professor of English, Director of Institute for Medieval & Early Modern Studies at Columbian College of Arts and Sciences; “Monster Culture” pg 4; University of Minnesota Press; 1996; accessed 06/29/2015; < http://ptfaculty.gordonstate.edu/rscoggins/Cohen,%20Monster%20Culture%20(Seven%20Theses),%203-20.pdf>.]

Thesis I: The Monster's Body Is a Cultural Body Vampires, burial, death: inter the corpse where the road forks, so that when it springs from the grave, it will not know which path to follow. Drive a stake through its heart: it will be stuck to the ground at the fork, it will haunt that place that leads to many other places, that point of in- decision. Behead the corpse, so that, acephalic, it will not know itself as subject, only as pure body. The monster is born only at this metaphoric Crossroads, as an embodiment of a certain cultural moment-of a time, a feeling, and -a place.1 The monster’s body quite literally incorporates fear, desire, anxiety, and fantasy (ataractic or incendiary), giving them life and an uncanny independence. The monstrous body is pure culture. A construct and a projection, the monster exists only to be read: the monstrum is etymologically “that which reveals,” “that which warns,” a glyph that seeks a hierophant. Like a letter on the page, the monster signifies something other than itself: it is always a displacement, always inhabits the gap between the time of upheaval that created it and the moment into which it is received, to be born again. These epistemological spaces between the monster’s bones are Derrida’s familiar chasm of différance: a genetic uncertainty principle, the essence of the monster’s vitality, the reason it always rises from the dissection table as its secrets are about to be revealed and vanishes into the night.

#### The monster the affirmative creates is the ultimate trope of dehumanization and disqualification.

Siebers 2010 [Tobin Siebers, Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Michigan; “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”; University of Michigan Press; 10/28/2010; <<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>>.]

Disqualification at this moment in time justifies discrimination, servitude, imprisonment, involuntary institutionalization, euthanasia, human and civil rights violations, military intervention, compulsory sterilization, police actions, assisted suicide, capital punishment, and murder. It is my contention that disqualification finds support in the way that bodies appear and in their specific appearances—that is, disqualification is justified through the accusation of mental or physical inferiority based on aesthetic principles. Disqualification is produced by naturalizing inferiority as the justification for unequal treatment, violence, and oppression. According to Snyder and Mitchell, disability serves in the modern period as “the master trope of human disqualification.” They argue that disability represents a marker of otherness that establishes differences between human beings not as acceptable or valuable variations but as dangerous deviations. Douglas Baynton provides compelling examples from the modern era, explaining that during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States disability identity disqualified other identities defined by gender, race, class, and nationality. Women were deemed inferior because they were said to have mental and physical disabilities. People of color had fewer rights than other persons based on accusations of biological inferiority. Immigrants were excluded from entry into the United States when they were poor, sick, or failed standardized tests, even though the populations already living there were poor, sick, and failed standardized tests. In every case, disability identity served to justify oppression by amplifying ideas about inferiority already attached to other minority identities. Disability is the trope by which the assumed inferiority of these other minority identities achieved expression. The appearance of lesser mental and physical abilities disqualifies people as inferior and justifies their oppression. It is now possible to recognize disability as a trope used to posit the inferiority of certain minority populations, but it remains extremely difficult to understand that mental and physical markers of inferiority are also tropes placed in the service of disability oppression. Before disability can be used as a disqualifier, disability, too, has to be disqualified. Beneath the troping of blackness as inbuilt inferiority, for example, lies the troping of disability as inferior. Beneath the troping of femininity as biological deficiency lies the troping of disability as deficiency. The mental and physical properties of bodies become the natural symbols of inferiority via a process of disqualification that seems biological, not cultural—which is why disability discrimination seems to be a medical rather than a social problem. If we consider how difficult it is at this moment to disqualify people as inferior on the basis of their racial, sexual, gender, or class characteristics, we may come to recognize the ground that we must cover in the future before we experience the same difficulty disqualifying people as inferior on the basis of disability. We might also recognize the work that disability performs at present in situations where race, sexuality, gender, and class are used to disqualify people as physically or mentally inferior.

#### The alternative is to reject the rhetorical violence of the 1AC. The criticism is a pre-requisite to policymaking, and any form of permutation is severance.

### Normalization of Speech 1NC

#### Speech therapy and speech assimilation re-entrenches ideologies of shame, difference and marginalization

Richter 14 12-1-2014, "Breathing techniques are not the problem: Economic and Knowledge bases for a critique of speech therapy&nbsp;," Did I Stutter?, <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/december-01st-2014> (WL)

A response to the critique of speech therapy has been to admonish those of us at Did I Stutter and to remind others that speech therapists simply do pain reduction. This is not a response to our argument. The problem with speech assimilation is that it does not position itself as pain or harm reduction. Speech therapy positions itself as being about achieving so-called developmental goals and in doing so, implies that people who lack verbal speech or ease of verbal speech are not as worthwhile human beings. If speech therapy was only about pain, it would not consider dysfluency itself to be a problem, but would only concern itself with external side effects. We know too well that speech assimilation is sold to stutterers as a path to citizenship and civility. That path comes through a relationship of subordination. To be dysfluent is to need reform, to require professional help, and to require services. Such services do not come freely available as techniques that can be easily shared or known about, but require submission to educational or therapeutic institutions that are reliant on funding. Often, through wide-ranged systematic shaming of stutterers, parents of dysfluent people are urged to participate in a cure for dysfluency both financially and through directed action in their relationships. Speech therapy and its ideology of speech assimilation is an ideology of submission by disabled people and their families to professional-controlled speech norms that can only be gained through giving up money and authority over the body. Stuttering exemplifies beauty, even if that beauty is unrecognized. The staccato play of syllables, slowed down repeated reaction, even perhaps onomatopoeic repetitions, indicating the staying power of a specific topic or speaking to an unrevealed intensity inherent to experience. The intention of quieting the stutter, of organizing or trapping it is to capture a way that bodies move. For individuals who make their living from speech therapy, the shame of stuttering secures their work. The perceived authority of medical charts over differing cultural experiences ensures that the speech therapist always has work. It is not that all treatments or elements of speech therapy are detrimental, but rather that the discipline frames differing speech as undeveloped speech: the production of speech difference is rendered a speech problem that requires intervention. As long as dysfluency is produced as a pathology, speech therapists will always speak as superiors to their clients, they will always reentrench a notion of the speech difference as a deficiency of body and sometimes of motivation. If there is a value in breathing, in controlling the body or in self-regulation, such ideas can be shared among dysfluent people instead of from a position of authority. The refusal of speech pathology for dysfluent people is a refusal of lifelong subordination.

#### **Attempts to normalize speech don’t solve underlying ableism**

Richter 14 [How to not be ableist toward dysfluent people: Patience, Honesty and Checking In](http://www.didistutter.org/blog/how-to-not-be-ableist-toward-dysfluent-people-patience-honesty-and-checking-in) <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/how-to-not-be-ableist-toward-dysfluent-people-patience-honesty-and-checking-in>

(WL)

Much has been written about what stutterers can do to speak more smoothly. We hear the rejoinders: talk slower, try to calm down, think about what you want to say first. These attempts to normalize speech are useless at best because they do not deal with the problem of society and ableism. Instead of coming up with things that dysfluent speakers can do to normalize, we might do well to think of what smooth speakers can do not to shame dysfluent people. This blog contains a list of some ideas. First, it is considered really rude by many dysfluent people when the people they are talking to finish their sentences for them. We have almost all done this and it still needs to stop. Learning to deal with our own anxiety about completion is better than trying to make the conversation fit a given structure or form perfectly. Along with that is the demand that non-dysfluent speakers work extra hard to be patient and not to judge dysfluent friends. If a conversation is not fitting the expected choreography, the response should not be to become angry or to stress out, that causes more emotional problems for everyone involved. Instead, patience is needed as a new conversation (not the one expected) freely appears. Miscommunication is an inevitable factor in any conversation. People always confuse meanings, say the wrong word, produce unintended meanings or other glitches come up. Instead of nodding and pretending to always understand what your conversation partner is communicating, it is better to exhibit the trait of honesty and ask what is meant.

#### Ableism is perpetuated individually and structurally by the medical model through the educational system, this internalizes self hatred onto the neurodivergent.

#### The Alternative is to embrace stuttering. Changing ourselves is key to changing the world around us.

St. Pierre 14, 7-8-2014, "Internalized Ableism, or, Why do I (Still) Hate Myself?," Did I Stutter?, <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/internalized-ableism-or-why-do-i-still-hate-myself> (WL)

Ableism, as a reminder, is the discrimination against disabled people in favour of those who are “able-bodied.” Ableism, like racism or sexism, occurs on the individual level (e.g. when we get insulted or ignored in conversation because of how we speak) as well as at the structural level (e.g. society is set up in such a way as to disadvantage us and privilege those who speak fluently). Ableism is a complex thing that takes tremendous work and many years to fight against in order to create more inclusive and welcoming societies. However, ableism is not just “out there.” It only works because it twists inside the people it targets, in our case, people who stutter. Ableism is internalized from an early age, as ableist assumptions take root in us and we begin to believe them to be true. Assumptions like: we must speak fluently to be taken seriously; we can expect to be made fun of and discriminated against (and there is really nothing to do about it); and, a stutter is not only a problem but is my problem. How many of these things do we simply accept as truth? These beliefs are, pardon my french, complete bullshit (poke around on our website to see our views on stuttering and ableism). I know this in my head. I know that stuttering is not really about my body and how it speaks, but about ridiculous ideas of what “normal” speech sounds like and cultural expectations regarding how fast and fluent everyone needs to be. I know that stuttering is more about society than about me. But the thing is, no matter how disgusting and untrue ableist beliefs may be, over time they become a part of us. How do you root out a part of yourself? We have lived with lies about stuttering for so long that making social changes to the world “out there” may be easier than not hating ourselves and our speech--those quiet whispers that tell us the negative ways people respond to stuttering really is our fault. A central part of reframing stuttering and resisting the medical model is going to be dealing with internalized ableism and changing ourselves. This is difficult work, but I believe it is possible to overcome these lies about ourselves. What can we do about internalized ableism? I am certainly no expert as I am still working through the process myself, but here are two ideas: 1) Education—while this ultimately isn’t the most important one on the list, it is still central. I believe it is difficult (as I mentioned in [another blog post](http://www.didistutter.org/blog/against-self-acceptance)) to change ourselves in any lasting way when we still accept the medical model of stuttering: the belief that stuttering is a biological and physiological thing.We need to understand ourselves in other ways that shift the focus away from our bodies and onto social discriminations and ableist social expectations. Sadly, the overwhelming majority of stuttering literature assumes the medical model. This needs to change. 2) Community—we need communities that affirm and encourage dysfluent speech. We support self-help groups, but we also need communities that are not based in medical-models of stuttering; communities of dysfluent speakers that can encourage one another enough to imaginetheir stutters not as individual problems to cope with, but as important and diverse voices in the world

### School to Prison Pipeline 1NC

#### **The school to prison pipeline is built on the interconnection of race of race and ableism. Black and brown bodies have historically been otherized as being disabled in an attempt to justify antiblack violence against them. The ableist pedagogy produced within the status quo sets up crip students for failure accelerating the likelihood of being put away and forcibly hidden from the antiblack and ableist world around them. Focusing on race alone is not enough to eliminate the school to prison pipeline.** The CJS continually neglects the needs of individuals with disabilities

Horowitz 2013 Alana Become A Fan, 2-4-2013, "Mental Illness Soars In Prisons, Jails While Inmates Suffer," Huffington Post, <span class="skimlinks-unlinked">http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/04/mental-illness-prisons-jails-inmates\_n\_2610062.html</span> (WL)

Armando Cruz tied a noose around his neck and hanged himself from the ceiling of his prison cell. He [left a note](http://solitarywatch.com/2013/01/17/suicide-in-solitary-the-life-and-death-of-armando-cruz-part-1/) that ended in two chilling words. “Remember me.” His mother Yolanda, who was shown the note after her son's death, wants to make sure no one forgets. “They took away my only son,” she says, her voice breaking. Cruz killed himself on Sept. 20, 2011, during his incarceration at California State Prison in Sacramento, after a long history of mental illness. His story, first reported by[the blog Solitary Watch,](http://solitarywatch.com/2013/01/17/suicide-in-solitary-the-life-and-death-of-armando-cruz-part-1/) is an example of how the criminal justice system is ill-equipped to handle people with mental health issues. Cruz spent years in solitary confinement and died while locked in a tiny solitary cell. [The rates of suicide](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/20/us/senators-start-a-review-of-solitary-confinement.html) in solitary confinement tend to be higher than in the general prison population. Suicide is the number one cause of death among inmates in local jails and in the top five for state prisons, according to [a federal report](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/mljsp0010st.pdf). Yolanda Cruz describes her son as a warm, funny person who was an easy child to raise. When he became a teenager, he began to change. He started to experiment with drugs and alcohol. Then, he was arrested for stealing tools from his neighbor’s garage. When he was 15, he admitted that he heard voices in his head. Psychiatrists first diagnosed him with psychosis. Later, he would be diagnosed with schizophrenia. [A 2006 study](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/mhppjipr.cfm) by the Bureau of Justice Statistics found that over half of all jail and prison inmates have mental health issues; an estimated 1.25 million suffered from mental illness, [over four times](http://www.hrw.org/news/2006/09/05/us-number-mentally-ill-prisons-quadrupled) the number in 1998. [Research suggests](http://nicic.gov/MentalIllness) that people with mental illness are overrepresented in the criminal justice system by rates of two to four times the normal population. The severity of these illnesses vary, but advocates say that one factor remains steady: with proper treatment, many of these incarcerations could have been avoided. “Most people [with mental illness] by far are incarcerated because of very minor crimes that are preventable,” says Bob Bernstein, the Executive Director of the Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law. “People are homeless for reasons that shouldn’t occur, people don’t have basic treatment for reasons that shouldn’t occur and they get into trouble because of crimes of survival.” Bernstein blames these high rates on a lack of community mental health services. In the past three years, $4.35 billion in funding for mental health services has been cut from state budgets across the nation, [according to a recent report.](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/26/us-mental-healthcare-system_n_2353319.htm) Because of the cuts, treatment centers have had to trim services and turn away patients. [State hospitals](http://www.nami.org/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm?ContentFileID=126233) have also been forced to reduce services. [A report by the Treatment Advocacy Center](http://www.treatmentadvocacycenter.org/storage/documents/final_jails_v_hospitals_study.pdf) even found that there are more people with severe mental illness in prisons and jails than in hospitals. Yolanda Cruz tried for years to get her son the right kind of care. But it wasn’t easy. She says that the first doctor she took him to refused to prescribe him any kind of medication, saying that he was only getting into trouble because he was using drugs and hanging out with the wrong kind of people. Other doctors would later prescribe him a host of medications but the one that eased his symptoms the most left him nearly catatonic. In 2000, when Armando Cruz was 17, a local police officer was attacked with a knife from behind. His throat was cut but he survived. Cruz confessed to the crime and was arrested. To this day, his mother swears he was manipulated by the voices in his head or by the real perpetrator. The courts didn’t see it that way. Cruz was convicted of the attempted murder of a police officer and sentenced to life in prison, with the possibility of parole after 8 years. Three years had passed between his arrest and his sentencing, most of which he spent in county jail. Eric Balaban, an attorney with the ACLU’s National Prison Project, said that mentally ill people who have contact with the criminal justice system are too often incarcerated while awaiting trial, rather than sent to hospitals or treatment centers. “There has been a very disturbing recent trend to keep them in jails and not send them to a hospital which is done as a money saving measure,” said Balaban. “They’re not receiving the appropriate level of care.” Once people with mental illness are incarcerated, Bazleon’s Bernstein says, it becomes a tough cycle to break. “Most people are there for minor crimes but then they deteriorate,” he explains. “They can’t follow the rules there and so they stay a long time, and they become difficult to release.” According to the [Bureau of Justice Statistics report,](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/mhppjipr.cfm) most inmates with mental illness don’t receive treatment while in prison. Patti Jones’ nephew Tony Lester was sent to state prison in Tucson, Ariz., for aggravated assault. Like Armando Cruz, Lester heard voices. He told his aunt that before he was incarcerated, he had only heard two voices. After he was admitted, there were seven. Lester was diagnosed with schizophrenia. He was prescribed medication but didn't always take it while in prison, Jones said. Lester was placed among the general prison population with little treatment available. His symptoms grew worse. “He started saying he thought his attorney was the Antichrist,” Jones says. “He thought Obama was an alien. He thought he was a time traveler.” Jones says she begged the jail to force him to take his medication, but staff told her he was allowed to refuse treatment. In June 2010, Lester stopped taking his medication completely. After he told a guard he was contemplating ending his life, he was placed on suicide watch. On July 9, he was deemed stable. On July 11, his roommate woke up to Lester’s blood dripping on him. He had stabbed himself vigorously in the neck, wrist and groin with a razor. “Treating the mentally ill is different than acting with a normal population,” says Joe Baumann, a corrections officer at the California Rehabilitation Center. “The problem is there’s so many of them either self-medicating or not taking medication at all. No one monitors whether inmates take their medication.” Corrections employees are not properly taught how to recognize and handle mental illness, he says. “There's a lack of any real training to identify specific issues and how to deal with them," says Baumann, who says he only receives a few hours of mental illness training each year and it isn’t enough. “There’s a lack of direction from management.” Corrections officers on staff at the time of Tony Lester's death said that when they arrived at his cell, they weren't sure what to do, [according to a state investigation](http://www.azcentral.com/12news/articles/20121217tony-lester-investigation.html) of the incident. [One officer said](http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/local/articles/2011/01/08/20110108arizona-department-of-corrections-inmate-death.html) that he "was never trained on how to apply pressure to a wound." Lester bled to death while the officers struggled to deal with the situation. Donn Rowe, president of the New York State Correctional Officers and Police Benevolent Association, says that mentally ill inmates place a huge strain on the corrections facilities and their employees. “It’s very challenging on our members,” he says. “They need much more attention than your average inmate population. It's a very expensive and very demanding job to manage these people.” The expense is high, to be sure. The average inmate in New York costs the state over $60,000 per year, [according to a report by the Vera Insitute of Justice.](http://thecrimereport.s3.amazonaws.com/2/fc/1/1470/john_jay_resource__2.pdf) That figure doesn't take into account the extra resources that mentally ill inmates require. Experts say that funding mental health services for these inmates would cost less than imprisoning them and could help prevent many incarcerations in the first place. According to [a Bazelon Center report](http://www.bazelon.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=VFwb7PPm7K0%3d&tabid=104), the annual cost of case management for mentally ill people in Michigan is $2,165 per person. A more intensive program, the popular Assertive Community Treatment, costs the state $9,029 per person per year. In contrast, the average Michigan inmate cost the state [over $34,000 last year.](http://www.michigan.gov/midashboard/0,4624,7-256-60564_60567_60618---,00.htm) But mental health services are dramatically underused. Over half of inmates with mental health problems never received treatment prior to incarceration, according [to a Department of Justice report.](http://www.nimh.nih.gov/statistics/1DOJ.shtml) “We're paying criminal justice and other costs, we're investing there and we really should be investing in the services that could prevent that whole trajectory to begin with,” says Bernstein. Not all mentally ill inmates’ stories end like Lester’s or Cruz’s. But the figures are too high to ignore. [In 2010,](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/mljsp0010st.pdf) 520 inmates committed suicide in local jails and state prisons. To the loved ones and advocates of these inmates, their deaths were avoidable. “When Tony was on his meds, he was our Tony,” says Jones. “If he’d had access to care, he would have lived.”

#### **The high amount of abuse in prisons is a result of a systemic lack of services outside prisons a trend that continues on the inside of prisons**

Fellner 14, Jamie 10-7-2014, "United States: Mentally Ill Mistreated in Prison," No Publication, <http://www.hrw.org/news/2003/10/21/united-states-mentally-ill-mistreated-prison> (WL)

Mentally ill offenders face mistreatment and neglect in many U.S. prisons, Human Rights Watch charged in [a report](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa1003/) released today. One in six U.S. prisoners is mentally ill. Many of them suffer from serious illnesses such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. There are three times as many men and women with mental illness in U.S. prisons as in mental health hospitals. The rate of mental illness in the prison population is three times higher than in the general population. According to the 215-page report, [Ill-Equipped: U.S. Prisons and Offenders with Mental Illness](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa1003/), prisons are dangerous and damaging places for mentally ill people. Other prisoners victimize and exploit them. Prison staff often punish mentally ill offenders for symptoms of their illness – such as being noisy or refusing orders, or even self-mutilation and attempted suicide. Mentally ill prisoners are more likely than others to end up housed in especially harsh conditions, such as isolation, that can push them over the edge into acute psychosis. “Prisons have become the nation’s primary mental health facilities,” said Jamie Fellner, director of Human Rights Watch’s U.S. Program and a co-author of the report. “But for those with serious illnesses, prison can be the worst place to be.” Woefully deficient mental health services in many prisons leave prisoners undertreated – or not treated at all. Across the country, prisoners cannot get appropriate care because of a shortage of qualified staff, lack of facilities, and prison rules that interfere with treatment. According to Human Rights Watch, the high rate of incarceration of the mentally ill is a consequence of underfunded, disorganized, and fragmented community mental health services. State and local governments have shut down mental health hospitals across the United States, but failed to provide adequate alternatives. Many people with mental illness – particularly those who are poor, homeless, or struggling with substance abuse problems – cannot get mental health treatment. If they commit a crime, even low-level nonviolent offenses, punitive sentencing laws mandate imprisonment. “Unless you are wealthy, it can be next to impossible to receive mental health services in the community,” said Fellner. “Many prisoners might never have ended up behind bars if publicly funded treatment had been available.” The Human Rights Watch report is based on more than two years of research and hundreds of interviews with prisoners, corrections officials, mental health experts and attorneys. It describes prisoners who, because of their illness, rant and rave, babble incoherently, or huddle silently in their cells. They talk to invisible companions, living in worlds constructed of hallucinations. They lash out without provocation, beat their heads against cell walls, cover themselves with feces, mutilate themselves until their bodies are riddled with scars, and attempt suicide. The Human Rights Watch report documents how prisoners with mental illness are likely to be picked on, physically or sexually abused, and manipulated by other inmates, who call them “bugs.” For example, a prisoner in Georgia, who is both mentally ill and mildly retarded, has been raped repeatedly and exchanges sex for commissary items such as cigarettes and coffee. Mentally ill prisoners can find it difficult if not impossible to comply with prison rules, and end up with higher than average rates of disciplinary infractions. Security staff – who usually lack training in mental illness – do not distinguish between the prisoner who is disruptive or fails to obey an order because of illness and a prisoner who causes problems for other reasons. Mentally ill prisoners have been punished for self-mutilating (“destroying state property”); attempting suicide with a torn sheet (“destroying state property”); for yelling and kicking cell doors because of hearing voices (“creating a disturbance”); for throwing papers at a guard while delusional (“battery”); and for smearing feces on the cell door (“being untidy”). Untrained staff escalate confrontations with mentally ill prisoners, sometimes using excessive force. Several mentally ill prisoners have died from asphyxiation after struggling with guards who used improper methods to control them. Over the past two decades, prison mental health services in the United States have improved – usually because of prisoner litigation. But the surging number of mentally ill men and women entering prison has outrun the availability of services. Public officials have been unwilling to provide the funds necessary to ensure adequate treatment for all the mentally ill offenders who need it. “Prison officials are being asked to do something they aren’t equipped to do,” said Fellner. “Prisons are designed for punishment, not as places to provide comprehensive mental health treatment. If people with mental illness must be incarcerated, they should be housed in facilities designed and funded to meet their mental health needs.” Human Rights Watch urged the U.S. Congress to enact legislation proposed by Senator Mike DeWine (R-Ohio) and Congressman Ted Strickland (D-Ohio) that would provide federal grants to divert mentally ill offenders into treatment programs rather than jail or prison, and to improve the quality of mental health services provided to jail and prison inmates. Human Rights Watch also recommended the use of independent mental health experts to assess mental health services in each prison system, urged elected officials and the heads of correctional agencies to ensure that mentally ill prisoners receive mental health services consistent with community standards of care, and called for rules to prevent housing prisoners with mental illness in isolated confinement or super maximum security prisons.

#### **Disabled folks are especially vulnerable to violence within the prison system.**

Fellner 14, Jamie 10-7-2014, "United States: Mentally Ill Mistreated in Prison," No Publication, <http://www.hrw.org/news/2003/10/21/united-states-mentally-ill-mistreated-prison> (WL)

Mentally ill offenders face mistreatment and neglect in many U.S. prisons, Human Rights Watch charged in [a report](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa1003/) released today. One in six U.S. prisoners is mentally ill. Many of them suffer from serious illnesses such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression. There are three times as many men and women with mental illness in U.S. prisons as in mental health hospitals. The rate of mental illness in the prison population is three times higher than in the general population. According to the 215-page report, [Ill-Equipped: U.S. Prisons and Offenders with Mental Illness](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa1003/), prisons are dangerous and damaging places for mentally ill people. Other prisoners victimize and exploit them. Prison staff often punish mentally ill offenders for symptoms of their illness – such as being noisy or refusing orders, or even self-mutilation and attempted suicide. Mentally ill prisoners are more likely than others to end up housed in especially harsh conditions, such as isolation, that can push them over the edge into acute psychosis. “Prisons have become the nation’s primary mental health facilities,” said Jamie Fellner, director of Human Rights Watch’s U.S. Program and a co-author of the report. “But for those with serious illnesses, prison can be the worst place to be.” Woefully deficient mental health services in many prisons leave prisoners undertreated – or not treated at all. Across the country, prisoners cannot get appropriate care because of a shortage of qualified staff, lack of facilities, and prison rules that interfere with treatment. According to Human Rights Watch, the high rate of incarceration of the mentally ill is a consequence of underfunded, disorganized, and fragmented community mental health services. State and local governments have shut down mental health hospitals across the United States, but failed to provide adequate alternatives. Many people with mental illness – particularly those who are poor, homeless, or struggling with substance abuse problems – cannot get mental health treatment. If they commit a crime, even low-level nonviolent offenses, punitive sentencing laws mandate imprisonment. “Unless you are wealthy, it can be next to impossible to receive mental health services in the community,” said Fellner. “Many prisoners might never have ended up behind bars if publicly funded treatment had been available.” The Human Rights Watch report is based on more than two years of research and hundreds of interviews with prisoners, corrections officials, mental health experts and attorneys. It describes prisoners who, because of their illness, rant and rave, babble incoherently, or huddle silently in their cells. They talk to invisible companions, living in worlds constructed of hallucinations. They lash out without provocation, beat their heads against cell walls, cover themselves with feces, mutilate themselves until their bodies are riddled with scars, and attempt suicide. The Human Rights Watch report documents how prisoners with mental illness are likely to be picked on, physically or sexually abused, and manipulated by other inmates, who call them “bugs.” For example, a prisoner in Georgia, who is both mentally ill and mildly retarded, has been raped repeatedly and exchanges sex for commissary items such as cigarettes and coffee. Mentally ill prisoners can find it difficult if not impossible to comply with prison rules, and end up with higher than average rates of disciplinary infractions. Security staff – who usually lack training in mental illness – do not distinguish between the prisoner who is disruptive or fails to obey an order because of illness and a prisoner who causes problems for other reasons. Mentally ill prisoners have been punished for self-mutilating (“destroying state property”); attempting suicide with a torn sheet (“destroying state property”); for yelling and kicking cell doors because of hearing voices (“creating a disturbance”); for throwing papers at a guard while delusional (“battery”); and for smearing feces on the cell door (“being untidy”). Untrained staff escalate confrontations with mentally ill prisoners, sometimes using excessive force. Several mentally ill prisoners have died from asphyxiation after struggling with guards who used improper methods to control them. Over the past two decades, prison mental health services in the United States have improved – usually because of prisoner litigation. But the surging number of mentally ill men and women entering prison has outrun the availability of services. Public officials have been unwilling to provide the funds necessary to ensure adequate treatment for all the mentally ill offenders who need it.

#### The alternative is to Crip the criminal justice system

Chandler 12 (Eliza, senior doctorial fellow at New College, U of T. “Cripping Community: New Meanings of Disability and Community” Nomorepotlucks. Issue 19. Jan/Feb 2012. <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/cripping-community-new-meanings-of-disability-and-community>

Ableism, to be sure, is pervasive. And although stories of how ableism is felt and how it persists are not necessarily the ones I want to tell, I believe that these are the stories with which we must begin. Again, I follow Hall (1997) when he says that we cannot think about how identities are constituted without thinking about how social subjects are represented. We know that disability is represented in a myriad of ways and by a myriad of social functions as a problem in need of a solution. And I can tell you as a disabled person who is communally connected to other disabled people, that disability is not experienced as a problem, by everyone, all of the time. To recognize that my experience of disability does not match its representation is**,** first of all, likely not surprising,but also not reason for me to disengage withhow my embodiment is represented. As Hall says, “culture lays the terrain in which identities are formed” (1997, p. 291). And, given that ableism informs our cultural sensibility, the pronouncement or arrival of disability identities and the enactment of crip communities with disability as their binding tie, is not yet recognized as sensible (Titchkosky, 2002). Disability identities and crip communities are formed despite of or maybe because of disability’s pervasive cultural understanding as a condition to be cured or killed.[3] In the beginning of this article, I cited my experience on the streets as one of the ways that I strongly sense or, I would even hazard, that I “know” that ableism circulates. My experience is also one of the ways that I sense/“know” that disability is done differently, communally. I experience crip community in different ways, in different places, and with different people. But for this article, as I do in my research, I wish to focus on how crip community is formed through unstructured enactments. I attend to the emergence and experience of community through enactments for I believe that such attention explicates how crip community “crips” community. This is to say that rather than being tied to a structure, institution, or common identity, crip communities are structured by and through communal enactments. In other words, they happen anytime people come together through the common desire to dwell with disability. In this way, crip community can be enacted anytime, in any place, with anyone, disabled or not.[4] In the preface to his book, Community, Zygmunt Bauman writes, “Out there, on the streets, all sorts of dangers lie in ambush; we have to be alert when we go out, watch whom we are talking to and who talks to us, be on the look-out every minute” (2000, pp. 1-2). In the space of the streets, enactments of disability as violence lie in ambush. The geographies of the street may feel unsecure, unsteady, hostile, and even unfamiliar. In these inhospitable spaces, I may feel unwelcomed, undesired, uncommon. I expect these enactments of disability as violence, but I don’t know when or where or how they will occur, and, in this sense, they “lie in ambush.” Because being on “alert,” that is, expecting the enactment of the normative meaning of disability, feels so familiar, when disability is enacted otherwise, when I feel that people are drawn to me by a desire to dwell with disability, it feels different. In these communal enactments, I feel safe; I feel comfortable; I feel desired; I feel secure, I feel differently from how I commonly feel when I am in the normative terrain, whether or not I am being ambushed or anticipating being ambushed by a normative enactment of disability. Recall my earlier description of the verb “to crip”: to open up desire for what disability disrupts. Crip communities disrupt the assumption that we can “know,” unquestionably, who our communal members are, and therefore, who they are not. We assume that communities are bound by members who share the same or similar identities. However, the unpredictable and ever-shifting character of disability requires us to consider its identity as also instable. As Hall asserts, “one thing identity does not signal is a ‘stable core’ of the self, unfolding from beginning to end through all the vicissitudes of history without change” (1996, p. 1). In crip community, one member may experience their disability as progressing or as a “becoming” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004), an ever-shifting embodiment that allows them to relate to their community and their communal others in different, never stable ways. Another may not currently be disabled, or currently be disabled in a particular way, and become disabled, or become disabled differently, either with time or through an accident. Another may have a disability that comes to them one day or moment, and leaves the next, ever-returning and ever-leaving. Still, another may be disabled and not be easily identifiable as such. And in community motivated by a desire for disability, disability can be an “inter-subjective experience” that is, enacted between two members, one disabled the other not, owned by no one, cradled by both (Weiss, 2008, p. 4). Disability teaches us that just as embodiments shift, so, too, do our communal experiences and relations. Ableist logic circulates, it is pervasive within the normative terrain, and traversing this terrain through an embodiment that is so often recognized as a problem in need of solution can be uncomfortable, even dangerous. However, as poet Dionne Brand tells us, “different geographic stories can be told,” and through them, we can achieve a different “sense of space” (Brand quoted in McKittrick, 2006, p. xxvii). I propose that crip communities, as we make them, are spaces in which we can create and perpetuate new stories of disability and new ways for disability to matter. More than this, attending to the ways that crip communities “crip” community, and to be open to that which disability disrupts, can unwork and rework how we ‘know’ community and how we understand communal structures beyond and against iterations of them as assuredly knowable, predictable, identifiable, or constant. Instead, we can imagine community as fleeting, boundless, and productive. Crip communities, unstable as they are, can open us up to new ways of understanding what it is to be crip and what it is to be in community.

# Language Links

### Non-exhaustive List of Ableist Words

Autistic Hoya 2016. "Ableism/Language." Autistic Hoya. December 7, 2016 . Accessed May 02, 2017. <http://www.autistichoya.com/p/ableist-words-and-terms-to-avoid.html>.

Barren  
Refers to people who are infertile, carries sexist connotations as well as ableist ones.  
  
**Blind to \_\_\_\_ / turn a blind eye to \_\_\_\_ / blinded by ignorance/bigotry/etc.**  
Refers to Blind, low-vision, or sight-limited people.  
  
**Bound to a wheelchair (wheelchair bound)**  
Refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities.  
  
**Confined to a wheelchair**  
Refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities.  
  
**Crazy**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Cretin**   
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**Cripple/Crippled (by \_\_\_\_)**  
Refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities.  
  
**Daft**   
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Deaf-Mute**  
Refers to Deaf or hard of hearing people.  
  
**Deaf to \_\_\_\_ / turn a deaf ear to \_\_\_\_ / etc.**  
Refers to Deaf or hard of hearing people.

**Derp (**also **herp-derp**and variations)  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**Diffability**  
Can refer to any person with a disability, and is usually a euphemistic phrase to avoid saying "disability" or "disabled."  
  
**Differently abled**or **different abilities**  
Can refer to any person with a disability, and is usually a euphemistic phrase to avoid saying "disability" or "disabled."  
  
**Dumb**  
Refers to d/Deaf or hard of hearing people, people with speech-related disabilities, or people with linguistic or communication disorders or disabilities.  
  
**Feeble-Minded**  
Refers to people with mental, psychiatric, intellectual, or developmental disabilities.  
  
**Handicap(ped)**  
Refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities, and is usually a euphemistic phrase to avoid saying "disability" or "disabled."  
  
**Handicapable**  
Usually refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities, but can also mean any person with a disability.  
  
**Harelip**  
Refers to people with cleft-lip palate or similar facial deformities/cosmetic disabilities.  
  
**Hearing-Impaired**  
Refers to d/Deaf and hard-of-hearing people.  
  
**Hermaphrodite**  
Refers to people with intersex conditions, whether or not they were coercively assigned to a particular sex/gender, and whether or not they currently identify with a binary gender.  
  
**Idiot(ic)**  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**Imbecile**  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**Insane**or **Insanity**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Invalid**(as a noun, as in "my neighbor is an invalid and never goes outside")  
Refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities or chronic health conditions.  
  
**Lame**  
Refers to people with physical or mobility disabilities.  
  
**Loony/Loony Bin**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Lunatic**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Madhouse/Mad/Madman**  
Refers to an institution housing people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Manic**  
Refers to someone with bipolar (used to be called manic depression).  
  
**Maniac**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Mental/Mental Case**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Mental Defective**  
Refers to people with mental, psychiatric, intellectual, or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Midget**  
Refers to little people or people with small stature or a form of dwarfism.  
  
**Mongoloid**  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities and specifically Down Syndrome. Derives from a double-whammy of racism AND ableism, from the belief that people with Down Syndrome look like people from Mongolia.  
  
**Morbidly obese** (or just **obese**)  
Refers to fat people/people of size. It's okay to use the word "fat."  
  
**Moron(ic)**  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**Nuts**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Psycho**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Psychopath(ic)**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Psycho(tic)**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.  
  
**Retard(ed)/[anything]-tard**(examples: **libtard**, **fucktard**, etc.)  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**[you belong on the] Short-bus/ that's short-bus material/etc.**  
Refers to people with intellectual, learning, or other mental disabilities.  
  
**Simpleton**  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities.  
  
**Spaz(zed)**  
Refers to people with cerebral palsy or similar neurological disabilities.  
  
**Specially Abled**  
Can refer to any person with a disability.  
  
**Special Needs**  
Usually refers to people with learning, intellectual, or developmental disabilities, but can mean any person with a disability. Usually a euphemistic phrase to avoid saying "disability" or "disabled."  
  
**Stupid**  
Refers to people with intellectual disabilities (i.e. "in a stupor").  
  
**Suffers from \_\_\_\_**  
Can refer to any person with a disability.  
  
**Wacko/Whacko**  
Refers to people with mental or psychiatric disabilities.

### “Caretaking”

#### Assuming that all disabled people need to be taken care of and supervised is ignorant and violent.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

9.4 ‘Carer’. This is the term self-identified and adopted by the “carers’ movement” in the United Kingdom. However Morris (1993, page 23) observes that the word also has a detrimental effect on perceptions about disabled people, implying “a sense of a need to be looked after”. As Barnes (2001) explains: “besides ‘have a liking’ or ‘desire for’, to ‘care’ means ‘to be concerned about’ or ‘to look after’. It is also associated with the concepts of ‘protection’ and ‘supervision’ and is used with reference to many sections of the community. We care about family and friends. We care about particularly vulnerable groups such as small children, older ‘frail’ people, and people with serious and life-threatening illnesses.” However, in reference to disabled people ‘care’ usually means ‘to be cared for’, ‘to be looked after’, ‘protected’ or ‘supervised’. From the perspective of disabled people this is an overtly patronizing and unhelpful use of the term because (Barnes, 2001): 1. It implies that disabled people can never achieve any degree of independence within their communities. 2. It conceals the fact that there is overwhelming evidence that many of the problems encountered by disabled people are the result of society's failure to meet their needs. Rock (1988) notes: “The word ‘carer' is beginning to be synonymous with acts of courage and bravery that is, battling along in a hostile world against uneven odds, with the enemy often, defined as the disabled person for whom she has to care.” Any words and phrases that characterise disabled people as dependent should be avoided (Barnes, 1992, page 43). So whilst the role of self-definition is an important one, it is appear important to make sure that the adopted term does not further oppress a different group of people. Some alternatives used by disabled people are ‘personal assistant’ (if the person is employed in that capacity) or ‘supporter’ (if the assistance is informal).

### “Challenged”

#### Using the word ‘challenged’ portrays disability as an obstacle to overcome. This rhetoric is incredibly violent and maintains the pressure for crip folks to fit into normative molds.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

5.2 ‘Challenged’. When ‘handicapped’ began to fall out of favour in America, it was replaced by phrases still based on the concept of competition. These phrases portray impairment as an obstacle to be overcome, for example: ‘physically / mentally challenged’, ‘challenging behaviour’, and ‘physically inconvenienced’. However these phrases again ignore the societal barriers that disable people, placing the emphasis instead on impairments as the ‘challenging’ factor (Disability Rag, 1985; Rae, 1989).

### “Crazy”

#### Your usage of the word crazy is ableist and reinforces violence against disabled people

James 2010 (Rachel McCarthy, FWD (feminists with disabilities) for a way forward, “Ableist Word Profile: Crazy”, May 17, <http://disabledfeminists.com/2010/05/17/guest-post-from-rmj-ableist-word-profile-crazy/> (WL BFI)

Like every ism, ableism is absorbed through the culture on a more subconscious level, embedding itself in our language like a guerrilla force. Crazy is one of the most versatile and frequently used slurs, a word used sometimes directly against persons with mental disabilities (PWMD), sometimes indirectly against persons with able privilege, sometimes descriptive and value-neutral, and sometimes in a superficially positive light. As a direct slur against PWMD: Crazy as a word is directly and strongly tied to mental disability. It’s used as a slur directly against PWMD both to discredit and to marginalize. If a person with a history of mental illness wants to do something, for good or bad, that challenges something, that person’s thoughts, arguments, and rhetoric are dismissed because that person is “crazy”. If a PWMD is going through pain because of something unrelated to their mental state, culpability for the pain is placed solely on their being crazy. Even if their suffering is related to their disability, it is, in a catch-22, dismissed due to their “craziness”; the PWMD is expected to pull themselves up by their bootstraps if they want to be viewed as a valid human being. Examples: “I can’t believe Britney shaved her head. Crazy bitch.” “Not only is Dworkin cissexist, she’s fucking crazy!”As a way to discredit neurotypical people: Crazy is also often used to describe a neurotypical person that the speaker disagrees with. It’s used to discredit able-privileged persons by saying that they are actually mentally disabled – and what could be worse than that? Examples: “Tom Cruise is fucking crazy. Seriously, he’s batshit insane about Prozac, yelling at Matt Lauer and shit.” “Did you hear that Shirley broke up with Jim? She thought he was cheating on her.” “Yeah, she’s crazy, Jim’s a great guy.” As an all-purpose negative adjective: Crazy is often used – even, still, by me and other feminists – to negatively describe ideas, writing, or other nouns that the speaker finds disagreeable. Conservatives are “crazy”, acts of oppression are “crazy making” , this winter’s snow is “craziness”. This usage makes a direct connection between mental disability and bad qualities of all stripes, turning disability itself into a negative descriptor. Whether it means “bad” or “evil” or “outlandish” or “illogical” or “unthinkable”, it’s turning the condition of having a disability into an all-purpose negative descriptor. When using crazy as a synonym for violent, disturbing, or wrong, it’s saying that PWMD are violent, disturbing, wrong. It’s using disability as a rhetorical weapon. Examples:“They took the public option out of the health care plan? That’s fucking crazy!” “Yeah, Loretta went crazy on Jeanie last night. Gave her a black eye and everything.” Crazy as a positive amplifier: On the flip side, crazy is often used as a positive amplifier. Folks say that they are “crazy” about something or someone they love or like. But just because it’s positive doesn’t mean it’s a good thing. Crazy as a positive adjective still mean “overly” or “too much”. It’s meant to admit a slight lack of foresight or sense on the part of the speaker. Furthermore, a slur is a slur is a slur, no matter the context. Crazy is mostly, and overtly, used to mean “bad”, “silly”, “not worth paying attention to”, “too much”. Persons with mental illnesses are none of these things as a group. The positive use is not that positive, and it doesn’t absolve the mountains of bad usage. Examples: “I’ve been crazy busy lately, sorry I haven’t been around much.” “I’m just crazy about ice cream!” Crazy a destructive word, used to hurt people with mental disabilities. It’s used to discredit, to marginalize, to make sure that we feel shame for our disability and discourage self-care, to make sure that those of us brave enough to publicly identify as having mental disabilities are continually discredited.

### “Crippled”

#### Your usage of crippled is ableist

Kali 2010 (Brilliant Mind Broken Body: Living with Ehlers-Danlos Syndrome, “I am not your Metaphor,” October 17, 2010, <http://brilliantmindbrokenbody.wordpress.com/2010/10/17/i-am-not-your-metaphor/> (WL BFI)

This is something that has bothered me for a long time, and actually led to one of the very few spats between the boyfriend and I (quickly mended, once we both cooled off a bit).  I really hate the use of disability-based metaphors.  Hate them, hate them, hate them.  I believe that they’re part of what makes disability such a fearful, distorted, tragic cloud to people who are able-bodied. It’s all well and good to say they’re bad, but I think it makes more sense if I actually go through some of the more common disability metaphors so you can see what I mean. Crippled – this one gets used ALL THE TIME.  The city was crippled by an unexpected snowstorm.  The political entity is crippled by corruption.  So-and-so was crippled by a powerful emotion.  The poor are crippled by their lack of savings.  I’ve even heard references to people being crippled by scruples.  Here’s the thing – crippled has a pretty specific physical meaning – it’s a physical disability, usually related to walking.  What being a crip really means is that you have to get creative about how you do things and how you get around.  It doesn’t mean that you’re unable to do things!  I think these metaphors that tell us an entity or person is incapable of doing ANYTHING (or at least, anything useful) really emphasize that being crippled is being useless.  And as someone who identifies as a crip, I can tell you I’m damn well not useless!  I do a great many things, including my work at a legal center for people of limited means and my disability advocacy, that I think have a great impact on the world.

### “Deaf/Dumb”

#### Saying deaf/dumb perpetuates active violence against disabled bodies.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

4.5 ‘Deaf and Dumb’ For thousands of years, being a Deaf person has been associated with ‘dumbness’ or lack of intelligence; the use of the term ‘deaf and dumb’ is commonly used to label Deaf people (Carver, 1995). The Greek philosopher Aristotle (350 BC) is credited with being one of the first to associate ‘deaf’ with ‘dumb’: “accordingly, of persons destitute from birth of either sense, the blind are more intelligent than the deaf and dumb.” Over the years the word ‘dumb’ when used in this context became synonymous with ‘silent’. The American National Association of the Deaf point out two reasons why Deaf people consider this offensive. First, Deaf and hard of hearing people are by no means silent since they use sign language and lip-reading to communicate. Second, the word ‘dumb’ is misleading since it automatically implies that all Deaf people also have a learning difficulty (Gannon, 1981).

### “Differently Abled”

#### Saying “Differently abled” reinscribes active violence against disabled bodies

Wendell 1989 Susan, Summer 1989. “Toward a Feminist Theory of Disability,” Hypatia, Vol. 4, No. 4, Feminist Ethics & Medicine, pp. 104-124. (WL BFI)

One recent attempt to reduce the "otherness" of disabled people is the in-¶ troduction of the term, "differently-abled." I assume the point of using this¶ term is to suggest that there is nothing wrong with being the way we are, just¶ different. Yet to call someone "differently-abled" is much like calling her¶ "differently-coloured" or "differently-gendered." It says: "This person is not¶ the norm or paradigm of humanity." If anything, it increases the "otheress"¶ of disabled people, because it reinforces the paradigm of humanity as young,¶ strong and healthy, with all body parts working "perfectly," from which this¶ person is "different." Using the term "differently-abled" also suggests a (po-¶ lite? patronizing? protective? self-protective?) disregard of the special difficulties, struggles and suffering disabled people face. We are dis-abled. We live¶ with particular social and physical struggles that are partly consequences of¶ the conditions of our bodies and partly consequences of the structures and ex-¶ pectations of our societies, but they are struggles which only people with bod-¶ ies like ours experience.¶ The positive side of the term "differently-abled" is that it might remind the¶ able-bodied that to be disabled in some respects is not to be disabled in all re-¶ spects. It also suggests that a disabled person may have abilities that the able-¶ bodied lack in virtue of being able-bodied. Nevertheless, on the whole, the¶ term "differently-abled" should be abandoned, because it reinforces the able-¶ bodied paradigm of humanity and fails to acknowledge the struggles disabled¶ people face.¶ The problems of being "the other" to a dominant group are always politi-¶ cally complex. One solution is to emphasize similarities to the dominant¶ group in the hope that they will identify with the oppressed, recognize their¶ rights, gradually give them equal opportunities, and eventually assimilate¶ them. Many disabled people are tired of being symbols to the able-bodied,¶ visible only or primarily for their disabilities, and they want nothing more¶ than to be seen as individuals rather than as members of the group, "the disa-¶ bled." Emphasizing similarities to the able-bodied, making their disabilities¶ unnoticeable in comparison to their other human qualities may bring about¶ assimilation one-by-one. It does not directly challenge the able-bodied para-¶ digm of humanity, just as women moving into traditionally male arenas of¶ power does not directly challenge the male paradigm of humanity, although¶ both may produce a gradual change in the paradigms. In addition, assimila-¶ tion may be very difficult for the disabled to achieve. Although the able-bod-¶ ied like disabled tokens who do not seem very different from themselves, they¶ may need someone to carry the burden of the negative body as long as they continue to idealize and try to control the body. They may therefore resist the¶ assimilation of most disabled people.

### “Dwarf”

#### Your usage of dwarf as a metaphor for things inside and outside of debate is problematic and perpetuates ableism

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

Dwarf is of Germanic ancestry, coming ultimately from the proto-Germanic root ‘dhwergwhos’ meaning "tiny". In Old English it was ‘dweorg’ and meant "person of abnormally small stature". That remained the only meaning until the late 18th century, when, with the influence of German mythology, dwarf came also to mean "small, manlike creature that lives underground and works metal" (Crowley and Crowley, 2001). It is often used in fairytales such as “Snow White and the Seven Dwarves” and fantasy novels such as “The Lord of the Rings”, often to further the stereotype that disabled people are sinister or evil (Barnes, 1992, page 22) and implying that small people are from a different race. In America people self-identify with the word ‘Dwarf’, however in the U.K. the alternative terms ‘short person’ or ‘person with restricted growth’ are generally used.

### “Handicapped”

#### Your usage of the word handicapped is violent and derogatory

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

5.1 ‘Handicapped’ / ‘Mentally Handicapped’. The use of the term ‘handicapped’ to refer to a disabled person did not come about until 1915, when a writer used the phrase "the handicapped child". The term rapidly caught on and, by 1919, the educational journal “School and Society” was using the term ‘mentally handicapped’. Disabled people have long since rejected this term as derogatory. In the UK the national organisation of people with learning difficulties, People First, said that ‘mentally handicapped’ has become a term of insult. However these issues have still not dissuaded the non-user led organisation Mencap from using and perpetuating the term (People First, 1992).

### “Idiot”

#### Calling someone an idiot is ableist

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

Of the two lower ratings, ‘idiot’ derives from the Greek word ’idiotus’, meaning: "a person who does not take part in public life." Its usage can be traced back at least to the thirteenth century (Payne and Patton, 1981, page 31), although it does not appear in the 1611 King James Bible. However Shakespeare often uses it: “What’s here? the portrait of a blinking idiot, presenting me a schedule!” (The Merchant of Venice, act II, scene 9).

### “Lame”

#### Your usage of the word lame is problematic, ableist and reinforces active violence against disabled bodies.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

3.7 ‘Lame’. A 17th century word used to describe a person with a physical impairment (Little et al, 1969), which became associated with various negative connotations. For example, the term “lame duck” is often used to describe a competitor who does not stand a good chance of winning. Similarly a “lame excuse” is one which is not very convincing.

### “Midget”

#### Your usage of the word midget is problematic and reinforces active violence against disabled bodies.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

3.8 ‘Dwarf’ and ‘Midget.’ These words have been commonly used to refer to people with restricted growth. Midget was formed from the word midge, meaning: "small fly", and ‘-et’, so that a midget is etymologically a "very small, small fly". It was first used 1848 in Canada with the meaning "sand fly". By 1865, midget was being used to describe a “very small person”, and by 1884 it referred to small people who were exhibited in freak shows and circuses.

### “Moron”

#### Calling someone a moron is problematic and ableist

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

‘Moron’ comes from Greek word ‘moros’ meaning: “foolish, stupid.” It was coined as a scientific term by Dr. Henry H. Goddard and proposed to the American Association for the Study of the Feebleminded by him in 1910. It was accepted by the Association and described a person with a mental age between eight and twelve years and who possessed an I.Q. below 75.” It was the highest rating, the two lower ratings being ‘imbecile’ and ‘idiot’. ‘Moron’ was quickly adopted in common English to mean: “fool”, and it is no longer in scientific use (Crowley and Crowley, 2001).

### “People with Disabilities”

#### Saying “people with disabilities” is problematic, you should use first person language instead

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

The British civil rights movement has rejected the term ‘people with disabilities’, as it implies that the disabling effect rests within the individual person rather than from society. The term ‘disabilities’ when used in this context refers to a person’s medical condition and thus confuses disability with impairment. In addition it denies the political or ‘disability identity’ which emerges from the disabled people’s civil rights movement in a similar way to the Black and Gay political identities (Barnes, 1992, page 43; Oliver and Barnes, 1998, page 18). Indeed some are now going further and writing Disabled with a capital ‘D’, in order to emphasise the word’s political connotations. The Deaf people’s movement largely does not identify with the term ‘disabled people’, instead adopting a cultural model and defining themselves as a linguistic minority. Corker (2002) defines Deaf people as “that group of people with hearing impairments who are excluded from the dominant areas of social and cultural reproduction by the perpetuation of a phonocentric world-view.” Deaf people too have adopted a capital ‘D’ in order to politicise the word.

### “Spaz/Spastic”

#### Saying spastic is problematic and reinforces active violence against disabled bodies

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

6.2 ‘Spastic’. The word ‘spastic’, originally a medical term defining a specific type of cerebral palsy, deserves particular mention here. First used in 1753, it derives from the Latin word ‘spasticus’. This in turn comes from the Greek word ‘spastikos’ meaning “drawing in”, presumably referring to muscle contraction (Little et al, 1969). In 1861 English orthopedic surgeon Dr. William John Little published the first paper describing ‘spastic diplegia’, referring to: “the universal spastic rigidity sometimes produced at later periods of existence” (Little, 1861), and thus associated the word with the impairment (Schleichkorn, 1987). The impairment was originally called ‘Little's Disease’, and Sir William Osler later coined the term ‘cerebral palsy’ at the end of the nineteenth century (Osler, 1889). In the UK it was adopted in 1952 and used by the organisation then known as ‘The Spastic Society’ for 42 years (Scope, 2001). During this time they ran many advertising campaigns that focused on the impairment, which in turn perpetuated the medical model of disability and charity perspectives, and were designed to invoke feelings of pity in order to fundraise (Hevey, 1992, pages 38-39). The negative imagery that they perpetuated led to the word becoming a playground insult. After nine years of research, the organisation changed its name to ‘Scope’ in 1994 (Scope, 2001).

### “Special Needs”

#### **Saying special needs is dehumanizing and creates disability as the other**

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

9.1 ‘Special Needs’. The phrase ‘special needs’ came about as an attempt to demedicalise the labelling of disabled children to what was hoped to be less negative labelling based on educational need (Reiser and Mason, 1990, page 88). In 1978 the Warnock Report introduced the concept of “Special Educational Needs” to replace the categories of impairment that were used previously. However the concept still retains the assumption that disabled children were “less than human” and required segregated provision (Barnes, 1991, page 33). Micheline Mason argues: “we consider disability to be a norm within every society, borne out by statistics, and we want our needs to be taken into account as normal needs. It seems questionable that even 20% of young people can have special needs. It seems ridiculous that 45% of young people within inner city areas have special needs” (Reiser and Mason, 1990). The ‘needs’ referred to here are typically determined by professional assessment, rather than by disabled people themselves. Often these needs are commonplace, for example disabled children ‘need’ to receive a decent education, just like any other children. However “the disabling culture transforms ordinary human needs into special needs and corrupts the identity of disabled children into special needs children” (Finklestein and Stuart, 1996). Therefore services based on the social model of disability which address societal barriers would not draw distinctions and segregate people via words such as ‘special’. ‘Special needs’ is now being used as a term of insult, for example British comedian Harry Enfield used it to describe a boy character in order to instil some level of fear of what the boy might do. This is also an indication that whatever term is used to describe a group who are unwanted, not accepted and derided can become derogatory and used as a term of abuse over time. For example the word ‘gay’ is now used as a way of saying something is dire.

### The “X”

#### **Your rhetoric essentializes the disabled experience as well as functions to objectify crip bodies.**

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

4.2 Denial of Individuality. Phrases that dehumanise and objectify disabled people, denying individuality, are also regarded as oppressive by the movement (Barnes, 1992, page 43). Examples include: ‘the disabled’, ‘the blind’, ‘the deaf’ and ‘the deaf and dumb’. Various acts such as the Poor Law (1601) use such terminology: “And also competent Sums of Money for and towards the necessary Relief of the Lame, Impotent, Old, Blind...” There are also numerous examples of this from the bible: "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind...” (Luke 14:13). The acceptable alternatives are, of course, disabled people, blind people, Deaf people, etc.

### “Wheelchair Bound”

#### **Your usage of the word wheelchair bound is problematic and creates misconceptions of disabled bodies which justifies active violence against them**

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

Similarly terms like ‘housebound’, ‘wheelchair bound’ and “confined to a wheelchair” are emotive and inaccurate, since wheelchairs are pieces of equipment that empower rather than restrict (Corcoran, 1977). In addition, many wheelchair users can walk short distances, often using mobility aids other than their wheelchairs, and are not therefore attached to them.

# Language Cards

#### And, using disabling language appropriates the lived experiences of others for our own use.

Ben-Moshe 2005 (“Lame Idea”: Disabling Language in the Classroom,” in Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability into the University Classroom and Curriculum, <Http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf)> (WL BFI)

Using disability as a metaphor to represent only negative aspects of a situation is problematic. It is made worse by the fact that blindness, deafness, paralysis, etc., are not floating signifiers, but have real referents behind them—people with disabilities. When using disabling language, we do not only de-value the lived experience of people with disabilities, but we also appropriate these lived experiences for our own use. This means that disabled people have been presented as socially flawed able-bodied people, not as people with our own identities. As responsible instructors, we must ask ourselves, when was the last time we discussed disability in our classrooms, not as metaphors, but as lived experiences? The consequences of this exclusion are that most students know disability only metaphorically (unless they have disabilities themselves), and that we fail them as teachers by not providing descriptions of what disability actually means to the people who embody it. As critical teachers, we should counteract the use of disability as a metaphor in everyday language, in media and in literary representations. This pedagogical goal can be achieved by introducing more complex accounts of the disability experience through autobiographies, guest speakers or critical accounts by people with disabilities or by scholars of disability studies.

#### Using disabling language is problematic and perpetuates misconceptions about disability, while also otherizing disabled bodies.

Ben-Moshe 2005 (“Lame Idea”: Disabling Language in the Classroom,” in Building Pedagogical Curb Cuts: Incorporating Disability into the University Classroom and Curriculum, <Http://www.syr.edu/gradschool/pdf/resourcebooksvideos/Pedagogical%20Curb%20Cuts.pdf)> (WL BFI)

We learn about disability through everyday use of language. In the same way that racist or sexist attitudes, whether implicit or explicit, are acquired through the “normal” learning process, so too are negative assumptions about disabilities and the people who are labeled as having them. Our notions of people who are blind, deaf or labeled as mentally retarded come into play when we use disabling phrases, and these notions are usually far from accurate. They do not convey the complexity of living in a society that regards people with disabilities as the Other on the basis of perceived mentally or bodily difference. The use of disability as a metaphor perpetuates false beliefs about the nature of impairment and disability. People who are blind, for example, do not lack in knowledge; they simply have different ways of obtaining it. Paralysis does not necessarily imply lack of mobility, stagnancy or dependence since there are augmentative instruments, such as wheelchairs and personal aids, that secure independence and mobility. The continued use of disabling language in the classroom perpetuates ignorance and misconceptions in regards to the lived experience of people with disabilities.

#### Your use of language actively denies the social construction of disability and continually operates as a mechanism to otherize disabled bodies

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

Over the years a large amount of terminology concerning disability has evolved which denies the social construction of disability and is now considered offensive by many people in the British disabled people’s civil rights movement. These terms have originated and been perpetuated by the likes of the medical, religious and welfare professions. Many are patriarchal in nature, evoking the notion that disabled people need looking after. Others are based on false premises that have since been disproved. The language that people use reflects what they think and can influence how they deal with situations. If they behave as if the problem is with the individual, they will take a different approach than if they regard the problem as being with the attitudes, systems and practices that create disabling barriers. Therefore it is important to re-examine their origins and evaluate their meanings and connotations today. The “Shorter Oxford English Dictionary of Historical Principles” (Little et al, 1969) is used to look-up dates when words were first used and whether they were derived from Greek or Latin words. In addition a number of key texts are referenced in order to how strongly some of these terms have been embedded in the English language.

# Links

### ADA

#### **The ADA doesn’t actually do anything because changing infrastructure to help only “a few” disabled people is too costly and inconvenient.**

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

What does a curricular cripistemology look like if the subterfuge of normalcy does not dictate the socially anemic goals of inclusionism—or that which Linda Ware has provocatively termed “(in)exclusion” (Ideology, 2)? Perhaps these reformist efforts have come on the heels of developments during the Clintonian era wherein previously inclusive legislation had to be revitalized and newly enforced. The implementation of more flexible accessibility followed implemen-tation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1992) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004). Both of these legislative reforms were necessary to update prior failures of inclusive legislation from two decades earlier, including the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) and the Architectural Barriers Act (1968). These policy-based efforts to mandate the inclusion of students with disabilities under neoliberal principles of integration opened up U.S. education to those with developmental disabilities and “multi-handicaps” who had been actively segregated from public education with their peers since the early 1900s and continuing into the early 1970s. Nevertheless, the results of inclusionism have been incomplete because neoliberal efforts evolve around beliefs that mainstreaming would largely require retrofitting architectural environments in order to bring crip/queer students into buildings outfitted for their able-bodied peers. Further, the political pressures of the disability rights movements to achieve meaningful integration ultimately rely on the neoliberal approaches they professedly critique. By advocating for the right to be included alongside their able-bodied peers, activists in the 1980s and 1990s used a normalizing framework to give weight to their critique of exclusion. They argue that disabled people are like everyone else and, therefore, deserve the right to pursue normative practices in tandem with their non-disabled peers. In other words, a disability rights-based model of policy intervention relies upon assimilationist claims in order to gain access to key neoliberal institutions such as education.

### Aristotle

#### The educational system neglects to call out the faults of those who have been deemed important by history, these types of acts make us all complicit within oppression.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

4.5 ‘Deaf and Dumb’ For thousands of years, being a Deaf person has been associated with ‘dumbness’ or lack of intelligence; the use of the term ‘deaf and dumb’ is commonly used to label Deaf people (Carver, 1995). The Greek philosopher Aristotle (350 BC) is credited with being one of the first to associate ‘deaf’ with ‘dumb’: “accordingly, of persons destitute from birth of either sense, the blind are more intelligent than the deaf and dumb.” Over the years the word ‘dumb’ when used in this context became synonymous with ‘silent’. The American National Association of the Deaf point out two reasons why Deaf people consider this offensive. First, Deaf and hard of hearing people are by no means silent since they use sign language and lip-reading to communicate. Second, the word ‘dumb’ is misleading since it automatically implies that all Deaf people also have a learning difficulty (Gannon, 1981).

### Antiblackness

\*Also functions as links to omission of black bodies

#### To be normal is to be white, historically black bodies have been deemed disabled as a method of exclusion.

Reid and Knight 2006. Reid, D. K., and M. G. Knight. "Disability Justifies Exclusion of Minority Students: A Critical History Grounded in Disability Studies." Educational Researcher 35, no. 6 (2006): 18-23. doi:10.3102/0013189x035006018. (WL BFI)

In this section, we discuss the ideology of normalcy and how this legacy has made it seem natural to see students of color and those living in poverty as "Other" by associating them with disability (Gallagher, 1999). By ideology, we mean systems of representa- tions-beliefs, images, and myths-that mediate our understand- ings of every aspect of life in profound but often unconscious ways (Althusser, 1971). Systemic discrimination provides an example of the power of ideologies: Although discrimination against all groups is illegal, it nevertheless persists. Consequently, some DS scholars (e.g., Brantlinger, 2004; Ware, 2004) argue that it is unlikely that discrimination resides in societal structures alone. Because the problem of disproportionality is limited to the high- incidence, psychometrically defined categories of disability (Harry & Klingner, 2006) and is not apparent when impairments are medically defined (e.g., cerebral palsy; Ferguson, 2001), we see how the belief systems rooted in the ideology of normalcy detri- mentally position students with these attributed impairments. Its strong association with abnormality and monstrosity made disability the quintessential marker of hierarchical relations used to rationalize inequality, discrimination, and exclusion. As Mitchell and Snyder (2003) explain, what our society considers the normal standard-Whiteness, middle-class or greater affluence, ability, and so forth-has no need of definition. What needs to be marked and narrated is what people think of as outside the norm, that is, the person of color, the disabled body or mind, the person living in poverty. Historically, non-Whites, women, the lower social classes, and homosexuals routinely have been marked through medicalization and pathologized (Smith & Erevelles, 2004). As one ex- ample, now seemingly preposterous medical diagnoses such as "Drapetomania" (a disease that caused slaves to run away) were constructed to label Blacks as defective (Baynton, 2001). Today, disabled people continue to be considered defective and are more segregated educationally and socially than any other minority (Longmore, 2003). Because many teachers and the public judge students as acceptable or unacceptable (i.e., normal or abnormal; Youdell, 2003) according to a set of standards that conform to the historical White European ideal, they (a) uphold Eurocentric and ableist concep- tions of knowledge and decorum (Ferguson, 2001); (b) consider the dialects of American Blacks and Latinas/os inferior to Standard American English (Delpit, 2003); and (c) believe that specialized instructional techniques are warranted for students who do not do well in school, often students of color, the poor, and those labeled disabled (Bartolome, 2003). These so-called normal expectations justify teachers' holding students to standards that may not be fa- miliar to those of non-European descent or even possible for stu- dents with impairments. Because most people in contemporary society perceive students with impairments as qualitatively distinct (i.e., empirically abnormal; Shapiro, 1999), "hunting for disabil- ity" in students-referral, diagnosis, labeling, sorting, and reme- diating-appears objective, fair, and benevolent (Baker, 2002). One result of perceiving "different" others through this technical- rational lens (i.e., as defective) is that it seems natural to many Americans that students of color, the poor, and immigrants lie outside the predominant norm and, therefore, belong in special education.

#### Disabled students of color are segregated into special education classrooms at vastly higher rates compared to their white peers.

Reid and Knight 2006. Reid, D. K., and M. G. Knight. "Disability Justifies Exclusion of Minority Students: A Critical History Grounded in Disability Studies." Educational Researcher 35, no. 6 (2006): 18-23. doi:10.3102/0013189x035006018. (WL BFI)

What serves to perpetuate oppression, then, are widespread conceptions and attitudes about race, class, gender, and disability and the attendant ideologies that shape these systems of (dis)advantage. One example of the impact of the ideology of normalcy is the fact that students of color and poverty receiving LD, Mentally ~~Retarded~~ (MR), and Emotionally Disturbed (ED) labels are segregated within schools at substantially higher rates than are their White counterparts (Losen & Orfield, 2002). This segregation continues to be condoned and defended by educators and the public alike, not on the basis of the students' race (which would be illegal) but because they are labeled disabled (Ferri & Connor) In essence, marking students of color as disabled allows their continued segregation under a seemingly natural and justifiable label. Because it makes segregation seem appropriate and even prefer- able, the enduring belief that impairment and disability are empirical facts is at the center of the disproportionality problem. These "facts" are, however, social constructions (Linton, 1998) whose de- finitions change through time (Longmore & Umansky, 2001) and across cultures (Kalyanpur & Harry)

#### White students are often diagnosed with more socially acceptable labels, whereas black disabled students are more likely to be labeled with more severe disabilities.

Reid and Knight 2006. Reid, D. K., and M. G. Knight. "Disability Justifies Exclusion of Minority Students: A Critical History Grounded in Disability Studies." Educational Researcher 35, no. 6 (2006): 18-23. doi:10.3102/0013189x035006018. (WL BFI)

However, critically examining policies and practices surrounding who is identified as LD unearths evidence of inequities in educational opportunities for Blacks and Latinas/os with respect to both placement and assessment. Black students are disproportionately represented in special education in general and, in elementary and high school, in the LD category (Warner, Dede, Garvan, & Conway, 2002), regardless of their socioeconomic class. Conversely, White middle-class students are identified in the spectrum of disabilities in ways directly connected to the race-class intersection. Middle- and upper-middle-class parents have the in- come to pay for expensive testing that allows their children to be labeled with socially acceptable labels that imply a medicalized, neurological substrate, such as dyslexic (Carrier, 1986). Conversely, less affluent Whites and minority students typically receive the less palatable label LD, the label conferred by schools that represents eligibility for special education. Nevertheless, if students who are identified as LD (including the so-called dyslexics) are increasing in representation in high schools (Artiles, Rueda, Salazar, & Higareda, 2005) and not in postsecondary institutions (Henderson, 2001), then the issue of underrepresentation of Blacks and other ethnic and linguistic minorities as disabled students substantiates institutional exclusion at the postsecondary level.

### Changing Debate

#### The affirmative’s talk of changing education is still a blatant refusal to critically examine and change the way in which we engage in the debate space right now. The debate space, right here right now is a unique format to introduce new pedagogies of accessibility.

Richter 2015. Richter, Zahari. "2 Disability analyses of Policy Debate." (dis/qu)iesence. July 23, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://zachrichter.weebly.com/awkward-gestures-blog/-2-disability-analyses-of-policy-debate>. (WL BFI)

1. The Inaccessible game. One part of my experience with policy debate is a reflection of my experiences as a disabled gamer. Like with the Nintendo 64 controller or later, the keyboard or mouse, I just could not figure out how to hold the controller. Intercollegiate debate also has an inaccessible interface. Video game controllers: expect you to move in certain ways, to hold the mouse and hold multiple fields of attention, attain a certain level of game space feeling and knowledge with the visuals, sounds and uses of the controller. Debate, similarly, relies on nonverbal and verbal engagements with the judge or person opposite them in the room---these engagements have steeper learning curves for some than others because communication itself is a culturally soaked activity. Like using a mouse is bad on my dexterity, using a face is bad for my communicative impairments. I did my best debating when I could shake my body into an emotional-speech inferno. When I was allowed to not use a flow, I gave better speeches. The multiple activities of taking notes and speech preparation illegitimately favor those with certain types of spatial and study based intelligence and brutally punish those whose learning styles or form of intelligence departs from debate norms. Video games also, would punish players for incomplete knowledge or use of the controls, but in video games, I would enter cheat codes because it is better to see some of the game than be held back terribly due to dexterity and spatial limits. Debate sees an unusual part of the academy where highly scholarly activities are taking place, but note-takers are not available and assistance with the material or the translation of it into other forms is also not available. In this way, like video games, debate on the basis of their justification of competitiveness builds inaccessibility into its game. The inaccessibility of the debate space in a broad way is due to the twin combinations of institutional over-arrogance: the snobbery of knowledge in the academy, the brutishness of professional sports. A true conversation has to be had about inaccessibility in the debate world, about whether organizations such as the NDT should advertise that they exclude disabled people on the basis of not having access services built in. Campbell has written about inaccessibility as having negative health effects upon the disabled, it also has negative social effects, isolating disabled people for over-reacting to the elitist condition of the place. Then, most debaters in the debate world who are disabled hide it because of the scorn placed upon it. And even this try at hiding sometimes falls apart and they are left having to scrounge for excuses. Compliance is hardly a step. Disabled people are widely excluded from debate on the basis of the narcissism among debaters that think of their activity as a touchstone for future leaders. Accessibility would bring in a far wider population and further activate debate as tool for wider radicalization. The affirmation of the disabled person in the debate space could open prisons, nursing homes and hospitals to participate, then informing and persuasively empowering other forsaken members of the disabled world. 2. Debate as trauma: how debate traumatizes and how debate changes trauma. Debate or the competitive policy debate that I participated in almost always takes place in a school and involves contestants speaking loudly and often emotionally at each other about politics at a high and fast volume. This amounts to the taking of the childhood classroom intimidation to its furthest level; in a debate when you make a mistake you may anger up to four other people in the room, staring at you. The rapid-fire exchanges, the emotionality of debate are part of what make it memorable but also how it gives the formative childhood traumas of the school house a new lease on life through repetitions of scolding by both classmate and teacher. The fast speech also offers an air of intensity. The hyperbolous building upon adolescent schoolyard nightmares by debate with the high degree of academic veneer coating its language, result in debate losses seeming to resonate back to failures of intellect that put into question self-value that was already fecked by repeated miscommunications.  For many of us, debate rounds on important things echo in our dreams for years afterward. Then, the echoing of traumatic debate experiences across time can be felt in the form of how the voice and body react to argumentative encounters. Hostile debate norms literally code the reactions former debaters when they get into an argument. A fierceness can often be heard when you hear a former debater arguing. For the debater, who has used interpersonal communication as a fencing stick for two competitors to brandish intellectually against each other, to show weakness in an interaction is to lose. Debate expectations and rules seem to stick to the body; even when debate life is filled with critiques of those rules. The traumatic stickiness of the habits of the debate world as well as its psychosocial intensity justify all the more clearly why debate norms need to be overhauled.

### Classroom Aides

#### Adding aides in the classroom doesn’t solve, if anything it’s a link to the criticism.

Hehir 2002. Hehir, Thomas. "Eliminating Ableism in Education." Harvard Educational Review 72, no. 1 (2002): 1-33. doi:10.17763/haer.72.1.03866528702g2105. (WL BFI)

In my view, the controversy around the provision of O&M raises broader questions about ableism in education. I am becoming increasingly concerned with the way I see school districts, and at times parents, respond to the needs of students with significant disability by assigning them a full-time aide. Adrian Ashe, a blind woman who teaches at Wellesley College, cautions, “An aide is not (or at least should not be) a chaperone, an administrative spy, a surrogate parent, or a personal servant. Any such role turns the aide into a shield or a barrier between the disabled student and his or her nondisabled peers” (Ferguson & Ashe, 1989, p. 129). These concerns are compounded when aides take the place of teachers and compromise the quality of instruction. One of my graduate students at the Harvard Graduate School of Education spent a semester observing a child with significant disabilities who was included in general education classes with the support of a full-time aide. As a highly experienced and skilled special educator, she was deeply concerned that the middle school student had not learned to read. After careful observation, she concluded that he had not beentaughtto read; instead, the aide viewed it as his job to read the material to the boy. Therefore, despite the fact that, according to her assessment, he had normal receptive language and could fully under-stand language, and was in a regular classroom where significant resources were being spent on his education, this boy was being deprived of the oppor-tunity to learn to read. Assigning full-time aides to children with disabilities rather than, as has been the case with blind children, teaching them to get around independ-ently through O&M reflects, in my view, deep cultural prejudices about sig-nificant disabilities. That is, it suggests that people with significant disabilities are weak and incapable of doing things on their own. The reaction of many educators to the integration of significantly disabled students into typi-cal schools and classrooms is to demand full-time aides. For example, when Penny Ford prevailed in her complaint with the OCR to have Joe attend a regular kindergarten, the “negotiated agreement” between the school and the Chicago Board of Education was to provide Joe with a full-time aide. Penny recalls her discomfort with the agreement: “I found it repugnant that my son’s rights were a matter of negotiation. He didn’t need an aide. All he needed was for someone to flip pages for him. Another kid could do that! He already knew how to read. He also needed some help in the bathroom. That’s not a full-time job” (P. Ford, personal communication, October 2001). Penny’s initial discomfort was prescient. When Joe showed up for school on the first day, he was denied entrance to the classroom because the aide had not cleared all the personnel hurdles. Already the object of two years of struggle over his entrance into the school attended by his sisters and friends, Joe Ford spent the first day of first grade in the school office, not in the classroom. It seemed the school could not conceive of approaching his education directly without the intermediary of a paraprofessional.

### Dyslexic Debaters

#### Dyslexic individuals are automatically excluded from policy debate due to community norms and lack of accessibility.

Nelson and Miller 2016. Natalie Nelson & Joshua H. Miller. Dyslexia and Debate. National Journal Of Speech & Debate Volume 4: Issue 3 April 2016, Symposium: Accessibility, Disability & Debate [Http://Site.Theforensicsfiles.Com/Njsd.4-3.Pdf](http://site.theforensicsfiles.com/NJSD.4-3.pdf) (WL BFI)

This contribution to the conversion about disability, accessibility, and debate focuses on dyslexia—the most common learning disability. Dyslexia is defined as “a specific learning disability that is neurobiological in origin. It is characterized by difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities.”2 Dyslexic debaters may not be able to recognize instantly or automatically as many of the words in the text as others. They may struggle to sound out letters and words. In addition, they will stumble over words, try to memorize the way words should look, or guess at the pronunciation of the words. Failed attempts to identify words may result in error. Because of this, individuals with dyslexia may find it difficult to build their word-reading abilities and this may impact reading comprehension. As a result, certain practices in debate, such speed-reading, may be problematic for dyslexic individuals. In this entry, we discuss how, in certain cases, speed-reading might be inaccessible and conclude by offering a few suggestions that could increase the accessibility of debate for dyslexic individuals. Certainly, this entry should not be read as attempting to cover all of the issues in debate in regards to disability and accessibility. Emphasis on speed might deter dyslexic individuals from participating in policy debate. If dyslexic individuals do choose to participate, they may face barriers to being able to participate fully. According to O’Brien, Mansfield, Legge, the maximum reading speed of a dyslexic individual is less than a non-dyslexic individual.3 Tops and colleagues concur and indicate that dyslexia is associated with slower and more effortful reading than would be expected of someone who is not dyslexic.4 Moreover, dyslexia is associated with phonological difficulties, which means that dyslexic debaters will have more difficulty speaking clearly than non-dyslexic debaters. Because dyslexic readers stumble over words, may omit words from sentences, and fail to identify the correct words in sentences, their speaking may be much less comprehensible than non-dyslexic readers,6 especially at high rates of speed. If judges value clarity, dyslexic debaters may not be able to satisfy judge expectations. Altering the fonts, font sizes, and spacing used in evidence might help make debate a little more accessible for dyslexic individuals. Rello and Baeza-Yates found that a significant correlation exists between font type and the ability for people with dyslexia to read a given text.7 According to their study, Helvetica, Courier, Arial, Verdana and Computer Modern Unicode constitute the best fonts for people with dyslexia. Moreover, these researchers found that dyslexic readers can read Courier and Helvetica faster while maintaining their accuracy. Slightly increasing the size of the font used for debate evidence also enables dyslexic individuals to read more efficiently and accurately.8 Furthermore, increasing spacing between letters and words can improve the accessibility of debate for dyslexic readers. Zorzi et al. for example, found a significant correlation between increase letter spacing and improvement in the reading speech of dyslexic individuals.9 According to their study, the extra spacing between letters decreases the influence of crowding, which enables quicker and more accurate letter and word recognition. In addition, according to Evett and Brown, some dyslexics prefer to read black text on a yellow background or dark blue text on a light blue background.10 The use of 14-point font is generally viewed as more accessible for dyslexic and visually impaired individuals than 12-point font (or smaller fonts than that).

### Education

\*Some cards labeled under self sufficiency and UQ also work here.

#### **Ableism plays out in education, the common ideology is that the more students can hide their disability, and act normal the better. This means that ableism manifests itself at the earliest phases of socialization.**

Hehir 2002. Hehir, Thomas. "Eliminating Ableism in Education." Harvard Educational Review 72, no. 1 (2002): 1-33. doi:10.17763/haer.72.1.03866528702g2105. (WL BFI)

Applied to schooling and child development, ableist preferences become particularly apparent. From an ableist perspective, the devaluation of disability results in societal attitudes that uncritically assert that it is better for a child to walk than roll, speak than sign, read print than read Braille, spell in-dependently than use a spell-check, and hang out with nondisabled kids as opposed to other disabled kids, etc. In short, in the eyes of many educators and society, it is preferable for disabled students to do things in the same manner as nondisabled kids. Certainly, given a world that has not been designed with the disabled in mind, being able to perform in a manner that is similar to that of nondis-abled children gives disabled children distinct advantages. If efficient ambu-lation is possible, a child who has received the help he needs to walk is at an advantage in a barrier-filled world. Similarly, a child with a mild hearing loss who has been given the amplification and speech therapy she needs may have little difficulty functioning in a regular classroom. However, ableist assumptions become dysfunctional when the educational and developmental services provided to disabled children focus inordinately on the characteristics of their disability to the exclusion of all else, when changing disability becomes the overriding focus of service providers and, at times, parents. Narratives of disabled people and their parents are replete with examples of how changing disability became the focus of their young lives and how such a focus denied them the opportunities taken for granted by nondisabled people. These narratives speak to the deep cultural preju-dices against disability that they had to endure from an early age — that dis-ability was negative and tragic and that “overcoming” disability was the only valued result (Ferguson & Asch, 1989; Rousso, 1984). In No Pity, his history of the disability civil rights movement, Joseph Shapiro (1994) chronicles the dominant cultural responses to disability. One model is exemplified by the poster children of the muscular dystrophy tele-thon, which he refers to as “Tiny Tims” — “the idea that disabled people are childlike, dependent, and in need of charity and pity” (p. 14). Cyndi Jones, a disability activist and former poster child, argues that “the poster child says it’s not okay to be disabled...butitsays if you just donate money the dis-abled child will go away” (p. 14). Marilynn Phillips, a professor at Morgan State University who has studied images of poster children, recalls that the image of the valiant “crippled” child on crutches learning to walk emerged in the mid-1950s. She argues that children like herself who had polio before a vaccine was developed were an affront to the postwar faith in medical tech-nology. Disabled children were now “damaged goods” who had to try harder to deserve charity and respect (p. 15). According to Shapiro (1994), the belief that disability could be overcome led to the rise of the other dominant image of disability: the inspirational dis-abled person, or the “supercrip.” Shapiro argues that this image is deeply moving to many nondisabled people and the press, but is widely regarded as oppressive to most disabled people. The extensive press coverage of a blind man who recently climbed Mt. Everest is a good example of the supercrip im-age. Cyndi Jones argues that, like the image of the poster child, this image implies that a disabled person is presumed deserving of pity — instead of re-spect — until the person proves capable of overcoming disability through ex-traordinary feats (Shapiro, 1994). Both of these dominant stereotypes of dis-ability, “Tiny Tims” and “supercrips,” have at their core ableist perspectives, the failure to accept and value disabled people as they are. I contend that negative cultural assumptions about disability continue to have a negative influence on the education of children with disabilities. The pervasiveness of ableist assumptions in the education of these children not only reinforces prevailing prejudices against disability but may very well con-tribute to low levels of educational attainment and employment. School time spent devoted to activities associated with changing disability may take away from the time needed to learn academic material. In addition, the ingrained prejudice against performing activities in ways that might be more efficient for disabled people but that are different from how nondisabled perform them, such as reading Braille or using sign language, may add to educational deficits. There is considerable emerging evidence that unquestioned ableist assumptions are handicapping disabled children and are a cause of educa-tional inequities.

#### Hehir further adds that

Hehir 2003. Thomas Hehir. Beyond inclusion: educators' 'ableist' assumptions about students with disabilities compromise the quality of instruction. School Administrator, March, 2003 [www.kidstogether.org/BEHeard/Beyond%20inclusion-ableist.doc](http://www.kidstogether.org/BEHeard/Beyond%20inclusion-ableist.doc) (WL BFI)

Ingrained Prejudice. The lens of ableism offers a useful perspective through which the future of inclusion and indeed all of special education can be considered. The various definitions of ableism in the literature share common origins that are rooted in the discrimination and oppression that many disabled people experience in society. Applied to schooling and child development, ableist preferences become particularly apparent. From an ableist perspective, the devaluation of disability results in societal attitudes that uncritically assert that it is better for disabled students to do things in the same manner as nondisabled kids. Certainly, in a world that has not been designed with the disabled in mind, being able to perform like nondisabled children gives disabled children distinct advantages. However, ableist assumptions become dysfunctional when the focus of educational programs becomes changing disability. School time devoted to activities associated with changing disability may take away from the time needed to learn academic material. The ingrained prejudice against performing activities in ways that are more efficient for disabled people may add to educational deficits. Considerable evidence points to unquestioned ableist assumptions that are handicapping the education of children with disabilities and resulting in educational inequities. Despite clear evidence of the benefits of sign language, deaf children were taught for many years to lip read and speak and prohibited from using sign language in an effort to make them appear more "normal." In recent years, schools have failed to teach visually impaired children to use Braille and instead provided them with taped books or large text books based on the perception that these are more normal ways to read. The devaluation of this disability-specific mode of learning has resulted in increasing levels of functional illiteracy among the visually impaired. The common practice in many school districts of assigning full-rime aides to children with multiple disabilities rather than teaching them to become independent reflects deep ableist prejudices about significant disabilities. It suggests that people with significant disabilities are weak and incapable of doing things on their own. While many aides do important and necessary work, their presence can have many negative effects. They can become a barrier between the disabled student and his or her nondisabled peers and take the place of teachers in ways that compromise the quality of instruction.

### Feminism

#### Feminism was founded on the eugenic policies of disabled individuals, the beginning of feminist epistemology scribed disability onto the bodies of anyone who wasn’t a white women.

Withers 2015 Withers, A.J. "How Disablist Western Ideas of 'Self-Determination' Undermine Social Justice and 5 Ways to Make It Right." Everyday Feminism. March 15, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/03/self-determination-disablist/>. (WL BFI)

First wave feminism, which began in the late 19th century and encompassed the women’s suffrage movement, came out of new discourses emerging around gender as well as sexuality and race. This began, according to Lennard J. Davis as a result of the emergence of eugenics. Eugenics is the belief in the selective reproduction of “desirable” people and began in the mid- nineteenth century. Queers, working class people, people of color, women, and the people that we still think of as disabled today were cast as feebleminded – as disabled. As middle-class white women were defined as disabled, privileged women chose to establish themselves as something other than disabled in order to build a successful rights movement in the era of eugenics. The early feminist movement not only established (certain) women as nondisabled, it also worked to reinforce oppression on the groups that they left behind: racialized, disabled, queer, and working class people.

#### **Feminism/Reproductive justice built its movement on deciding who was too disabled to participate within its borders. Any permutation on the link is severance because the epistemology of the affirmative is interconnected with the death of disabled bodies. This also functions as a disadvantage to the permutation.**

Withers 2015 Withers, A.J. "How Disablist Western Ideas of 'Self-Determination' Undermine Social Justice and 5 Ways to Make It Right." Everyday Feminism. March 15, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/03/self-determination-disablist/>. (WL BFI) – This card is kind of tricky because in order to win the link here you have to win that reproductive justice is bound to different strains of feminist thought.

Second wave feminism, which began in the 1960s, while no longer publicly advocating for eugenics, built much of its movement on the principles of equality and choice, primarily the choice to have an abortion. Reproductive Justice. When the “pro-choice” movement emerged, it was (and too often still is) largely by and for middle-class, non-disabled white women. At the same time that the pro-choice movement was building momentum, in the early 1970s, hundreds of thousands of women – primarily women of color and/or disabled women – were sterilized without their consent in Canada and the United States. Angela Davis writes: “During the early abortion rights campaign, it was too frequently assumed that legal abortions provided a viable alternative to the myriad problems posed by poverty. As if having fewer children could create more jobs, higher wages, better schools, etc.” Reproductive justice, on the other hand, works (at least in theory) for people not only have access to abortion services – which are essential, but also for access to reproductive healthcare in general. It challenges the denial, repression and/or exotification of disabled women and/or women of colour’s sexualities. It also means working to eliminate poverty – which restricts reproductive freedom on a very material level. True choice does not always exist where one knows that there might not be enough food for the child. Reproductive justice also means working to eliminate the mass incarceration of men of colour which keeps families from forming and tears them apart – one of the many ways that eugenics operates today. And ultimately reproductive justice means the undoing of all systems domination and oppression. Unfortunately, however, reproductive justice doesn’t actually look like this (yet). Feminists who advocate for reproductive justice have not expressed outrage over the continued denial of the access to reproductive health care – including access to abortion and the eugenic pressures on disabled women not to have children. Pre-Natal Testing and Eugenics. For many women, freedom of reproductive choice is also threatened by the prevalence of pre-natal testing and the lack of information surrounding the results. Pre-natal screening is a widespread modern medical practice used to test fetuses for potential disabilities and diseases. This is done so the fetus can be aborted if the perspective mother cannot or does not want to carry or raise a disabled child. However, the absence of accurate information surrounding disability, the inadequacy of support for families with disabled children, and societal contempt for disabled people create a discrete eugenics program rather than greater opportunity for choice. Pre-natal testing and the question of choice forces one to question which disabilities or conditions should be considered for testing and what criteria should be used for that determination. For instance, should fetuses with cleft palate or who would be pigeon toed be aborted? Should genetic tests be developed to eliminate these conditions? There have been proposals to use IVF sex selection to eliminate the possibility of carriers of X-linked genetic diseases. Feminist author Patricia Spallone points out that this proposal “is a most presumptuous eugenic tactic, defining us as fit to live according to our reproductive capacity and quality of our genes.” To be clear, however, her objection is about the sexist implications of this test, not the disablist ones. In “Eugenics and Reproductive Choice,” Lisa Blumberg states that “too often counselors do little more than provide future parents with a dreary laundry list of problems their child could have and express sympathy.” Prenatal screening cannot provide information regarding the severity of a medical condition, only that the fetus has a disease – that the fetus is disabled. Further, abortion rates are incredibly high following a prenatal diagnosis (often 80-95%). In a disablist society, choice or self-determination is an illusion when it operates in the context of pre-natal testing.

#### Feminist discussions have routinely excluded, disabled women literally have to force themselves and take up space

Slater 2012 Slater, Jenny. "Youth for Sale: Using Critical Disability Perspectives to Examine the Embodiment of ‘Youth’." Societies 2, no. 4 (2012): 195-209. doi:10.3390/soc2030195. (WL BFI)

Uncovering the notion of youth as an aesthetic project begins with recognizing the body as discursive and culturally inscribed with meaning [6,14–16]. During the 1990s examining the consequences of bodily representations became central to feminist theory [15,16]. Scholars used feminist theory to explore the body in relation to gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality and class – asking how these intersections of identities allow some bodies to be regarded more highly than others [17]. However, despite the centrality of disability to experiences of embodiment [18,19], how dis/ability played out in discourses of the body was an area neglected by feminist theorists [15]. This silence cannot be blamed entirely on lack of feminist engagement. British Disability Studies, with its staunch social model focus, separating impairment (a difference, or perceived difference, of bodily function) and disability (subsequent oppression placed on disabled people by society) prohibited talk of the body within Disability Studies [20]. This was not without reason, previous medical focus constructed the disabled body as deficient, in need of intervention, rehabilitation and, ultimately, extermination. Therefore, to remove the gaze from the disabled body and counter this by challenging an oppressive disabling society was crucial to the political struggle of disabled people. In addition, the lack of communication between feminist and disability theory could be attributed to the pragmatism that few disability theorists knew‘ feminist theory and few feminist theorists knew‘ disability theory [15]. A CDS approach, however, has meant the body, and experiences of embodiment, have begun to re-enter discussions. Much of this can be attributed to the voices of disabled women highlighting the lack of space available for them within both feminist and disability movements [20–23], and therefore carving the way for feminist-disability theory.

### Food Allergies

#### For children with food allergies the cafeteria is a difficult place to navigate.

Lembeck No Date Jacqueline C. "The Lunchtime Dilemma: Accommodating Disabilities and Food Allergies in the National School Lunch Program." McAndrews Law Firm. <http://mcandrewslaw.com/publications-and-presentations/articles/the-lunchtime-dilemma-accommodating-disabilities-and-food-allergies-in-the-national-school-lunch-program/>. (WL BFI)

For a child with a food allergy or dietary restriction, the school cafeteria may be a challenging place to navigate. While his or her peers only have to think about which table to choose, a child with food allergies has to consider the ingredients in the school lunch and where and how it was prepared. For the child’s parent, it may seem that packing lunch is the only safe option. What is more, a child’s dietary restriction may make families feel as if they cannot rely on free and reduced-price school lunches. However, when food allergies or dietary restrictions constitute a disability, schools must make accommodations to provide school lunches which are safe for the child. The National School Lunch Program requires that schools make substitutions for students with disabilities which restrict their diet. Schools must make substitutions on a “case by case basis only when supported by a written statement of the need for substitution(s) that includes recommended alternate foods . . . signed by a licensed physician.” 7 C.F.R. § 210.10(m)(1). Regulations governing school lunch programs define disability using the definition also used in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act covering any person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities. 7 C.F.R. 15b.3. It is important note that accommodating children with disabilities does not end at substituting alternate foods. For example, schools may have to alter the texture of foods for children with disabilities, depending on the child’s needs. In addition, a school that does not normally serve breakfast or snacks, may have to serve breakfast at school or snacks at school for a child whose disability requires it. If your child’s disability requires a substitution or alteration in the school lunch, you should obtain a physician’s statement which clearly states the nature of your child’s disability and how it restricts your child’s diet, the major life activity affected by the disability, and the specific substitutions or accommodations which are necessary. It is a good idea to have a document outlining the need and the substitution that will be made so you and the School District are on the same page and can refer back or amend the substitutions as necessary. Schools may, but do not have to, make substitutions for students without disabilities who have a medical or dietary need. Substitutions for children who do not have a disability which affects diet are discretionary and made on a case by case basis when supported by a written statement signed by a recognized medical authority. 7 C.F.R. § 210.10(m)(2). Because most food allergies or dietary restrictions are not so severe as to cause an impairment that substantially limits a major life activity, schools generally may decide whether to make a substitution. Severe or life-threatening food allergies, on the other hand, likely are disabilities which must be accommodated. Finally, just because a child has a disability, does not mean that the disability affects her/her diet. Therefore, a school is not required to make substitutions for unrelated disabilities which do not impact the child’s ability to have school lunch.

### International Symbol of Access

#### The international symbol of access is part of a neoliberal process to pacify the bad crip while pushing cripness to the outer edges.

Fritsch 2013. Fritsch, K. "The Neoliberal Circulation of Affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair." Health, Culture and Society 5, no. 1 (2013): 135-49. doi:10.5195/hcs.2013.136. (WL BFI)

In this paper I argue that the International Symbol of Access (ISA) produces, capacitates, and debilitates disability in particular ways. This production of disability is grounded in a happy affective economy that is embedded within neoliberal capitalism and runs counter to the dismantling of ableism and compulsory able-bodiedness. Ableism, as outlined by Fiona Kumari Campbell (2009) is “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” (p. 5). As Robert McRuer argues, compulsory able-bodiedness masquerades able-bodiedness as “a nonidentity, as the natural order of things” (2006, p. 1). Together, ableism and compulsory able-bodiedness cast disability as “a diminished state of being human” (Campbell, 2009, p. 5). The ISA is the most ubiquitous and prototypical representation of accessibility in Western societies: a white graphic depiction of a wheelchair user, faced to the right, presented on a blue background. In charting the development of the modern wheelchair, the rise of disability rights in North America, and the emergence of the ISA as a universally acceptable representation of access for disabled people, I argue that the ISA produces disability through a neoliberal, ableist logic, capacitating disability as an individualized problem that can be known and solved. To serve such a capacitating function, the ISA engages particular forms of impairment and disability that can be captured through a neoliberal economy of inclusion. By coming to know disability as an individualized problem and by having the ISA adorn a bus or a building, the uncomfortable problem and unease of the difference of disability appears to be taken care of. That is, the ISA as a symbol of inclusion and accommodation allows disability to appear in order to disappear. By appearing and appearing to have been taken care of, the difference and uncomfortableness of disability disappears. In this way, the ISA produces happy feelings and such happy feelings circulate with ease, reproducing the capacitation of particular productions of disability and leading to the limited inclusion of capacitated forms of disability within neoliberal economies. Thus, this paper explores the ways in which the ISA produces an exclusionary form of inclusion, allowing for the production of the “able-disabled” (Titchkosky, 2003) while other debilitated disabled people face “slow death” (Berlant, 2007). In this way, through the ISA, disability both appears so as to be included in neoliberal economies and disappears by way of slow death. I conclude by critically approaching the happy affects of the ISA, including the way in which the symbol creates a sense of “cruel optimism” (Berlant, 2013) for disabled people. In engaging the investment of happy feelings disabled people have towards the ISA, I trouble the ease by which certain forms of disability are capacitated.

#### The ISA produces disability as a physical impairment requiring a wheelchar. This erases all other forms of impairment and disability, which makes accessibility impossible for everyone else.

Fritsch 2013. Fritsch, K. "The Neoliberal Circulation of Affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair." Health, Culture and Society 5, no. 1 (2013): 135-49. doi:10.5195/hcs.2013.136. (WL BFI)

In depicting the wheelchair as the symbol of access, a mobility-impaired person who uses a wheelchair comes to symbolize all other forms of disability (Fritsch, 2013). Conceptualized in this way, disability pertains only to a “young man in a wheelchair who is fit, never ill, and whose only need is a physically accessible environment” (Morris 2001, 9). This internationally-recognized, allegedly universal symbol, in other words, comes to produce disability as a physical impairment that requires a wheelchair, while sidelining and erasing other forms of impairment and disability, and the various needs of a disabled person (Fritsch, 2013). Drawing on Butler’s (1993) theory of the performativity of language, the ISA can be considered as enacting or producing what accessibility and inaccessibility are. The ISA also constitutes disability such that it is impossible to conceive of disability without thinking of someone needing special access. In this sense, the ISA produces that which it names (Butler, 1999). If accessibility and disability are to be denoted by a figuration of the wheelchair, then the ISA produces disability as requiring wheelchair things like ramps, elevators, and large bathroom stalls. Because the ISA is considered “self descriptive” with “no secondary meaning,” (Rehabilitation International, 2013) it constitutes disability in such a way that allows for taken-for-granted conceptions of who has an access issue and what access means to prevail, and these prevailing conceptions influence how people perceive these issues and act upon them (Titchkosky, 2011). As Ben-Moshe and Powell (2007) argue, the ISA attempts to create clear boundaries between who is considered disabled and who is considered abled-bodied in which some bodies are just disabled and others are not. This constructed binary “belies the relational context-dependent aspect of disablement” (p. 495). The ISA, as a static image, does not show the fluid, context-dependent nature of disability and impairment that changes over the course of one's life. Nor can the static character of the symbol account for the ways that developments in cybernetics, pharmaceutical therapies, prosthetic enhancements, and other medical or technological interventions have already radically altered what bodies can do and will continue to do in years ahead (Fritsch, 2013). By designating spaces that are accessible in contrast to inaccessible spaces, the ISA positions disability as something apart from normative embodiment. Such a division of space flies in the face of universal design or notions of collective access (Hamraie, 2013; Mingus, 2010), and reinforces the divide between non-disabled and disabled that again reinforces a static, reified understanding of disability. In creating separate spaces, the ISA naturalizes able-bodies as not requiring “access,” and ignores the ways in which most people may only ever be “momentarily able-bodied” (Zola, 1982, p. 242) and thus have bodies that are always moving between modes of capacity. By naturalizing disability as an inherent and static mode of being, the ISA also obfuscates the ways in which disability appears through the construction of space (Gleeson, 1998; Freund, 2001; Dolmage, 2012; Himraie, 2013). The ISA relies upon creating an exclusionary space. As Titchkosky (2011, p. 61) argues: “Every universal access sign suggests that access is available only in particular locations. If access were widely available, signs of access would not be necessary.” Furthermore, she contends: Disability is a key way of constitutively perceiving non-normalcy; it is a way of referring to and dealing with that which is regarded as anomalous and is almost always devalued. This means that the concept of disability gives us access to certain people, places, and events, but it does so while shoring up a belief in a naturalized version of access: one either has access or does not; one personally needs access or does not. Through unexamined relations to both disability and non-disability, the idea that the world is ‘naturally’ for some and not for others is reproduced. A failure to attend to the ways the world is naturalized, and thus to appear ‘naturally’ there only for some, is the basic premise of the social processes of able-ism, patriarchy, and colonialism. (p. 6)

### Invisible Disabilities

**tag**

Stevens 2015. Stevens, Maddy. "Ableism." Premier Debate Today. November 19, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/11/19/ableism/>. (WL BFI)

Most debaters are familiar enough with ableism to pick up on an obvious link for a discourse k somewhere in their backfiles, but fail to recognize that it’s just the tip of the iceberg. Ableism is not just a list of words, it’s a pervasive system of oppression that seeks to identify, isolate, institutionalize, and even erase disability. Language is one of the ways through which ableism solidifies its power over divergent existences, however, the analysis of its influence and range of power is not completed merely by establishing what words we shouldn’t use (especially since many people don’t take the time to understand why that rhetoric is harmful, and because the list is ever expanding to accommodate new discursive additions). It is vital that we examine our understandings of disability and abandon monolithic and inaccurate constructions, that our analysis extends to an interrogation of norms which we often take for granted, both within debate and society at large, and that we work with disabled members of our community to reach solutions. There are many standards, expressions, and norms which seem innocuous, but which reveal an underlying harmful mentality upon inspection. Many of these things have become so far ingrained and accepted that to even challenge the appropriateness of them is to incur indignation and outrage against oneself. We operate under a paradigm of “able until proven otherwise”. Sometimes it’s easy to identify disability because the person matches the paradigm we have for being disabled, in other words, they have an identifying trait of disability which we cannot reason away. More often than not, disability is not easily ascertained. People who have so called “invisible disabilities” often fly under ablenormativity’s radar, so abled people accept us as one of them. Because we do not “look disabled”, people do not check themselves in conversations, and will have discussions about disabled existence as though it is an abstract concept, or will make jokes they would not say in front of someone they identify as disabled, and will voice opinions which they believe you, as an able individual, will share. I’ve debated rounds where, after reading an advocacy dealing with disabled empowerment, I was criticized for commodifying the ballot because I did not concede. This criticism assumed that I was speaking for others, and demanded that I either disclose my identity in a potentially hostile space against my initial inclination or admit to taking advantage of oppression. In forums where I have disclosed and discussed my disability, I have been met with skepticism and scrutiny, because I do not live up to every criteria in The Able Person’s Check List: Disability Edition. Both of these instances represent a time when ablenormativity informed an audience that it was impossible for disability to exist among them, and that it was especially impossible for a disabled individual to compete, educate, or exist alongside, or as well as, them. The notions we have of disability have been informed by a mostly able academia, a mostly able media, and a mostly able society. In this way, we have come to know about disability through the lens of those who are accepted and thus are in control, rather than those who are affected and who are kept subdued by such constructions.

### Law

#### The goal of the legal system is to create order out of disorder, the crip is always viewed as chaotic and consequently deviance that cannot be normalized exists within a state of exceptionality.

Campbell, 2009(Fiona Kumari , Senior Lecturer in Disability Studies at the School of Human Services & Social Work Griffith University and Adjunct Professor in Disability Studies, Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya, "States of Exceptionality: Provisional Disability, its Mitigation, and Citizenship", <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/109813/20_Marshall_Vol3_Ch19_p273-p284.pdf)> (WL BFI)

Law has traditionally had an ambivalent attitude toward disabled people, restricting itself to being an arbiter of rules and policies about care and protection. The rule of law and its enactment in common law constitutions focus on the rights of individuals, as enforced by courts. A frequent motif in the literature on the rule of law is that the rule protects against the use of arbitrary power by governments against individuals. Joseph Raz (1977) noted elasticity of the notion of arbitrary power, concluding that “many forms of arbitrary rule are complementary with the rule of law” (p. 2). When courts construct legal doctrine and write judicial opinions, they do so by organizing and interpreting events and ontologies of personhood according to a narrative in which the events and characters “relate to one another and to some overarching structure, in the context of an opposition or struggle” (Ewik & Sibley, 1995, p. 200). However, the elusive nature of impairment (particular when lived out in a social context) and the problematical difﬁ culties, in some instances, of forecasting prognosis, does not neatly ﬁt with the law’s focus on rules, formulas, and predictability. Legal responses to the challenges of disablement persistently demonstrate a performative passion for sameness (Stiker, 1999). Not just any sameness, but paradoxically and deliberately, a sameness underpinned by an ontological separation between abled and disabled, where mixtures are absorbed through processes of fabricating or simulating abledness. In many ways, law is an attempt to create order out of disorder (i.e., diversity and difference) through a process of puriﬁcation—the establishment and demarcation of distinct zones (disabled/abled, human/nonhuman), and through a process of translation that acknowledges the reality of mixtures between these extremes. States of disability and health are far more ambiguous and ambivalent than the establishment zones suggest. The health/disability continuum is continually meditated through context (e.g., certain mobility differences matter more in distinct environments than others), always ﬂuid and ﬂuctuating according to both internal (organic) and external (environmental) stressors and cultural modalities. Law is uneasy with bodies that ooze or are leaky, especially those that are fat, distressed, sick, dying, addicted, and appear impermanent. I argue that law reﬂects a broader desire to drive down disability —thus ensuring that this class of enumerated persons remains problematically in a state of exceptionality, deﬁned by law, rather than being a signiﬁcant part of a country’s population. The state of exceptionality refuses to conceive of disability as a form of difference within the population. The role of bio-medicalism coupled with regulative aspects of the law can be found in many legal deﬁnitions of disability. For instance, in the Indian Person with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act (1995), disability is reduced to diagnostic types: s. 2 (i) and a “person with a disability” to “a person suffering from not less than 40% of any disability as certiﬁed by a medical authority” (s. 2 (t))

#### For disabled people to pursue litigation they must literally define themselves as non-human within courts of law.

Campbell, 2009(Fiona Kumari , Senior Lecturer in Disability Studies at the School of Human Services & Social Work Griffith University and Adjunct Professor in Disability Studies, Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya, "States of Exceptionality: Provisional Disability, its Mitigation, and Citizenship", <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/109813/20_Marshall_Vol3_Ch19_p273-p284.pdf)> (WL BFI)

In this example, the legal enactment of puriﬁcation zones attempts to settle the matter of disability by way of enumerative exactness and reduction of disability to a medical model. The motif of disability is much more than a state of being. Nationalism demands that the archetypal normative citizen be free from ﬂaws and matters of possible degeneracy. In these times of economic rationalism and panics over risk and terror, the sentiments of famous U.S. eugenist case Buck v. Bell (274 U.S. 200) ﬁnd new credence: We have seen more than once that the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives. It would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the State for these lesser sacriﬁces, often not felt to be such by those concerned, in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence. It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unﬁt from continuing their kind. . . . Three generations of imbeciles are enough. (p. 208) The utilization of legal remedies by disabled people, especially after acquisition of impairment, occurs within a broader sociological context of an in- creasing “culture of blame.” The disabled litigant is required to show that they have suffered (Brown, 1993, 1995). For example, when a court declares that a disabled litigant does or does not conform to a legal rendering of disability, the court has to ﬁrst construct a narrative in which a character (the disabled plaintiff) is faced with an obstacle or conundrum (disability discrimination) posed by an antagonist (a disability discriminatory employer, for instance). In framing a disability discrimination case in this way, a court is assembling a set of circumstances into an intelligible whole, into a coherent narrative in which the actions and events are endowed with intentionality, meaning, and purpose.

#### The law is key in rendering disabled bodies invisible

Campbell 03 (Fiona Kumari, Associate Professor in Law for Griffith Law School, and a Adjunct Professor in Disability Studies at the Unviersity of Kelaniya “The Great Divide: Ableism and Technologies of Disability Production.” PhD Thesis. 2003.Pg. 142.

Law plays an exacting and explicit role in this subjectifying activity of government. Legal intersections/interventions facilitate this subjectification by allocating and regulating populations into fixed and discrete ontological categories (such as disability, gender, sex, race) in order that the subjects assigned to those categories can be rendered visible and calculable (Foucault, 1976: especially 135-159; Foucault, 1994 orig. 1970). The fixity of disability (which is assume to be a pre-given property of human bodies) within both legislative and case law not only establishes the boundaries of permissible inquiry it also establishes the legal fiction of ‘disability’ in the first place. It is this reification of disability (frequently based on bio-medical technologies and ascriptions) that reinforces the centrality of the ableist body and the terms of its negotiation. The formulations of disability often engaged by disability activists and enshrined in disability related law, in effect discursively entrench and thus reinscribe the very oppressive ontological figurings of disability that many of us would like to escape. Alternative renderings of disability, if they are not able to ‘fit’ such prescribed ‘fictions,’ are barred from entry into legal and other discourses. Consider, for instance, the instructions given in a recent staff survey produced by the Equity Section of Queensland University of Technology (QUT) (2000). The QUT equity survey instructs: “You should answer ‘yes’ to question 2 only if you are a person with a disability which is likely to last, or has lasted two or more years. Please note that if you use spectacles, contact lenses or other aids to fully correct your vision or hearing, you do not need to indicate that you are a person with a disability and would answer ‘no’ (emphasis added). (Equity Section Queensland University of Technology, 2000).” As we can see, defining disability in terms of what it ‘is’ and ‘is not’ performs an emblematic function that re-cognises the relationship between impairment and disability and civil society.

### NDT

#### Ableism is institutionalized within the highest levels of debate

Richter 2016. Zahari Richter. The Disabled Person’s Struggle In Round & Beyond: Taking Back Formerly Ableist Educational Spaces In The Post-Ada Generation. National Journal Of Speech & Debate Volume 4: Issue 3 April 2016, Symposium: Accessibility, Disability & Debate <Http://Site.Theforensicsfiles.Com/Njsd.4-3.Pdf> (WL BFI)

My presentation must call upon a recent example of organizational policies in the debate world in which the National Debate Tournament (NDT) posted an accessibility statement that harmed both disabled and black debaters. It took significant lobbying on the part of a wide coalition of debate people across the nation to correct the problematic language. Even then, the language of the NDTs access statement was oriented around reacting to the possibility of inaccessibility, not to build debate in such a way that disabled people were considered and included in their full capacity from the start and in advance. In the concept of universal design, gleaned from the work of Mace,14 we are offered an image of what might be considered a crip optimism: redesigning the world for all body types, mental, psychiatric and health statuses. This concept is preferred over the tendency for institutions to be in a defensive posture fearing disabled response.

### Neoliberalism/Capitalism

#### **Capitalist markets are reliant upon disability in order to pursue profits.**

Johnson 2014. Johnson, Merri, and Robert Mcruer. "Cripistemologies: Introduction." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 127-48. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.12. (WL BFI)

Neoliberal disability epistemologies are highly lucrative—this much we know for sure. Disability identity is now part of capitalism’s array of target markets; a “crip economy” akin to the globalized queer pink economy is emergent (materializing out-and-proud disabled consumers, in and out of the academy), even if crip dollars, pounds, and euros are not yet as thoroughly in circulation as pink dollars, pounds, and euros. What we might term the debility dollar, however, is one of the most sought-after currencies in the world; in the United States alone, money spent on actual or seeming impairments represents 17.6 percent of the GDP. Hypostasized beneath neoliberalism, a global psychopharmaceutical industry compels targeted consumers to know about and from a space of impairment: “Ask your doctor,” Big Pharma instructs the consumer, “if Cymbalta is right for you.” We argue that all too many ways of knowing disability are beholden to the debility or crip dollar, caught up in economies that actively closet what Lisa Duggan (in the roundtable that follows this introduction) identifies as crip forms of “intellectual, political, and affective creativity.” But the closeting of crip creativity can never be complete, as the history of crip activism, performance art, and theory richly demonstrate, and as the term’s origin story also illustrates.

#### Compulsory ablebodiedness is considered to be a positive social goal. Capitalism allows people to overcome the unfortune of being disabled in order to become normal. “Fixing” the disabled body allows subjects to become somewhat human. This is not only violent in the sense that it stigmatizes the deviance of disability. But it makes the dehumanization of disabled bodies.

Fritsch 13 Fritsch, K. "The Neoliberal Circulation of Affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair." Health, Culture and Society 5, no. 1 (2013): 135-49. doi:10.5195/hcs.2013.136. (WL BFI)

In sum, the ISA produces disability as a static thing rather than marking disability as a fluid, contextual, social relation. As a thing, disability can be known, contained, marketed, consumed, profited from, and solutions can be found. Inclusion can be celebrated, as if accessibility were simply about arriving at the side entrance. In thing form, disability can be capacitated by neoliberal practices of inclusion: that is, one can be included if one can be captured by market rationality, or market values. Bodies that are profitable, that can be marketed to, can be enhanced, or incorporated into the labour force, are bodies that neoliberalism deems worthy. These “able-disabled” (Titchkosky, 2003) bodies are included because they can be predictably productive under neoliberalism and as such are rewarded and trumpeted as evidence of an inclusive society. These bodies are entrepreneurs and have the capacity for “self-care” or “the ability to provide for their own needs and service their own ambitions” (Brown, 2005, p. 42). Those bodies that do not fit within the static thingness of disability as produced by the ISA, or cannot be capacitated in such a way as to participate in the labour force, are debilitated or rendered for “slow death” or “death as a way of life” (Berlant, 2007, p. 776). For Lauren Berlant (2007), slow death “refers to the physical wearing out of a population and the deterioration of people in that population that is very nearly a defining condition of their experience and historical existence” (p. 754). This rendering does not place these people outside of capitalism because “slow death” is, as Jasbir Puar (2012) points out, also profitable. Puar (2012) argues that all bodies in neoliberal capitalism are “being evaluated in relation to their success or failure in terms of health, wealth, progressive productivity, upward mobility, [and] enhanced capacity” (p. 155). Puar contends that given biopolitical developments in neoliberal capitalism, a shift has occurred such that the focus is on the differential capacitation of all bodies and not simply their normalization. That is, through capacitating processes like genetic therapies, surgeries, supplements, prosthetic enhancements, and healthism, bodies are to be capacitated beyond what is thought of as the able-body. Drawing on Donna Haraway (1997), Matthew Sothern (2007) notes that in the context of the promise of technoscientific solutions, “disability occupies a privileged position” (p. 146). That is, disability “is the category that neoliberal figurations of biomedicine promise to eliminate even while neoliberalism invests in the proliferation of categories of disability” (p. 146). While the policies of neoliberalism promise that our active, self-cared-for-selves will avoid illness and disability through the wonders of technoscience, “there is the simultaneous pharmaceutical-industrial production of increasingly complex and expanding categories of disability that can be medicated or otherwise manipulated for profit” (p. 146). Kafer comments on this technoscientific tension stating: “The same technology that enables a paraplegic to walk allows a soldier to kill more efficiently and ergonomically” (2013, p. 121). Further, as Steven Kurzman reflects: “I stand and walk with the irony that the materials and design of my leg are based in the same military technology which has blown the limbs off so many other young men” (quoted in Kafer, 2013, p. 121). According to Puar, neoliberalism mobilizes the tension between capacity and debility in order to profit from both the debilitation of certain bodies but also profit from the ways in which people recover or overcome debility through processes of capacitation (2012, p. 154). An economics of both debility and capacity serves the interests of neoliberal capital and reshapes formations of disability. Thus, through neoliberalism, those who are “upwardly mobile” become not only the able-disabled, but also entrepreneurs, employers of attendants, consumers of therapies, supplements, and enhancements. Neoliberalism, by way of the retrofit of the economy, orients and capacitates those disabled who can afford to be included. Disability is privatized, individualized, entangled in deregulation, and profoundly affected by austerity measures. It is for this reason that Sothern concludes: “the space of the disabled body must also be thought of as a space of the contradictions of neoliberalism – it is at once privileged as a site of inclusion, but that inclusion is also the promise of its exclusion” (2007, p. 146).

### Pain

#### Notions of pain justify the disqualification of disabled bodies.

Patsavas 2014 Patsavas, Alyson. "Recovering a Cripistemology of Pain." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 203-18. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.16. (WL BFI)

Likewise, Tobin Siebers argues that the presence of pain (real or assumed) justifies the pity and disqualification of disabled lives. Pain plays a major role, according to Siebers, “as a motive force [used] to justify disability oppression” (“In the Name,” 184). Siebers and Carlson both detail the violence carried out “in the name of ” relieving pain and suffering. Indeed, disability scholars, activist organizations, and the disability community have long challenged this over-determined relationship between disability, pain, and the (supposed) desire to die. Yet these concepts remain culturally cemented together, reinforcing the perception of chronic pain as a devastating tragedy. The belief that all disabled people experience pain and that all pain leads to suffering runs through popular discourses to create entrenched ways of “knowing” pain and disability. These ways of knowing shape how we experience pain:

### Private Schools

#### Charter schools are the worst offenders. The lack of regulations for charter schools are appalling. Schools refuse to screen for special education services, cut off communication with parents, create makeshift classrooms, falsify data and accomodations in addition to other abhorrent offenses.

Dreilinger 2015, Danielle. "Flagrant special ed violations, cover-up alleged at New Orleans charter Lagniappe." NOLA.com. March 03, 2015. Accessed May 27, 2017. <http://www.nola.com/education/index.ssf/2015/03/new_orleans_charter_school_vio.html>. (WL BFI)

New Orleans charter school Lagniappe Academies illegally deprived special education students of the teaching they needed -- and then faked forms to hide it once the Louisiana Department of Education was on its trail. Those are just two of the explosive findings in a report released Tuesday (March 3) by the state. More: The school held back almost one third of its students last year, sometimes despite spring report cards saying the child did well. Administrators refused to screen students for special education services even when families had a diagnosis from a doctor. They created a "Do Not Call" list of families whose children they did not want back, and instructed staff to skip them when phoning families with key information about registration and summer session. When state officials were to visit, administrators asked staff to move furniture out of a storage space so it looked like the school had a special education room. And administrators put in for a very high number of disability accommodations requests when testing time came around -- although almost no students received those accommodations during the school year. The state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education will consider this week whether to renew Lagniappe's charter with the Recovery School District. After the state sent Lagniappe an initial report in the fall, the charter's board voted to transfer to the local Orleans Parish school system. That too is still pending. The report also comes as a federal court monitoring agreement begins overseeing special education in New Orleans to ensure students are properly served. In a written response, the Lagniappe board asked for more time to consider the findings. It also submitted an affidavit from administrator denying a handful of the allegations. Lagniappe board member Dan Henderson called the report "a big distraction" in a Monday email to NOLA.com | The Times-Picayune. "We are continuing to serve all of our 160 students, and look forward to another round of high-stakes testing, showing again our amazing accomplishments." The school's C letter grade would typically mean a renewal term of four to six years. However, the state may reject renewals for management problems or if officials lose faith in the charter administration's integrity. "A preponderance of evidence provided by families and teachers and collected by the Department of Education suggests that the school administration is not able to adequately manage the needs of the students within the building," state officials wrote. Lagniappe has 180 students in kindergarten through fourth grade and one of the lowest special education rates in the city: seven students when the school year began, or 4 percent, compared to a Recovery average of 13 percent. The report is backed by affidavits and signed statements by eight former teachers and seven family members, plus additional interviews -- 24 people in all. These people said Lagniappe's special education students were astonishingly ill-served. Two were simply moved around instead of taught, the former assistant to Principal Kendall Petri stated in an affidavit, shuffled from place to place, never in a classroom. They were often unsupervised and seldom given assignments; "they often slept or sat with nothing to do." Petri told this year's new special education coordinator that special ed was the third priority, saying, "Students with (service) minutes can be squeezed in," according to an affidavit. Administrators told the coordinator "there was only enough funding in the budget for five evaluations." This employee quit. Teachers also reported or discovered efforts to cover up the lack of services as well as outright cheating on tests. "Students told me they were upset because the (test) administrators gave answers to some students during the test," one reported. A second teacher said administrator Alison McCormick told her to make up test scores for three kindergarteners. Problems were found with several special education logs submitted after the state reprimanded Lagniappe this fall: When the state cross-checked dates, it found some fell during fall break. Some had the name of a staffer who denied providing the services they listed. As far back as November 2012, one staffer "was asked to forge a phone log and service logs," and quit, that teacher wrote. The school reported that staffer as the teacher of record through 2014. Yet another teacher was coerced into signing a federal special education form, threatened with not being paid. The accounts in the report go on and on. McCormick wouldn't let one parent see their child's grades and said, "We don't have to tell you anything," according to a letter from the parent. Lagniappe removed one student for 10 days and her "return to school was conditioned upon a requirement for her to get a blood test to prove that she was taking her medication," which is illegal, her grandparent reports. One kindergartener received none of the services he was supposed to get, despite repeated parental requests, his parent attests. At the end of the year, he was held back. That was typical, said a former teacher. "Lagniappe's leadership failed to follow up about the many students to which I alerted the administration about academic and behavioral concerns," that person said. "When students who likely had undiagnosed special needs did not receive needed services and subsequently performed poorly, Lagniappe often retained these students. Parents who protested the retention decisions often withdrew their students from the school."

#### A charter school just this year, literally told a student not to come back to school until he saw a psychiatrist.

Jewson 2017.Marta Jewson, Staff writer March 31, 2017 11:42am. "Joseph A. Craig Charter School broke state law by suspending student who seemed depressed." The Lens. March 31, 2017. Accessed May 27, 2017. <http://thelensnola.org/2017/03/31/friends-of-king-broke-state-law-by-suspending-student-who-seemed-depressed/>. (WL BFI)

Joseph A. Craig Charter School broke state law by suspending a student school leaders thought was depressed, and preventing him from returning until he saw a psychiatrist, according to the state Department of Education. That’s not a legitimate reason to keep a child out of school, Laura Hawkins, deputy chief of staff for the state education department, wrote to Hilda Young, chairwoman of the Friends of King Schools board. In the February letter, she formally notified Young that the school had violated the terms of its charter and had to take certain steps to return to good standing. The boy’s mother was given a “Notice of Exclusion” on Jan. 25 and told he could not return until he’d been cleared by a particular psychiatrist recommended by the school, according to Hawkins’ letter. School officials told the mother they thought the boy was depressed and needed to be on medication, according to Hawkins. But the document his parents received, she wrote, listed “various illnesses that are generally considered contagious but which are unrelated to this student’s situation.” The boy was out of school for five days, which “amounted to a suspension,” Hawkins wrote. State law and Board of Elementary and Secondary Education policy “do not provide for the use of exclusion in the instance of a child recommended for psychiatric evaluation or showing signs of depression,” she wrote. In an apology letter to the boy’s mother, Tracie Washington, an attorney for the charter network, wrote there had “been a grave misunderstanding.”

### Reform/Rights Based Models

#### **Rights based models while appearing noble, are still reliant upon the normalization of disability to be able to access rights. Rights are rejected upon the appearance of unworthiness, after all aren’t disabled people too stupid to know what their rights are anyways.**

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

What does a curricular cripistemology look like if the subterfuge of normalcy does not dictate the socially anemic goals of inclusionism—or that which Linda Ware has provocatively termed “(in)exclusion” (Ideology, 2)? Perhaps these reformist efforts have come on the heels of developments during the Clintonian era wherein previously inclusive legislation had to be revitalized and newly enforced. The implementation of more flexible accessibility followed implemen-tation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1992) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004). Both of these legislative reforms were necessary to update prior failures of inclusive legislation from two decades earlier, including the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) and the Architectural Barriers Act (1968). These policy-based efforts to mandate the inclusion of students with disabilities under neoliberal principles of integration opened up U.S. education to those with developmental disabilities and “multi-handicaps” who had been actively segregated from public education with their peers since the early 1900s and continuing into the early 1970s. Nevertheless, the results of inclusionism have been incomplete because neoliberal efforts evolve around beliefs that mainstreaming would largely require retrofitting architectural environments in order to bring crip/queer students into buildings outfitted for their able-bodied peers. Further, the political pressures of the disability rights movements to achieve meaningful integration ultimately rely on the neoliberal approaches they professedly critique. By advocating for the right to be included alongside their able-bodied peers, activists in the 1980s and 1990s used a normalizing framework to give weight to their critique of exclusion. They argue that disabled people are like everyone else and, therefore, deserve the right to pursue normative practices in tandem with their non-disabled peers. In other words, a disability rights-based model of policy intervention relies upon assimilationist claims in order to gain access to key neoliberal institutions such as education.

### Transhumanism

#### Compulsory ablebodiedness is considered to be a positive social goal. Capitalism allows people to overcome the unfortune of being disabled in order to become normal. “Fixing” the disabled body allows subjects to become somewhat human. This is not only violent in the sense that it stigmatizes the deviance of disability. But it makes the dehumanization of disabled bodies.

Fritsch 13 Fritsch, K. "The Neoliberal Circulation of Affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair." Health, Culture and Society 5, no. 1 (2013): 135-49. doi:10.5195/hcs.2013.136. (WL BFI)

In sum, the ISA produces disability as a static thing rather than marking disability as a fluid, contextual, social relation. As a thing, disability can be known, contained, marketed, consumed, profited from, and solutions can be found. Inclusion can be celebrated, as if accessibility were simply about arriving at the side entrance. In thing form, disability can be capacitated by neoliberal practices of inclusion: that is, one can be included if one can be captured by market rationality, or market values. Bodies that are profitable, that can be marketed to, can be enhanced, or incorporated into the labour force, are bodies that neoliberalism deems worthy. These “able-disabled” (Titchkosky, 2003) bodies are included because they can be predictably productive under neoliberalism and as such are rewarded and trumpeted as evidence of an inclusive society. These bodies are entrepreneurs and have the capacity for “self-care” or “the ability to provide for their own needs and service their own ambitions” (Brown, 2005, p. 42). Those bodies that do not fit within the static thingness of disability as produced by the ISA, or cannot be capacitated in such a way as to participate in the labour force, are debilitated or rendered for “slow death” or “death as a way of life” (Berlant, 2007, p. 776). For Lauren Berlant (2007), slow death “refers to the physical wearing out of a population and the deterioration of people in that population that is very nearly a defining condition of their experience and historical existence” (p. 754). This rendering does not place these people outside of capitalism because “slow death” is, as Jasbir Puar (2012) points out, also profitable. Puar (2012) argues that all bodies in neoliberal capitalism are “being evaluated in relation to their success or failure in terms of health, wealth, progressive productivity, upward mobility, [and] enhanced capacity” (p. 155). Puar contends that given biopolitical developments in neoliberal capitalism, a shift has occurred such that the focus is on the differential capacitation of all bodies and not simply their normalization. That is, through capacitating processes like genetic therapies, surgeries, supplements, prosthetic enhancements, and healthism, bodies are to be capacitated beyond what is thought of as the able-body. Drawing on Donna Haraway (1997), Matthew Sothern (2007) notes that in the context of the promise of technoscientific solutions, “disability occupies a privileged position” (p. 146). That is, disability “is the category that neoliberal figurations of biomedicine promise to eliminate even while neoliberalism invests in the proliferation of categories of disability” (p. 146). While the policies of neoliberalism promise that our active, self-cared-for-selves will avoid illness and disability through the wonders of technoscience, “there is the simultaneous pharmaceutical-industrial production of increasingly complex and expanding categories of disability that can be medicated or otherwise manipulated for profit” (p. 146). Kafer comments on this technoscientific tension stating: “The same technology that enables a paraplegic to walk allows a soldier to kill more efficiently and ergonomically” (2013, p. 121). Further, as Steven Kurzman reflects: “I stand and walk with the irony that the materials and design of my leg are based in the same military technology which has blown the limbs off so many other young men” (quoted in Kafer, 2013, p. 121). According to Puar, neoliberalism mobilizes the tension between capacity and debility in order to profit from both the debilitation of certain bodies but also profit from the ways in which people recover or overcome debility through processes of capacitation (2012, p. 154). An economics of both debility and capacity serves the interests of neoliberal capital and reshapes formations of disability. Thus, through neoliberalism, those who are “upwardly mobile” become not only the able-disabled, but also entrepreneurs, employers of attendants, consumers of therapies, supplements, and enhancements. Neoliberalism, by way of the retrofit of the economy, orients and capacitates those disabled who can afford to be included. Disability is privatized, individualized, entangled in deregulation, and profoundly affected by austerity measures. It is for this reason that Sothern concludes: “the space of the disabled body must also be thought of as a space of the contradictions of neoliberalism – it is at once privileged as a site of inclusion, but that inclusion is also the promise of its exclusion” (2007, p. 146).

### The State

#### Legitimization of the state is rooted in abled bodied masculinity

Soldatic and Biyanwila 2006 (Karen and Janaka, Graduate School of Education; Organisational and Labour Studies, University of Western Australia. “Disability and Development: A Critical Southern Stand point on Able-Bodied Masculinity”, TASA Conference 2006, University of Western Australia & Murdoch University.

While strengthening conditions for global capital to invest and operate, the state’s attempts to gain legitimacy is increasingly based on patriarchal ethno-nationalist strategies. In contrast to previous closed economy projects, this nationalist development discourse is committed to market-driven politics. While there are different versions of this nationalist project, they are grounded in able-bodied patriarchal constructions of nationhood where the nation is represented as masculine reason. This depiction of the nation-state as masculine reason excludes women from the ‘social’ and ascribes them to ‘nature’. In effect, women are engaged in reproducing the nation, biologically, culturally as well as symbolically (Yuval-Davis, 1997). By casting the Tsunami as an irrational act of nature, humanity is masculinised while nature is feminised. The masculinity implied in patriarchal ethno-nationalist strategies is an able-bodied masculinity. The emphasis on ability relates to how culturally mediated economic activities, discipline, control, subjugate and reproduce bodies as well as embodiment. The body is central to the self as a project as well as social status (Turner, 2001). In effect, the body is shaped by both cultural and material practices. The dominant forms of masculinity articulated in nationalist projects are an able-bodied masculinity, which is based on evading the shared frailty of human beings and the vulnerability as social beings (Turner. 2001). While the body is “inescapable in the construction of masculinity”, the bodily performance that valorises ability is also related to the de-valuation of the disabled body (Connell, 1995: 56). The able-bodied masculinity of ethno-nationalist projects overlaps with fascist tendencies which Connell describes as a “naked assertion of male supremacy” (1995: 193). The fascist image of masculinity combines disparate dispositions of “unrestrained violence of frontline soldiers”, rationality (bureaucratic institutionalisation of violence) and ironically, irrationality too (thinking with ‘the blood’, the triumph of the ‘will’) (Connell, 1995:193). In turn, elements of dominance as well as technical expertise are core features of able-bodied masculinity that subordinate disabled bodies and women.

### Self – Sufficiency

Pining the link here in CX is incredibly easy, just ask questions like; “What’s the purpose of the education system.?” “Why does independence matter?”

#### \*Current social society marks those who are not independent as non-human.

Withers 2015 Withers, A.J. "How Disablist Western Ideas of 'Self-Determination' Undermine Social Justice and 5 Ways to Make It Right." Everyday Feminism. March 15, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/03/self-determination-disablist/>. (WL BFI)

However, interdependence is something that we really all do rely on to survive. Did you grow all of the food you ate today? Did you sew all the clothes you are wearing? One of the brilliant tricks of capitalism is that it erases interdependence and perpetuates this myth that we all need to be self-supporting individuals. It asserts that the systemic oppression that people face, particularly their poverty, are the consequences of their own individual failings. Disabled people are depicted as being burdens, as being needy, when non-disabled people’s neediness is normalized and thus erased. The root of disabled people’s oppression is depicted as rooted in the individual – often at a genetic level – and the social causes of our oppression are erased. Independent Living. Instead of unpacking this really problematic understanding of self-determination, many non-Indigenous disabled people identify it as the goal. One of the best examples of how liberal notions of self-determination get taken up in disability discourse is with respect to the independent living movement and attendant care. Independent living has led to some incredibly important changes in the lives of many disabled people, and I want to be clear that I am not devaluing its significance or impact. However, it has also constructed this notion of independence through capitalist consumption. Independent living focuses the notion of independence around self-determination rather than physical acts. This line of argument actively pits physically disabled people against people labelled with intellectual or psychiatric disabilities. Physically disabled activists assert that independence, which in a capitalist society is tantamount to their humanity, is located in the capacity to direct. Those who cannot direct – cannot assert self-determination in this way (so we are talking about large groups of people considered to not have “capacity”) – are not independent, not self-determining, not as human. Here, self-determination is being used as a way to actively marginalize people and legitimize their domination in order for certain people to access privilege. This is what Dan Irving calls “scarcity of liberation” – the notion that we must fight amongst one another for legitimacy and liberation rather than recognize it as necessarily a collective project. Also, attendant care is restricted to those who can afford it or the small number of people who are lucky enough to receive direct funding (or, in very rare circumstances, those who are able to mobilize community resources through care collectives).

#### Notions of preparing students for the good life, exclude students who don’t fit into the mold and perpetuate notions that to be disabled is to be monstrous.

Slater 2012 Slater, Jenny. "Youth for Sale: Using Critical Disability Perspectives to Examine the Embodiment of ‘Youth’." Societies 2, no. 4 (2012): 195-209. doi:10.3390/soc2030195. (WL BFI)

If youth for sale signifies the idealized, normative qualities of youth, where does this leave non-normative youth? If to be youthful is to be beautiful and healthy, what does this mean for disabled young people? Despite the old cliché, ̳beauty is in the eye of the beholder‘, we have seen that there are strong cultural conventions around what is beautiful‘. This, combined with arguably even stronger medical and cultural discourses about what is healthy‘ may, to use Shildrick‘s [18] term, leave those differently embodied‘ in a paradoxical position: although adulthood is wrapped up in a rhetoric of ableism [1], which alongside an ideology of paternalism surrounding disability leads to the infantilizing of disabled people, and their positioning as forever young; there is simultaneously an idealized discourse of youth which leaves little space for human diversity. Baron, Riddel and Wilson [61] ironically quip that disabled people hold the secret of eternal youth. In this sense, disability is perhaps the counterpart of Blatterer‘s [3] ideal of being youthful, but not adolescent. Disability Studies scholars have highlighted that we will all become disabled if we live long enough [14,62]. Take this assertion alongside Featherstone‘s [8] argument that striving for a youthful body is an attempt to deny our own mortality, and we could argue that the desire for eternal youth is an attempt to disavow disability. Of course, this is not the lived reality of dis/abled young people‘s lives, rather, it is an example of the abstraction of youth, leading to the enfreakment of young people that do not meet the conventions of youth for sale‘. Youth for sale stands as a synecdoche for health and beauty. Furthermore, health and beauty are arguably the promise and want of youth that we are encouraged to strive towards in our own aesthetic projects.

### STEM

#### Fundamental values of STEM such as medicine and science directly clash with social models of disability, the educational system violently exclude disabled bodies from their institutions and the STEM workforce rewards those who pass as able-bodied. These narratives prove.

Smith 2012, SE. "Where Are All the Disabled Scientists?" XoJane: Women's Lifestyle & Community Site - xoJane. May 1, 2012. <http://www.xojane.com/issues/disabled-people-in-science-technology-math-engineering-fields>. (WL BFI)

Kit, who was forced to stop pursuing a degree in mathematics, spoke via email about the problems facing a lot of disabled students seeking STEM degrees, although these problems are by no means limited to the sciences: When I returned to university after dropping out the first time, I got an appointment with the disability team (automatically probably, looking back). I asked them what they could do to support me. They asked me what I wanted. I said I didn't know what was available, and asked again. I left the room with no support, no follow-up appointment, and no knowledge of what I could do to make that time work better than the previous. I dropped out again within a term. These kinds of experiences are common for disabled students, many of whom don’t know what kinds of accommodations are available, so they don’t know what to ask for. When disability services representatives fail to provide information about the spectrum of options, students are left frustrated and turned off, and they’re unlikely to follow up. Simple information about accommodations like more time on tests, attendance flexibility, assistance with making appointments, and help with transportation, food, and other tasks of daily living would be beneficial, but often isn’t on the table. Kit doesn’t intend to go back to school, frustrated by three separate attempts at a STEM degree. This is a chronic issue among students with disabilities, who have a much higher dropout rate than nondisabled students. Kimmy, a science professor, discussed her struggles throughout school as a student with learning disabilities: During my postdoc, all of [my learning disability-related issues] made me a target of absolutely unimaginable abuse from my postdoc adviser and my fellow postdocs in the lab. I was excluded from lab decisions and publications and snubbed socially, and any tiny misstep was harshly reprimanded and closely scrutinized...This was the sort of abuse that not only almost drove me out of the field; it very nearly drove me to suicide. She’s settled in to a tenure-track position after hard-fought battles, but she still notes the lack of representation of people with disabilities in STEM: “Other than Temple Grandin and Stephen Hawking I can't think of any PWDs I know of at the Ph.D. level in the sciences.” However, she points out, part of the issue involves living in stealth; she’s not “out” at work and many of the people I interviewed indicated they concealed their disabilities as well. This means that some scientists may appear nondisabled, but could have learning disabilities, mental illnesses or other non-evident disabilities. When there's pressure to conceal, it's hard to get accurate statistics on representation, or the kinds of accommodations that might help STEMers work more effectively. For people with physical disabilities, “passing” is not an option. Jenni, who had to leave a career in STEM due to disability-related issues, had to be out to her colleagues because her disabilities were evident, and she often needed assistance in the lab. “It's incredibly draining to have to constantly ask for help with what seem to be the simplest of things, especially when it’s the nth time that day,” she said, talking about difficulties with access and accommodations. Sasha Feather, a research study collaborator with a chronic illness, stressed that some of the problems when it comes to inclusion in STEM involve fundamental attitudes: ...persistent attitudes in medicine and science are not always compatible with the social justice model of disability. Many geeks like to think that bodies are machines that can be fixed, and that medicine has all the answers. Learning that this isn't true might cause a disruptive shift in people's world view. Kimmy echoed this, talking about the approach to disability in academic settings: ...there's still this quiet undercurrent of opinion that regards LD as a synonym for "less intelligent" and ADHD as overdiagnosed and an excuse for being disorganized and unmotivated. There's even a certain amount of quiet joking about things like Asperger's Syndrome. I've encountered it at several institutions, and it's nothing that faculty members let students see, but I have to say that as a faculty member with LD I feel distinctly unwelcome, and like my tenure prospects might be compromised by being open about my issues. In Sasha’s experiences in an office research environment, she has problems related to fluorescent lights and bright lighting, both known migraine triggers. And, she adds, a recurrent issue in science labs and offices around the world, where harsh lighting is commonplace and workers may not have an opportunity to adjust lighting for comfort. Those who do speak up may be criticised when requesting accommodations, which encourages them to suffer in silence -- or find other work. She, along with Kimmy and many other people I talked to, such as Elizabeth, a systems administrator, also discussed the physically demanding nature of the work. STEM jobs tend to insist on long hours with few breaks, which can make participation difficult for people who have limited energy reserves. Work environments often require standing for extended periods and performing other physically complex tasks. Although equipment is available to facilitate accessibility and make labs more comfortable, such as wheelchair accessible lab benches, it often isn’t provided, sometimes because no one thinks to provide it. Kimmy said that her experiences were generally positive, working in small labs with close-knit groups, but that she was still required to ask for accommodations because no one had predicted or considered the need. This can be a turnoff for people with disabilities, as an inaccessible space is an unwelcoming one. For people who acquire disabilities later in life, like Andrea Chandler, the shift in attitudes in the workplace can be devastating: ...before I became a visible cripple with my cane and needed time off for medical stuff, I was assigned to projects where my technical expertise was used. After, I was assigned to be a secretary to engineers...I will not go back to work in a STEM field if I can help it. Between the shit I got as a woman, where I constantly had to recite my bona fides to prove I had the technical expertise to contribute and then becoming a crip and finding there was no way I could be accepted anymore, I'm done. It kills your soul. “Since I live in the United States, every single career choice I've made ever has been shaped by my need to have not only health insurance but good health insurance,” Elizabeth told me via email, highlighting yet another barrier for people with disabilities working in STEM fields. When your career needs to be based on access to benefits, your options can be limited, and you may be afraid when it comes to advocating for yourself in the workplace, protecting team members, and fighting for better working conditions, because you would risk losing your benefits.

#### **Assumptions about disabled bodies make STEM inaccessible, unless ableism is deconstructed STEM fields and STEM academia will never be a place for disabled bodies.**

Wong 2015, Alice. "Q&A with STEM Professionals with Disabilities." Model View Culture. November 25, 2015. Accessed May 27, 2017. <https://modelviewculture.com/pieces/qa-with-stem-professionals-with-disabilities>. (WL BFI)

Ronit: My first challenge was convincing the graduate programs during my interviews that I would be capable of being a genetic counselor, even if I didn’t have all the answers as to how I would accomplish things at that moment. My next challenge was figuring out how to draw a pedigree independently. My biggest challenge by far has been convincing others that I am capable. I received a bad grade on one of my rotations due to close-mindedness about my abilities and it took me over a year to find my first job and over six months to find my second. Josh: Simply too many to list… None of my books were ever available, getting notes was difficult and time consuming, managing readers was a job by itself, getting access to charts, tables, graphs, etc. was almost impossible, as was creating them. AW: What are some common misconceptions and stereotypes regarding STEM education and careers for people with disabilities? Ronit: People in general do not think people with disabilities are as capable of doing anything, this includes simple life skills like dressing, cleaning the house, picking out clothes, taking care of children, etc. If a person with a disability cannot do these things, how could they possibly do math or science? I believe people who are not disabled imagine themselves if they were disabled and could not imagine how they would accomplish these tasks, so they automatically think it’s not possible. Josh: A lot of teachers think it’s going to be difficult to create an inclusive curriculum or to otherwise provide an accessible educational experience for students with disabilities. This is especially true in lab classes like bio or chemistry. The truth is that this attitude is more of a barrier than anything else. There are usually relatively simple ways of adapting activities and assignments to allow students with disabilities to participate. Alex: The main thing is that people think that people with disabilities have trouble doing any jobs, STEM or not… People also view us as just not being sharp enough to do things that require hard skills… stereotypes keep us from pursuing STEM education and careers, they make it so that college admissions and hiring managers don’t let as many of us in, and then people in general don’t see us in those types of careers so the stereotypes get reinforced.

### Supreme Court

#### The supreme court is incredibly ableist on education policies. Rowley v. Board of Education proves.

Hehir 2002. Hehir, Thomas. "Eliminating Ableism in Education." Harvard Educational Review 72, no. 1 (2002): 1-33. doi:10.17763/haer.72.1.03866528702g2105. (WL BFI)

The ultimate institutionalization of ableist assumptions can be seen in a U.S. Supreme Court interpretation of IDEA in the case of Rowley v. Board of Education of the Gloversville Enlarged City School(1993). The Court decided that a deaf girl who was integrated into a regular class was not entitled to a sign language interpreter because she was “receiving benefit” — that is, she was passing. This decision in effect says that it was acceptable for this deaf child to understand only some of what the teacher was saying. Clearly, this child was not given the same access to educational opportunity afforded hearing children. Would parents of hearing children tolerate such a standard being applied to their children’s education? School board meetings would be full of parents demanding change. However, deaf children are few in number and therefore unlikely to sway a school board. In my view, the Court failed to serve its role of protecting a minority, a deaf student, from the rule of the majority, the school board.

### Suffering Reps

#### Your representations of affliction, suffering and the plight of the victim reinforce negative reactions to the existence of disabled people.

Clark and Marsh 2002 (Laurence and Steven) 2002. “Patriarchy in the UK: The Language of Disability”, <http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/Clark-Laurence-language.pdf> (WL BFI)

4.1 Emotive Terms. Emotive terms relating to disabled people, such as ‘afflicted’, ‘restricted’, ‘stricken’, ‘sufferer’, ‘unfortunate’ and ‘victim’ tend to reflect a person’s negative reactions to a disabled person.

### Workforce

#### Disabled workers earn nearly 10k less a year compared to non-disabled workers.

Bhattacharya and Long 2015. Ananya, and Heather Long. "America still leaves the disabled behind." CNNMoney. July 26, 2015. Accessed May 27, 2017. <http://money.cnn.com/2015/07/26/news/economy/americans-with-disabilities-act-problems-remain/>. (WL BFI)

Show me the jobs: Employment for disabled Americans has actually fallen since 1990, and there's an even bigger gap between disabled and non-disabled jobs prospects today. In the early 1990s, about half of disabled Americans were employed, according to Census data. Today that has fallen to just 41%. Some of the decline is due to an aging population. Older workers are more likely to have disabilities, especially physical ones. But it's telling that the employment rate of disabled Americans has dropped more than for the non-disabled. The problems often start at an early age. Basic barriers remain: While in high school, Gallacher had three teachers who he says didn't accommodate for his disability in their classes. He found similar problems when he entered college, which is why he transferred to Louisiana Tech from a different university that did not cater to his needs at all. "As a mother of student with disability, I've seen how many schools don't have ramps that are usable. I am just stunned that there hasn't been more attention in our education system to these very obvious emblems of discrimination," said Susan Dooha, executive director of the Center for Independence of the Disabled, who herself suffers from a traumatic brain injury. Being fully blind in the small town of Pearl River in Louisiana does not open up a lot of options for Gallacher. He says he might be the only disabled person in his town so people don't know how to deal with him. The only jobs he's had are volunteering stints. He still lives with his parents and is grateful they support him financially. "I'm always amazed at how many job applications I try to fill it out online but can't get any further because the rest of the offline application becomes inaccessible," said Gallacher. Many businesses no longer list Human Resources contact info, so he can't even call to seek help. Low wage jobs: Even for those with jobs, the prospects remain bleak. Disabled persons earn significantly less than non-disabled, and the gap between annual earnings has widened since the early 1990s. Disabled workers earn about $9,000 less a year than a non-disabled workers, according to Census data on median earnings. That gap was under $6,000 in the early 1990s. A report by the Center for Independence of the Disabled found that the top job for non-disabled people is teaching. For the disabled, it's janitorial duties.

#### Being open about disability in the workplace automatically a red flag. Applicants without disabilities are 26% more likely to generate interest with an employer despite the ADA.

Sola 2015, Katie. "Discrimination Against Disabled Applicants Sadly 'Not Surprising': NDRN Director." Forbes. November 3, 2015. <https://www.forbes.com/forbes/welcome/?toURL=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.forbes.com%2Fsites%2Fkatiesola%2F2015%2F11%2F03%2Fdiscrimination-disabled-job%2F&refURL=&referrer=#63a55e35331d>. (WL BFI)

Employers really do discriminate against job applicants with disabilities, even when the disabilities might make them better workers, a new study shows. The results may help explain why unemployment rates remain high among people with disabilities. "Unfortunately, the results of the study do not surprise us," says Curt Decker, executive director of the National Disability Rights Network. Pure prejudice, litigation concerns and perceived accommodation costs drive employers to reject applicants with disabilities, he explained. Researchers at the National Bureau of Economic Research wanted to see how disabilities affect the hiring process. They submitted 6,016 fake applications to junior and senior positions at accounting firms. One third of the fake applicants mentioned having Asperger's Syndrome, and one third mentioned a spinal cord injury in their cover letters, with a note explaining they could still do their job. The final third of the fake applications did not disclose any disability. The researchers explain in the paper that people with Asperger's Syndrome may be particularly suited to the largely technical and solitary work of accounting. Employers were unconvinced. As shown in the graph above, applicants without disabilities were 26% more likely to get an expression of interest from an employer than their disabled peers. Surprisingly, the fake applicants who had a CPA and six years' experience were less likely to hear back from employers than novice accountants. People with disabilities face enduring challenges in the workplace. The unemployment rate for people with disabilities was 12.5 percent in 2014, twice as high as the 5.9 percent of people without disabilities, according to the Bureau for Labor Statistics. "Unemployed" people are defined as people who don't have jobs but are available and searching for work. Decker spelled out a few reasons why employers might shy away from hiring applicants with disabilities. Companies are wary of having to provide expensive accommodations, although Decker says accommodating disabled employees is easier and cheaper than most companies realize. He pointed out that people with spinal cord injuries use wheelchairs, so they need higher desks, a path of travel and wheelchair accessible bathrooms. Most modern office buildings are wheelchair accessible, and the other modifications wouldn't cost more than a few hundred dollars, he said. Employees with Asperger's might require a flexible schedule, but probably no other accommodations, he added. Decker says companies may believe employees with disabilities are more likely to sue their companies, which he calls a "myth."

#### Disabled people aren’t hired out of the fear that it harms workplace production and creates uncomfortable interactions between coworkers and customers

Lengnick-Hall, Gaunt, and Brooks No Date Mark, Philip Gaunt, and Adrienne Brooks. "Why Employers Don't Hire People With Disabilities: A Survey of the Literature." CPRF. <http://www.cprf.org/studies/why-employers-dont-hire-people-with-disabilities-a-survey-of-the-literature/>. Mark Lengnick-Hall is Professor of Management at the University of Texas at San Antonio, Philip Gaunt is Professor of Communication at Wichita State University, and Adrienne Brooks is a graduate student at the University of Texas at San Antonio. (WL BFI)

Employers Don’t Hire PWDs Because of Coworker Reactions Coworker reactions present a possibility for explaining why employers hire fewer workers with disabilities. Employers may fear that coworkers will react negatively to working with PWDs and thereby lower productivity, increase labor costs, and make their organizations less profitable. Greenwood and Johnson (1987) concluded that while the evidence for these concerns regarding PWDs is mixed, there is “a continuing concern about coworker relationships, particularly when mental and emotional disabilities are involved.” What concerns might coworkers have about working with individuals with disabilities? Stone and Colella (1996) propose three possibilities. First, coworkers may fear a negative effect on work-related outcomes. For example, individuals without disabilities may fear an increase in their workloads as a result of working with an individual with a disability. In conditions of task interdependence, coworkers may fear a loss of rewards if their own job performance is dependent upon an individual with a disability’s job performance. Colella, et al. (1998) found some support for this reaction in a laboratory experiment. Second, coworkers may fear a negative effect on personal outcomes. Individuals without disabilities may fear that some disabilities are contagious (even when they are not). People without disabilities may also feel resentment regarding accommodations and special treatment received by PWDs (Colella, 2001). Third, coworkers may fear a negative effect on interpersonal outcomes. For example, coworkers may feel awkwardness, discomfort, ambivalence, and guilt about how they should interact with PWDs. This may result in avoidance behavior and exclusion of PWDs from formal and informal work groups. All of these coworker concerns may play an even more important role in organizations structured around teams, where team members get to hire their coworkers. Employers Don’t Hire PWDs Because of Customer Reactions Likewise, employers may fear that customers may have negative reactions to interactions with employees with disabilities and transact less business with their organizations. Both explanations are plausible, and interestingly, both explanations were offered in the past to explain employer reluctance to hire other minority groups, such as women, Blacks, and Hispanics. However, this argument ignores the fact that PWDs earn $3630.5 billion in yearly aggregate income (McNeil, 2000). By not hiring PWDs, organizations may be losing revenue as well. While there is no research on this phenomenon, one might expect similar responses to those described previously for coworkers. For work-related outcomes, customers may fear that employees with disabilities do not produce high quality products or are incapable of delivering the same level of service as workers without disabilities. For personal outcomes, customers may hold similar fears as coworkers regarding the contagion of disabilities. For interpersonal outcomes, customers may likewise fear feelings of awkwardness, discomfort, ambivalence, and guilt about how they should interact with PWDs. All of these explanations are plausible; however, there is no research that has been conducted in this area. In summary, employers may choose not to hire individuals with disabilities because of fears about negative coworker and customer reactions. Several theoretical explanations have been proposed that seem quite plausible. Unfortunately, virtually no research has been conducted to test the validity of these propositions.

# U/Q – Schools Inaccessible Now

#### Questions about accessibility and mental illness go unaddressed in schools now.

Rakova 2016. Rakova, Kira. "3 Ways to Help Combat Ableism and Mental Health Stigma in Schools." Everyday Feminism. October 6, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/10/ableism-saneism-in-schools/>. (WL BFI)

3. Redefine Accommodations. Although mental illnesses are recognized under Title II of the American Disabilities Act, most schools’ accommodations largely ignore mental illnesses. This reflects the general attitude and understanding of mental illness in our society. Historically, people with mental illnesses have been excluded and institutionalized (and then subsequently deinstitutionalized without proper support systems or resources). Mental illness continues to be misunderstood and stigmatized within larger society and this influences how schools interact with students with mental illnesses. Moreover, mental health services are largely underfunded and understaffed in schools, meaning that workers without mental health training may be reviewing accommodation cases involving mental illnesses. Of course, having access to technology or extra time during a test are very important accommodations, but for someone with a mental illness, this may not be enough. Individuals with mental illnesses may instead need greater flexibility in terms of absences or participation-based grading. In choosing to expand the types of accommodations available, schools can both make their classrooms accessible and help contest the boundaries of disability and accessibility.

#### **The current school system fails disabled folks**

Rakova 2016. Rakova, Kira. "3 Ways to Help Combat Ableism and Mental Health Stigma in Schools." Everyday Feminism. October 6, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/10/ableism-saneism-in-schools/>. (WL BFI)

The first time I formally learned about mental illnesses and disabilities was in my high school health class. Along with topics like pregnancy and a healthy diet, we also touched on eating disorders, schizophrenia, addiction, and physical disabilities. I use the phrase “touched on” deliberately – because while these topics were mentioned, we never really talked about them. We watched outdated videos with singular, stereotypical (mainly white, cis, middle-class) examples of individuals living with or affected by mental illnesses and various physical disabilities. We read definitions and biomedical criteria of diagnoses in textbooks filled with glossy photographs of the same stereotypical depictions as the videos. It took me years to merge these classroom images with the lived experiences of people I knew. As more and more schools recognize the importance of incorporating social justice topics and consent into the classroom, it’s important to recognize how the US education system has so far not only failed to contest ableism and mental health stigma, but also fails to challenge schools’ reinforcing these forms of oppression. The US education system (at all levels) has helped to create and maintain mainstream (mis)understandings of mental illness and disability. In this way, it has limited disabled and mentally ill folks’ access to educational and labor opportunities. The school system’s failure to be inclusive and educate students about mental illness and disability has contributed to stigma and stereotypes, further causing harm. To some degree, radical changes within education (for example, a greater prioritization of mental health services) are needed to fully address the role of schools in the fight against ableism and mental health stigma. But even without structural and policy changes, there are ways schools can start to combat these issues.

#### Caley Farinas Narrative

Caley Farinas 2016. Farinas, Caley, and Creigh Farinas. "4 Ways Ableism in My Elementary School Left Me Completely Traumatized." Everyday Feminism. April 22, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/04/ableism-elementary-school/>. (WL BFI) – MAYBE READ THIS CARD AS A NARRATIVE

3. They Acted Like I Was Incompetent Because I’m Disabled. There’s a saying in the disability community: presume competence. Our instincts are to lower the bars of presumed abilities so far below what a disabled person can actually do that this saying was created to fight back. My experience in schools is sadly a great example of how the default is to presume incompetence. When I was in high school, the guidance counselor refused to allow me to take Advanced Placement classes. She didn’t attempt to hide the reason why, she simply said, “ESE [disabled] students don’t take Advanced Placement classes.” Because I’m disabled, it was automatically assumed that I and all other disabled students couldn’t handle an Advanced Placement class. They didn’t look at my grades, which were great. They didn’t look at how I’d done in my previous Honors classes. They simply said that a disabled person can’t possibly succeed in a hard class, so we don’t allow them to take those classes. What?! They made me fulfill objectives no other student had to complete. When I was in fifth grade, my mother was summoned to a school meeting. Some students’ influential parents had complained, they said, about having a disabled student in class with typical students. And it was annoying for the teachers for having to deal with my behavior (calling out of turn, constant movement – the typical for ADHD and autism) in class. They then tried to kick me out of the school. My mother, bless her, despite being surprise attacked and outnumbered ten to one at the meeting, fought tooth and nail for my rights. Finally, they conceded to “merely” put me on probation. I would have to meet a certain standard of performance, they said. If I did, I could stay. If I didn’t, I would be kicked out. From that point on, every day they would hand me a rating card. I would take it from teacher to teacher, and they would then rate me on a behavior scale from 0-3. It’s not great for your self-confidence and image to be rated all the time by adults; I knew a low number meant I was bad and a high number meant I was more okay. I couldn’t do anything about it, though. I didn’t know what they wanted from me. I acted as good as I could and many days I got bad scores. Sometimes I would act in a way I felt was bad and I’d get great scores. And eventually I just said, screw it; I learned I had no control over my own life. “Good behavior” was a moving target, too. Every time I was pulled into see the principal they’d tell me multiple new rules I needed to follow. I couldn’t remember everything and it was never written down. I felt like I was walking on a terrifying minefield. It was always “act like this or else” but I didn’t understand the “this.” But honestly the worst thing did that entire year was being very bouncy when my ADHD meds weren’t working. As you might imagine, this discriminatory probation had massive effects on me. All of a sudden adults were very scary and not trustworthy. I was always terrified that I would be kicked out. I learned I was helpless against others. 4. They Saw Nothing But My Weaknesses There’s a rule here in the United States that once children reach an age of competence, they sit in on the meetings establishing their accommodations and talking about their goals. This is something I am all in favor of, because, when done in the manner intended, this gives the student a wonderful opportunity to learn and practice self-advocacy. Unfortunately, when done by my school team, all that happened was I was held captive in a meeting in which all my teachers were telling me how terrible I was. “She doesn’t listen well and she didn’t complete her task to the best of her abilities,” one complained. “She doesn’t sit well,” another added. “She’s far behind in writing and she’s missed three assignments,” a third might say. It basically felt like a “let’s talk about Caley and everything that’s bad about her, and remind her how different she is, and shame her for not having met her goals” time. And all I was allowed to say in my defense was “yes, sir” or “no, ma’am.” An opportunity to teach self-advocacy was twisted into an opportunity to teach helplessness.

# Impacts

### Generic/Root Cause

\*Several of these cards also function as link evidence to other isms.

#### Ableism is the root cause of all oppression. To be disabled to is be everything that is not normal and welcome.

Siebers 2009 (Tobin, University of Michigan, Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, Oct 28, 2009.

Oppression is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves “groups,” and not “individuals,” means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority—what some call “in-built” or “biological” inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics—not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed. One additional thought must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. “Racism” disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. “Sexism” disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. “Classism” disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. “Ableism” disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature. As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority—and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression—the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.

#### Ableism is responsible for worker exploitation, abuse, criminalization, homelessness, and others.

Stevens 2015. Stevens, Maddy. "Ableism." Premier Debate Today. November 19, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/11/19/ableism/>. (WL BFI) (Links to academia, biopolitics,

The notions we have of disability have been informed by a mostly able academia, a mostly able media, and a mostly able society. In this way, we have come to know about disability through the lens of those who are accepted and thus are in control, rather than those who are affected and who are kept subdued by such constructions. Various institutions and groups continue to benefit from the misunderstanding leveled towards disability, as well as its otherization and criminalization. Employers in the United States may obtain an exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act, allowing them to pay their disabled (read: unproductive, less important) employees below the minimum wage, the average being $2.15 an hour. The perpetuated myths of disabled persons being in a state of “arrested development” or “children in adult bodies” justify the segregation and poor treatment of disabled workers, who, it is asserted, should be grateful for any employment or compensation at all in light of their “defects”. Lawmakers routinely use disability as a scapegoat in order to preserve their own agendas (because the problem isn’t guns or racism, it’s crazy people!) despite the fact that having a disability increases the likelihood of being abused, not being an abuser. Historically, disability has been punishable by imprisonment and institutionalization, trends that we see continuing through the criminalization and abuse of homeless and lower income persons, who are disproportionately disabled, and thus disproportionately excluded. Legacies of disenfranchisement continue in all areas, but most egregiously (and for some reason, least acknowledged) in the 35 states in which it is illegal for developmentally disabled persons to vote. All of these connections stand to demonstrate that the idea and treatment of disability has been created by those who, in some way, benefit from the identification of and stigma towards disabled communities.

#### Isms are reliant upon the otherization of the body, to be black is to be disabled, to be feminine is to be disabled to be queer is to be disabled.

Wolbring 2008 (Gregor Wolbring, assistant professor, Dept of Community Health Sciences, Program in Community Rehabilitation and Disability Studies, University of Calgary. “The Politics of Ableism.” Development (2008) 51, 252–258.

Ableism is a set of beliefs, processes and practices that produce - based on abilities one exhibits or values - a particular understanding of oneself, one’s body and one’s relationship with others of humanity, other species and the environment, and includes how one is judged by others (Wolbring, 2006a,2007a, b, c, d). Ableism reflects the sentiment of certain social groups and social structures that value and promote certain abilities, for example, productivity and competitiveness, over others, such as empathy, compassion and kindness. This preference for certain abilities over others leads to a labelling of real or perceived deviations from or lack of ‘essential’ abilities as a diminished state of being, leading or contributing to justifying various other isms (Wolbring, 2006a, 2007a, b, c, d). Ableism is an umbrella ism for other isms such as racism, sexism, casteism, ageism, speciesism, anti-environmentalism, gross domestic product (GDP)-ism and consumerism. One can identify many different forms of ableism such as biological structure-based ableism (B), cognition-based ableism (C), social structure-based ableism (S) and ableism inherent to a given economic system (E). ABECS could be used as the ableism equivalent to the NBICS S&T convergence (Wolbring, 2007e). Ableism and preference of certain abilities has been rampant throughout history. Ableism shaped and continues to shape areas such as human security (Wolbring, 2006c), social cohesion (Wolbring, 2007f), social policies, relationships among social groups, individuals and countries, humans and non-humans, and humans and their environment (Wolbring, 2007a, b, c). Ableism is one of the most societally entrenched and accepted isms. Historically, ableism has been used by various social groups to justify their elevated level of rights and status in relation to other groups (i.e. women were viewed as biologically fragile and emotional, and thus incapable of bearing the responsibility of voting, owning property and retaining custody of their own children (ableism leading to sexism; Silvers et al.,1998;Wolbring, 2003). Different forms of ableism Ableism against disabled people (Wolbring, 2007a, b, c) reflects a preference for speciestypical normative abilities leading to the discrimination against them as ‘less able’ and/or as ‘impaired’disabled people (Wolbring, 2004, 2005). This type of ableism is supported by the medical, deficiency, impairment categorization of disabled people (medical model) (Wolbring, 2004, 2005). It rejects the ‘variation of being’, biodiversity notion and categorization of disabled people (social model). It leads to the focus on ‘fixing’ the person or preventing more of such people being born and ignores the acceptance and accommodation of such people in their variation of being (Wolbring, 2005). Ableism has also long been used to justify hierarchies of rights and discrimination between other social groups, and to exclude people not classified as ‘disabled people’. Sexism is partly driven by a form of ableism that favours certain abilities, and the labelling of women as not having those certain necessary abilities is used to justify sexism and the dominance of males over females. Similarly, racism and ethnicism are partly driven by forms of ableism, which have two components. One favours one race or ethnic group and discriminates against another. The book The Bell Curve (Herrnstein and Murray, 1994) judged human beings on their ‘cognitive abilities’ (their IQ). It promoted racism by claiming that certain ethnic groups are less cognitively able than others. The ableist judgement related to cognitive abilities continues justifying racist arguments. Casteism, like racism, is based on the notion that socially defined groups of people have inherent, natural qualities or ‘essences ’that assign them to social positions, make them fit for specific duties and occupations (Omvedt,2001).The natural inherent qualities are ‘abilities’ that make them fit for specific duties and occupations.

Siebers 2010 [Tobin Siebers, Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Michigan; “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”; University of Michigan Press; 10/28/2010; <<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>>.]

Disqualification at this moment in time justifies discrimination, servitude, imprisonment, involuntary institutionalization, euthanasia, human and civil rights violations, military intervention, compulsory sterilization, police actions, assisted suicide, capital punishment, and murder. It is my contention that disqualification finds support in the way that bodies appear and in their specific appearances—that is, disqualification is justified through the accusation of mental or physical inferiority based on aesthetic principles. Disqualification is produced by naturalizing inferiority as the justification for unequal treatment, violence, and oppression. According to Snyder and Mitchell, disability serves in the modern period as “the master trope of human disqualification.” They argue that disability represents a marker of otherness that establishes differences between human beings not as acceptable or valuable variations but as dangerous deviations. Douglas Baynton provides compelling examples from the modern era, explaining that during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States disability identity disqualified other identities defined by gender, race, class, and nationality. Women were deemed inferior because they were said to have mental and physical disabilities. People of color had fewer rights than other persons based on accusations of biological inferiority. Immigrants were excluded from entry into the United States when they were poor, sick, or failed standardized tests, even though the populations already living there were poor, sick, and failed standardized tests. In every case, disability identity served to justify oppression by amplifying ideas about inferiority already attached to other minority identities. Disability is the trope by which the assumed inferiority of these other minority identities achieved expression. The appearance of lesser mental and physical abilities disqualifies people as inferior and justifies their oppression. It is now possible to recognize disability as a trope used to posit the inferiority of certain minority populations, but it remains extremely difficult to understand that mental and physical markers of inferiority are also tropes placed in the service of disability oppression. Before disability can be used as a disqualifier, disability, too, has to be disqualified. Beneath the troping of blackness as inbuilt inferiority, for example, lies the troping of disability as inferior. Beneath the troping of femininity as biological deficiency lies the troping of disability as deficiency. The mental and physical properties of bodies become the natural symbols of inferiority via a process of disqualification that seems biological, not cultural—which is why disability discrimination seems to be a medical rather than a social problem. If we consider how difficult it is at this moment to disqualify people as inferior on the basis of their racial, sexual, gender, or class characteristics, we may come to recognize the ground that we must cover in the future before we experience the same difficulty disqualifying people as inferior on the basis of disability. We might also recognize the work that disability performs at present in situations where race, sexuality, gender, and class are used to disqualify people as physically or mentally inferior.

### Dehumanization

#### **The disabled body is never in possession of self-direction under the aff**

Dillon 99 (Michael, University of Lancaster, “Another Justice” Political Theory Vol. 27, No. 2, April 1999)

Otherness is born(e) within the self as an integral part of itself and in such a way that it always remains an inherent stranger to itself." It derives from the lack, absence, or ineradicable incompleteness which comes from having no security of tenure within or over that of which the self is a particular hermeneutical manifestation; namely, being itself. The point about the human, betrayed by this absence, is precisely that it is not sovereignly self-possessed and complete, enjoying undisputed tenure in and of itself. Modes of justice therefore reliant upon such a subject lack the very foundations in the self that they most violently insist upon seeing inscribed there. This does not, however, mean that the dissolution of the subject also entails the dissolution of Justice. Quite the reverse. The subject was never a firm foundation for justice, much less a hospitable vehicle for the reception of the call of another Justice. It was never in possession of that self-possession which was supposed to secure the certainty of itself, of a self-possession that would enable it ultimately to adjudicate everything. The very indexicality required of sovereign subjectivity gave rise rather to a commensurability much more amenable to the expendability required of the political and material economies of mass societies than it did to the singular, invaluable, and uncanny uniqueness of the self. The value of the subject became the standard unit of currency for the political arithmetic of States and the political economies of capitalism. They trade in it still to devastating global effect. The technologisation of the political has become manifest and global. Economies of evaluation necessarily require calculability. Thus no valuation without mensuration and no mensuration without indexation. Once rendered calculable, however, units of account are necessarily submissible not only to valuation but also, of course, to devaluation. Devaluation, logically, can extend to the point of counting as nothing. Hence, no mensuration without demensuration either. There is nothing abstract about this: the declension of economies of value leads to the zero point of holocaust. However liberating and emancipating systems of value-rights-may claim to be, for example, they run the risk of counting out the invaluable. Counted out, the invaluable may then lose its purchase on life. Herewith, then, the necessity of championing the invaluable itself. For we must never forget that, "we are dealing always with whatever exceeds measure. But how does that necessity present itself? Another Justice answers: as the surplus of the duty to answer to the claim of Justice over rights. That duty, as with the advent of another Justice, is integral to the lack constitutive of the human way of being.

#### **Dehumanization is the root cause of any and all violence**

Katz 97 (Katheryn D. Katz, prof. of law - Albany Law School, 1997, Albany Law Journal

It is undeniable that throughout human history dominant and oppressive groups have committed unspeakable wrongs against those viewed as inferior. Once a person (or a people) has been characterized as sub-human, there appears to have been no limit to the cruelty that was or will be visited upon him. For example, in almost all wars, hatred towards the enemy was inspired to justify the killing and wounding by separating the enemy from the human race, by casting them as unworthy of human status. This same rationalization has supported: genocide, chattel slavery, racial segregation, economic exploitation, caste and class systems, coerced sterilization of social misfits and undesirables, unprincipled medical experimentation, the subjugation of women, and the social Darwinists' theory justifying indifference to the poverty and misery of others.

#### **Dehumanization creates infrastructure which allows for genocide**

Maiese 2003 (Michelle. "Dehumanization." Beyond Intractability, Conflict Research Consortium, UC Boulder, http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/dehumanization)  
While deindividuation and the formation of enemy images are very common, they form a dangerous process that becomes especially damaging when it reaches the level of dehumanization. Once certain groups are stigmatized as evil, morally inferior, and not fully human, the persecution of those groups becomes more psychologically acceptable. Restraints against aggression and violence begin to disappear. Not surprisingly, dehumanization increases the likelihood of violence and may cause a conflict to escalate out of control. Once a violence break over has occurred, it may seem even more acceptable for people to do things that they would have regarded as morally unthinkable before. Parties may come to believe that destruction of the other side is necessary, and pursue an overwhelming victory that will cause one's opponent to simply disappear. This sort of into-the-sea framing can cause lasting damage to relationships between the conflicting parties, making it more difficult to solve their underlying problems and leading to the loss of more innocent lives. Indeed, dehumanization often paves the way for human rights violations, war crimes, and genocide. For example, in WWII, the dehumanization of the Jews ultimately led to the destruction of millions of people.[9] Similar atrocities have occurred in Rwanda, Cambodia, and the former Yugoslavia.

### Classroom Violence

#### Ableism is violence, against those who, in their body and mind, deviate from what we perceive as normal. Ableism leads authority figures to force neurodiverse people to be "normal," a method that of course always fails, so coercion just becomes punishment for perceived abnormality

Perry 2016. Perry, David. "Teacher's awful mistreatment of special needs child." CNN. May 04, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://www.cnn.com/2016/05/04/opinions/special-needs-child-mistreated-in-classroom-opinion-perry/>. (WL BFI)

(CNN)Last week, a Georgia principal went into a classroom in Conyers, Georgia, a small city east of Atlanta, and witnessed a literally unbelievable sight. A 5-year-old African-American boy, a student in the special education program at the school, had been suspended by his belt from the top of the blackboard. According to the child's grandmother, the boy was screaming. The culprit wasn't some bully picking on a disabled child. According to news reports, the boy's teacher was punishing the boy for misbehavior. Worse, it wasn't the first time she had used this horrific, terrifying, method. The school superintendent is recommending the dismissal of the teacher, a paraprofessional in the classroom, and another teacher. The abuse should be shocking. How could something like this happen in 2016? Alas, I've spent the last few years researching and writing about the abuse of disabled children in school, and I'm sad to report that this kind of incident is pretty typical. Despite decades of improvement in our special education practices, and the hard work of tens of thousands of fantastic teachers, the data is clear. Children with disabilities -- especially those who are black or brown -- remain terribly at risk for violence in schools. While I've never heard of a child being hung by his belt from a blackboard, there are stories of children being handcuffed, locked in closets, knocked to the ground or taunted by the very professionals who are tasked with educating them. It happens because too many teachers value absolute compliance over tolerance for neurodiversity and atypical behaviors, and feel empowered to use coercive measures to enforce this cult of compliance. Widespread abuses. Some problems are systemic. Last year, major exposes revealed terrible abuses in schools in Massachusetts, Florida and California. Children were locked in closets, choked, put into prone restraints for minor behavior issues, sent to jail and even killed. More recently, teachers, guards and other staff at the Tobinworld schools in California have been accused of regularly using violence to control children's behavior. As I wrote for CNN, too many children are ruthlessly handcuffed for behavioral -- not criminal -- infractions. While it's law enforcement that does handcuffing, it's teachers who call school resource officers into classrooms to control atypical behavior. When individual cases pop up, such as the one in Conyers, I always wonder how many hidden abuses are escaping notice.

#### Disabled students are more than 20 times more likely to be the victims of violence at the hands of their educators.

Perry 2015. Perry, David. "When Teachers Abuse Disabled Children – Pacific Standard." Pacific Standard. December 17, 2015. Accessed April 28, 2017. <https://psmag.com/when-teachers-abuse-disabled-children-79c600fe4e83>. (WL BFI)

Calm response to non-compliance is a necessary part of educating and caring for all children, but the importance of using positive reinforcement takes center stage in situations involving children with disabilities. Neither fear nor pain can force a child to be less disabled or to suddenly become neurotypical. Unfortunately, in many school districts and institutions, the use of restraint, seclusion, and, too often, pain and trauma, have become the default response to disabled children who don’t perfectly obey commands. American schools have become one site of a cult of compliance, a cult that penalizes disabled students most obviously, but in fact puts every child at risk. Three independent reports on restraint and abuse of disabled children — from Florida, Massachusetts, and California, respectively — happened to be released almost simultaneously at the end of last week. They join a litany of other horror stories from 2015 that detail the systematic abuse of disabled children. While the circumstances differ, they coalesce around the same pattern — a refusal to tolerate even the most banal defiance. These reports collectively reveal that too many people charged with protecting our most vulnerable students are failing to do their jobs. Our nationwide circumnavigation of abuse stories begins with ProPublica’s report, “What Happened to Adam?” about an AdvoServ school in Florida. AdvoServ is a private for-profit school serving 700 disabled children and adults in three states. Heather Vogell, author of the ProPublica report, focuses on a young autistic man named Adam. He entered the school when he was 16, and, over seven years, was regularly restrained at Carlton Palms, AdvoServ’s biggest facility. Toward the end of his tenure there, he was restrained 44 times in just two months. His behavior deteriorated and his body bore the marks of painful devices and holds, finally alerting his mother to the situation. Lawsuits have followed. Why did the staff at Carlton Palms restrain Adam so regularly? Vogell writes: “Some restraints occurred in response to what sounded like dangerous behavior…. But others hardly screamed emergency at all. One time, Adam refused to clean up Legos and ended up in mechanical restraints. He was put in them, too, for an incident that began with his smiling and throwing a toy across the room. His ankles were bound after he tossed a dinner bowl and broke it, and after he launched couch cushions across the room.” Even worse, Adam was not an anomaly. Vogell describes allegations contained within a series of lawsuits and criminal investigations, including a boy kicked in the head and choked, residents who were dragged across the floor, and one 14-year-old autistic girl who died. Her name was Paige Lunsford. She was non-verbal, bound to her bed by her hands and wrists as she vomited, day after day, until she died of dehydration in July of 2013. Denied communication devices, she couldn’t even ask for help. The Miami Herald reports that the Department of Children and Family probe of Lunsford’s death was the 140th investigation of abuse or neglect at Carlton Palms. So far, though, nothing has been done, and both ProPublica and the Herald suggest that AdvoServ’s political donations may help shield it. The company has generally donated to Democrats in New Jersey and Delaware, and to Republicans in Florida. When Wellspring Capital, a private equity firm, bought AdvoServ last month, Wellspring’s press release touted “AdvoServ’s historic accomplishments,” adding that “favorable industry dynamics present compelling opportunities to grow our business by caring for, and improving the lives of, more individuals in need.” Wellspring refused to comment on the allegations for this piece. It might be easy to focus just on AdvoServ as a bad private actor with political connections, but that would be a mistake. In Massachusetts, the abuse took place in the public school system. According to the Disability Law Center of Massachusetts, Peck School, in Holyoke, deployed dangerous prone restraints for disabled children on a near-constant basis. Prone restraints involve pressing an individual’s body to the ground, on their stomach. One adult can use body weight to hold the child down while grabbing the child’s arms and pinning them, or two adults can team up, one taking the arms and the other the legs. In all cases, prone restraint of children brings with it the risk of injury or even asphyxiation. Staff at Peck School used the technique casually, to force compliance, despite mounting injuries. Restraint in such schools is often paired with forced seclusion. One teacher placed a child in a locked closet on three occasions and turned off the lights, leading to apparent psychological trauma. Many of Peck’s students specifically struggled with post-traumatic stress disorder; this kind of violence only exacerbates such conditions, even if the use of force grants teachers and staff temporary control. Again, there’s no reason to think Peck is unique. After teachers were caught forcing disabled students into padded closets, the state of Texas recently passed a law making it mandatory for schools to videotape all interactions between staff and disabled students. Video may help with accountability, but it would be better for teachers to stop shoving their students into closets. The third report, from the Center for Public Integrity, details regular restraint, seclusion, and criminalization in the San Bernardino City Unified School District in California, including the restraint of a non-compliant 18-year-old Latino man with Down syndrome, who was subsequently arrested. This study emphasizes the rush to deposit children of color in the school-to-prison pipeline, an issue that the American Civil Liberties Union raised earlier this year as well — right now, the ACLU is helping three Kentucky families sue over the use of restraints on much younger children of color. In August, the ACLU released a video that quickly went viral. It shows a slender eight-year-old boy with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder sobbing as he’s cuffed for “not listening.” The School Resource Officer tells the sobbing boy, “You can do what we asked you to, or you can suffer the consequences.” Claudia Center, senior staff attorney of the ACLU’s Disability Rights Program says: “If you crunch the numbers from the latest data [2011–12], students with disabilities are more than 20 times as likely as students without disabilities to be subjected to physical restraint at school,” including mechanical restraints such as handcuffs and shackles. In a case of multiplying marginalization, disabled children of color are vastly more likely to be restrained than disabled white students. We saw this play out in Virginia, with the arrest of Kayleb Moon-Robinson, a 12-year-old African-American autistic boy, who was charged with felony assault in a series of incidents that began with kicking a trashcan. It shouldn’t be this way. While it’s reasonable to expect neurodiverse children and adults to learn to regulate their behavior to whatever extent is possible, punitive discipline is the worst way imaginable to achieve that goal. Barb Trader, the executive director of TASH, an advocacy organization that uses research to advocate for best practices in supporting people with significant disabilities, says that experts have long known how to support students with behavior difficulties. You don’t punish them; instead, you look beyond the incident of non-compliance for the cause. “There’s always a cause to a behavioral situation,” she says. Trader cited well-developed techniques such as “Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports” or “Trauma Informed Practices” that offer safer and more effective ways of reaching even the most challenging children.

#### Ableist violence in schools has long lasting effects

Farinas 2016. Farinas, Caley, and Creigh Farinas. "4 Ways Ableism in My Elementary School Left Me Completely Traumatized." Everyday Feminism. April 22, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/04/ableism-elementary-school/>. (WL BFI)

I wake up with nightmares about elementary school. I’m twenty-two years old. I’m a college graduate. I don’t live in the same city as any of the schools I attended, so I’m never forced go past my own schools or bump into my old teachers. However, the trauma I experienced from grade school was so intense that I still wake up screaming some nights. So why this pain still? You’d have nightmares, too, if you experienced the ableist violence, discrimination, targeting, and exclusion of the school system the way I and many disabled people have. Not only was the school system not set up in a way to protect me from the unregulated bias of my teachers and school administrators, but it turned its head the other way when I was treated by other children in a horrifying way. And, unfortunately, both dynamics were the norm, all the way from kindergarten to twelfth grade. I keep hoping things have changed, that it was only bad luck that put me in the path of terrible schools, and that things are far better for disabled kids now. But in truth, even though I went to pretty good schools and despite the fact that over a decade has passed since I was in elementary school, feedback I hear from disabled children and their parents indicates the effects of ableism in the schools really hasn’t changed all that much. Kids are still going through the pain, the terror, and the oppression that I went through so many years ago, and that not only terrifies me – it breaks my heart. So I’m speaking out. I’m pointing out the themes in my experience that I hear echoed in the voices of other disabled people. And I’m hoping that those who work in the schools, or advocate for school-aged children, will listen. Because my school experience is a pretty messed up story, and I never, ever want to see it repeated with anyone else. The traumas that we subject disabled students to — or fail to protect them from — leave long lasting scars. And they teach disabled kids the way they should expect to be treated by the world. The following list of completely preventable acts of ableism that fueled traumatic events I experienced as a disabled kid are some of the deepest scars I bear. I really wish I could say that this was all any disabled student faced, but it’s by no means anywhere close — especially for kids with intersecting marginalized identities and circumstances.

### Eugenics

#### While the original notions of eugenics may no longer be prevalent the notions that some lives are more valuable than others, and that some lives are less productive compared to others further perpetuates violence and genocide against the disabled body

St. Pierre 2014 9-25-2014, "Eugenics and the Cure for Stuttering," Did I Stutter?, <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/eugenics-and-the-cure-for-stuttering> (WL)

While society has always discriminated against disabiity to some degree, it is only in the past 150 years that humans have believed themselves capable of removing disability from the human population altogether in the happy march of human progress. The irradiation of disability fits into a larger story, into the history of what is termed “eugenics.” Eugenics is the attempt to improve the genetic stock of humanity—literally to create better people. Originating in the mid-nineteenth century with Francis Galton, an English scientist responsible for discovering statistical techniques of measuring heritable human abilities and characteristics, eugenics caught on like wildfire across Europe and especially in North America. Galton introduced the idea of statistically “normal” human traits and the idea that the quality of the human race could be improved by promoting the reproduction of “higher” quality people (positive eugenics) while discouraging the reproduction of “lower” quality people (negative eugenics). Following from Galton’s theory of negative eugenics, institutions were quickly erected to separate those deemed “feeble-minded” from the rest of society. Built upon some very sketchy science, thousands of disabled people (or people diagnosed as disabled) were segregated and sterilized in an attempt to produce a better population, or a better human “stock” throughout Canada and the US. In Alberta, the Canadian province in which I live, 2 800 people were approved by the government between 1928 and 1972 to be sterilized non-consensually and often without their knowledge (I am involved with a major research project called the [Living Archives on Eugenics in Western Canada](http://eugenicsarchive.ca/)) . ¶ ¶ The logic of eugenics—that the human race should and can be improved—is most infamously associated with the Nazi Final Solution. Yet it is less-well known that the creation of a “pure” Aryan race was first tested on disabled people. By the end of WW2, an estimated 275 000 disabled people had been murdered by the Nazis, many of them severely intellectually disabled or mentally ill.[1] Moreover, it is worth noting that many champions of eugenics in North America praised early Nazi attempts at social hygiene. These events seem chilling from our perspective, yet eliminating "less suitable" kinds of people through eugenics was commonly assumed as necessary to combat poverty, crime, and a host of racist and ableist cultural anxieties. ¶ After the holocaust, eugenic practices—no surprise—fell out of favor. The racism of the holocaust was denounced, as was the “science” that it relied upon. Yet many institutions for the “feeble-minded” remained open for business, some, like in Alberta, sterilizing disabled people into the 70s. How could this happen? Put in simple terms, the ableism propelling eugenics was never slowed. While no one in the scientific community now suggests that certain racialized groups are inferior and should not exist, the idea that the world would be a better place without disability is rarely questioned. Disabled people are still treated as less-than fully human. Think of the language we commonly use to describe unwanted things: “that’s so *lame*” “are you *blind*?” “what a *dumb* idea” “you’re so *insane*” (there are many other ableist terms that get thrown around). What is disability in movies but a tragedy, an inspiration, or something to laugh at? How many times have you heard someone exclaim that they would rather die than be blind or in a wheelchair? Disabled lives are still not understood as fully human. ¶ The ugly eugenics of the 20th century is now being replaced by shiny “newgenic” practices such as pre-natal screening that still attempt to stop disabled people from existing. The methods have changed, but the endgame is the same: a world without disability, weakness, and deviance. In other words, while we decry sterilization and (sometimes) institutionalization as inhumane, eugenic beliefs are only gaining steam. It is from this perspective that I worry about the search for a stuttering cure. There was much hubbub about a “stuttering gene” a little while back, a search that would not have been out of place 100 years ago. I have sat across from speech-language pathologists excitedly telling me about the search for a stuttering cure and wondered: what other reason is there to find a cure for stuttering than to eliminate our voices and to remove stuttering from the gene pool and the human condition? Being from Alberta and knowing about our shameful eugenic history colours the search for a stuttering cure for me. As well intentioned as it may seem, a “cure” for stuttering cannot be separated from the idea and practise of eugenics that assumes the world would be a better place without disability, without *us*. We already screen for Down Syndrome since we have decided some lives are more valuable than others. In 20 years might we screen foetuses for stuttering? (I am, by the way, dubious that a stuttering gene will ever be found). What about Speech Easy? Pharmaceuticals? Therapy? While often advertised as helping us “find our voice,” I believe these practices are often eugenic, aimed at normalization. It is just assumed that, given a choice, we would rather talk fluently. We would rather not be disabled. I do not believe that the world would be a better place without disability and without stuttering. We have seen shadows of that world and it is foul and dangerous, full of fear and hate. Rather, with disability theorist Rosemarie Garland-Thomson,[2] I believe we need to understand disability as intrinsic to our humanity, something that needs to be “conserved” and encouraged to flourish in the face of eugenic ideas and practises. My desire is for a world where different types of bodies, voices, minds, experiences, and people can exist together, learn from each other, and yes, even love each other.

### Self Hatred

#### Ableism is perpetuated individually and structurally by the medical model through the educational system, this internalizes self hatred onto the neurodivergent

St. Pierre 2014, 7-8-2014, "Internalized Ableism, or, Why do I (Still) Hate Myself?," Did I Stutter?, <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/internalized-ableism-or-why-do-i-still-hate-myself> (WL)

Ableism, as a reminder, is the discrimination against disabled people in favour of those who are “able-bodied.” Ableism, like racism or sexism, occurs on the individual level (e.g. when we get insulted or ignored in conversation because of how we speak) as well as at the structural level (e.g. society is set up in such a way as to disadvantage us and privilege those who speak fluently). Ableism is a complex thing that takes tremendous work and many years to fight against in order to create more inclusive and welcoming societies. However, ableism is not just “out there.” It only works because it twists inside the people it targets, in our case, people who stutter. Ableism is internalized from an early age, as ableist assumptions take root in us and we begin to believe them to be true. Assumptions like: we must speak fluently to be taken seriously; we can expect to be made fun of and discriminated against (and there is really nothing to do about it); and, a stutter is not only a problem but is my problem. How many of these things do we simply accept as truth? These beliefs are, pardon my french, complete bullshit (poke around on our website to see our views on stuttering and ableism). I know this in my head. I know that stuttering is not really about my body and how it speaks, but about ridiculous ideas of what “normal” speech sounds like and cultural expectations regarding how fast and fluent everyone needs to be. I know that stuttering is more about society than about me. But the thing is, no matter how disgusting and untrue ableist beliefs may be, over time they become a part of us. How do you root out a part of yourself? We have lived with lies about stuttering for so long that making social changes to the world “out there” may be easier than not hating ourselves and our speech--those quiet whispers that tell us the negative ways people respond to stuttering really is our fault. A central part of reframing stuttering and resisting the medical model is going to be dealing with internalized ableism and changing ourselves. This is difficult work, but I believe it is possible to overcome these lies about ourselves. What can we do about internalized ableism? I am certainly no expert as I am still working through the process myself, but here are two ideas: 1) Education—while this ultimately isn’t the most important one on the list, it is still central. I believe it is difficult (as I mentioned in [another blog post](http://www.didistutter.org/blog/against-self-acceptance)) to change ourselves in any lasting way when we still accept the medical model of stuttering: the belief that stuttering is a biological and physiological thing.We need to understand ourselves in other ways that shift the focus away from our bodies and onto social discriminations and ableist social expectations. Sadly, the overwhelming majority of stuttering literature assumes the medical model. This needs to change. 2) Community—we need communities that affirm and encourage dysfluent speech. We support self-help groups, but we also need communities that are not based in medical-models of stuttering; communities of dysfluent speakers that can encourage one another enough to imaginetheir stutters not as individual problems to cope with, but as important and diverse voices in the world¶

# Alternatives

## Cripistimology/Failure

#### **\*The alternative is to fail. To fail to engage, to fail to be normal, whatever it may be. The alternative is to engage in difference.**

#### **Curricular cripistemologies offer teachable moments organized around crip/queer content that interrupt normative cultural practices. Our rejection of “best teaching methods” spins on its head the way that the neoliberal world values education and disabled bodies**

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

Whereas the administrative platform of former President George W. Bush pushed for U.S. educational reforms around the promotion of standardized testing to “leave no child behind,” we, in turn, present an argument for recognizing standardization of curricula as ultimately “leaving every child behind,” or at least promoting a certain type of norm-fulfilling child in whose name most students turn up wanting. This curricular abandonment of difference in the name of assimilation occurs primarily through an incapacity (or, perhaps, unwillingness) to adapt the lessons of systemically in-built accommo-dations and crip/queer content designed to address the range of learning differences comprising today’s classroom demographics. The neoliberal school attempts to resolve the accommodation of disability through downplaying rather than drawing from people’s differences. Through the promotion of active abandonment of crip/queer differences, neoliberal standards guide educational reforms saturated in the questionable values of ableism and normalization. In order to double back on this process, practitioners of curricular cripiste-mologies undertake critical examinations of “compulsory able-bodiedness” (McRuer 31) and “compulsory able-mindedness” (Kafer 16). Thus, what appears on the surface as disabled students’ incapacity to keep up with their normative peers, turns out to be a purposeful failure to accomplish the unreal (and, perhaps, unrealizable) objectives of normalization. Within the multiplying paradoxes of neoliberal inclusionism, crip success is, paradox-ically, to fail to become normate. In The Queer Art of Failure Halberstam advocates a concept of “failure [that] allows us [crip/queer people] to escape the punishing norms that discipline behavior and manage human development with the goal of delivering us from unruly childhoods to orderly and predictable adulthoods” (3). This queer studies inversion of ways to read non-normative lives as failing standards of heteronormative expectations enables crip/queer people to pursue other modes of existence as alternates to sanctioned social roles. These alternative strategies of living pass by largely undetected because educational assessments measure only the degree to which students clear the bar of normalization. By applying this crip/queer deployment of “failure,” curricular cripistemologies undertake pedagogical practices suppressed (or, at least, devalued) by normative neoliberal educational contexts. In adopting a strategically counter-intuitive slogan such as “every student left behind,” then, the critique of inclusionism acknowledges the increasingly disciplinarian nature of public education’s normalizing objectives. Inclusion has taught teachers a dangerous lesson in what appears to be a failed model of adaptation: crip/queer students cannot effectively compete with their non-disabled peers. The pedagogical assessment of the distance that exists between crip/queer and normal students by standardized testing regimes is now part and parcel of the wider cultural abandonment of non-normativity. But what if a “failure to thrive” in pre-determined educational roles is understood as the product of active refusal (that which Halberstam refers to as a “rejection of pragmatism” [89] and Herbert Kohl terms “willed not-learning” [134]) to “fit” disability paradigms reductively dictated by normative institu-tional expectations? We could take seriously the findings of DSE scholars such as Phil Smith, who points out in Whatever Happened to Inclusion? that education has actually lost ground in terms of including students with more significant disabilities in recent years (28). Within this context, the objectives accomplished by public relations-driven educational “creaming practices” proliferate. They operationalize inclusionist claims to success wherein the normative accomplishments of the most “able disabled students” eclipse the struggles of those left behind. Inclusionism, in other words, covers over an unethical promotion of the successes of the few based upon normative standards of achievement for the inadequacies of the many. Within curricular cripistemologies disability metamorphoses from successful normalization into lesser versions of the ableist self into a meaningful alternative site for transforming pedagogical practices and failed social identities. A productive failure whose sites are set significantly higher than neoliberal tolerance allows.

### Generic Solvency

#### Cripistemology allows for a unique form of pedagogy, and understanding of the world around us, everything from opening up alternative epistemologies and ontologies to the deconstruction of the global creation of difference.

Puar 2014. Jasib Puar in Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Jasbir K. Puar I teach a class called The Globalization of Disability. The course title indicates first the ways that the conceptualization of what disability is travel through circuits of political economy, legislative rights regimes (nation-state and interna-tional human rights), and indeed now through the project of disability studies. The class also focuses on how geopolitical relations of global disparity literally produce disability: labor exploitation, biomedicine, colonization, occupations, and war machines. In other words, disability is already part and parcel of a system of governing inclusion and exclusion, and the category disability may well create exclusion as much as it ameliorates it. What forms of epistemic violence does the category of disability, routed through neoliberal capital and flows of globalization, produce? How will cripistemologies address the dominance of Western knowledge production, the predominance of English, the tendency to look to Western Europe and the US for frames of modernity and progress, or for what one should know? While our class exerts pressure on disability studies proper around a much-needed intersectional critique, decentering the white, Euro-American, and economically privileged subjects continually recognized as “disabled” (a cripistemological corrective, if you will), it also pushes beyond a well-worn critique of identity politics and its limitations to highlight constantly shifting assemblages of power. I want cripistemologies to articulate not only alternative epistemologies, but also ontologies, challenging the limits of intersectional analyses and noting the disciplinary character of any subject-driven endeavor.

#### Cripistemology leads to the creation of avenues which allow for identity formation, knowledge production and activism.

Serlin 2014. David Serlin in Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

David Serlin Does the embrace of a disabled identity foreclose possibilities of imagining different bodily futures? This is an important question for any scholar or activist contemplating the concept of a critically engaged cripistemology. Experiences of bodily difference and desire, in all of their variegated glories, are the most likely dimensions of subjective identity to be sacrificed for the privilege of social and political legibility. A critical cripistemological position focused on the subjective experience of bodily difference might expose the tendency for the social life of disability to be transformed, under codification or implementation of law, into something wholly different than the experiential life of disability. This position parallels the queer critique of the same-sex marriage movement, which challenges the equation of a legal life of rights with a social life of happiness. Supporters of same-sex marriage contend that, without legal recognitions of one’s rights, one lives in epistemological darkness, unequal before other human beings. Living in a nation or community without legal protection is, of course, intolerable. It delivers one to a wilderness of possible outcomes. Yet a carefully cultivated cripistemology may well provide an oasis in which identity formation, knowledge production, and activism can take shape. Disability can exist outside of the overarching epistemological frameworks of law, medicine, government, and religion, and differential bodily subjectivities must be instrumental, not incidental, to the formation of disabled identities and reimagined human futures.

### Other Cripistemology Cards

#### **\*Instead of forcing disabled students to fit into normative boxes of neoliberalism, cripistemology rejects inclusion and allows rehabilitation to develop into a unique form of resistance which empowers disabled people.**

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

Odysseus’s experiences on Phaeacia provide an historical example of the insights awaiting those who undertake pedagogical practices informed by curricular cripistemologies. Curricular cripistemologies involve the development of teaching pedagogies that deviate from core teachings by foregrounding crip/ queer content as fortunate failure. This pedagogical “incoherence” offers important social options for constructing alternative ethical frameworks for living. An alternative ethical framework results in the creation of useable crip/ queer maps that, from a curricular cripistemological standpoint, are otherwise absent from normative teaching approaches. One overarching goal of such content is to provide opportunities for crip/queer embodiments to better speak to the political dilemmas of contemporary experience. The pedagogy of curricular cripistemology depends upon the insights of human interdependency illustrated in the examples above. It is neither a discourse of “specialness” wherein we learn to value disabled people as “human” too, nor tolerate their incapacities when we discover them scraping out an existence alongside others; nor do we find the value of disability guaranteed in overcoming social barriers wherein crip/queer peoples’ incapacities are offset by the compensatory qualities of an otherwise “extraordinary body” (Garland-Thomson 5). Nor do we discover disability as an opportunity for political correctness wherein all bodies are valued for “diversity” in a relativistic equation of multicultural differences. We witness this philosophical tendency even in disability studies, for example, in the universalist cast of arguments that “everyone’s disabled” featured in Tom Shakespeare and Nicholas Watson’s “embodied ontology” (27) and Lennard Davis’s “dismodernism” (273). Relativistic valuations of difference often lead to a process explained by Lee Edelman as neoliberal normativity’s “tenacious will to sameness by endlessly turning the Other into the image of itself ”(59). Instead of these various strategies for culturally rehabilitating disabled people’s experiences into recognizable normativities, curricular cripiste-mologies cultivate ways of realizing failure as an appropriate response to the finite goals of inclusionism. For instance, curricular cripistemologies critically assess how communities place limits on the facilitation of crip/queer people’s participation. Such forms of inclusionism often result in false perceptions of absence as a “chosen” exile and a naturalized condition of non-normative existence. While social spaces superficially appear open to all who wish to navigate them, curricular cripistemologies unveil architectural, aesthetic, and moral spaces of inclusion that, paradoxically, strictly police ways of being different for the bodies they include. Consequently, there is no inclusionism that does not come replete with a strategy of making estranged bodies better fit normative expectations. Paradoxically, then, curricular cripistemologies necessarily promote failure of rehabilitative regimens as a worthy goal. One’s rehab is another’s resistance, particularly when rehab requires classroom pull-outs to perform yet another battery of the MMPI (diagnostic assessment tests). Curricular cripistemologies reject the form-fitting mold of neoliberal normativities as substantively under-performing. Likewise, in The Reorder of Things: The University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference, Roderick A. Ferguson explores the impact of educational diversity strategies of cultural incorporation in public schools. Ferguson identifies late 1960s inclusionist practices as institutional ways of robbing minority students of alternative insights while seeming to embrace them (190). Similarly, inclusionist practices place crip/queer bodies in the compromising position of making normative practices more desirable: of course, they want to be like us, the story of institutional normalization goes, because our ways naturally enshrine that which all human beings desire. In this sense, curricular cripistemologies actively explore alternative modes of navigating the world as crip/queer embodiments. In effect, cripistemological pedagogies actively leave behind the goal of arriving at identities domesticated of their defining differences. Such approaches to the teaching mission force an encounter with the often discomforting content of living interdependently with others.

#### \*The current classroom environment forces students to hide their deviance, which functions as a classroom disturbance. Forcing children to conceal their identities produces a variety of negative effects. Cripistemology allows students to shift their liabilities into a collective understanding.

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

While placing crip/queer instructors in front of the classroom enables one kind of educational change, the evolving participation of crip/queer students in the classroom also results in critical insights heretofore only marginally realized. If the overwhelming emphasis of today’s inclusion practices rely on receiving a passing mark as synonymous with passing (i.e., approxi-mations of able-bodiedness), DSE’s anti-normative-based instruction emphasis consistently results in more students coming out as crip/queer during the semester. As Tobin Siebers explains, publically held norms of able-bodiedness require masking the disruptive visibility of disability in order to keep its shameful embodiments out of view (97). This practice proves no less common in the normatively inclusive classroom. The approximation of able-bodiedness treats crip/queer embodiments as a matter of stealth differences disguised at the core of passing’s successful performativity. In other words, mitigation of disability treats crip/queer bodies as levels of deviance to be avoided. However, in the alternative parlance of curricular cripistemologies, the avoidance of this trap requires “leaving every child behind.” Accordingly, our findings show that avoiding the myriad stigmas associated with crip/queer bodies results in less desirable educational outcomes. When students spend time leaving behind crip/queer identifiers, they also find their embodied differences further devalued. In fact, the dictates of the normative classroom draw crip/queer students into complicity with a wider social devaluation by teaching them to downplay the existence of alternative lives. The destructive requirements of leaving behind non-normative modes of being effectively reifies the desirability of heteronormativity at the expense of the crip/ queer body’s consignment to “dustbins for disavowal” (Shakespeare 284). One result is that crip/queer bodies become constitutive of heteronormativity while deflecting the pivotal role they are made to play in the advocacy of normativity. Curricular cripistemologies argue that there is too much at stake in this unequal exchange of consecrated normativities and disavowed non-normativities, thus leaving every child behind is necessary to transform existing inflexibilities extant in neoliberal educational standardization. The crip/queer classroom produces a more meaningful system of differential values wherein shame about one’s body as inadequate, medicalized, and pathological (the current terms of normalization within inclusionism) are abandoned. In their place, curricular cripistemologies insert the creative alternatives of interdependency, the politics of atypicality, and a more critical assessment of neoliberalism’s founding in(ex)clusions.3 Consequently, curricular cripistemologies encourage the identification of personal expertise with crip/queer lives as a reservoir of knowledge. When the classroom conversation gives credence to the authority of crip/queer experience, crip/queer student subjectivities gradually sense a thaw in the labor required to keep their differences at bay. Instead, they begin actively cultivating personal experiences with alternative ways of being crip/queer into fertile ground for classroom contributions. The transformation can be profound. Students can be witnessed suddenly operationalizing ways of drawing from the authority of their experience rather than removing a formative aspect of their knowledge from conversation. In this manner crip/queer bodies shift from liabilities to be secreted away into active vectors of insight from which one may engage in classroom models of collective understanding. Through such developments, crip/queer subjec-tivities become a way of knowing the world; embodiments akin to other forms of discredited knowing such as femininity, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and so on (yet, importantly, containing all of these differences at the intersection of what makes bodies crip/queer). The non-normatively embodied classroom that emerges within curricular cripistemologies becomes a place in which diversity operates as a nuancing agent of knowledge. This open exploration of subcultural differences in the non-normative classroom provides what David Halperin explains in relation to gay subcultures as “a social space for the construction of different identities, for the elaboration of various types of relationships, for the development of new cultural forms” (67). Likewise, curricular cripistemologies promote the classroom as a place of productive differentiation—both in relation to creating more flexibility within majoritarian norms and within crip/ queer subcultures themselves. In Halberstam’s words, the differential space of crip/queer classrooms fails to cohere into a univocal identity of difference. A curricular cripistemology, in other words, leaves no body behind.

#### Cripestimology is an open refusal to engage in compulsory ablebodiedness. The world of the “Cannot” has a multitude of positive possibilities.

Johnson 2014. Johnson, Merri, and Robert Mcruer. "Cripistemologies: Introduction." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 127-48. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.12. (WL BFI)

In “Prognosis Time,” Puar describes an interdependent relationship between the neoliberal consumer subject who “assumes the right not to be injured” by products made by “other bodies” who are selected for this work “because they are deemed available for injury,” “expendable” bodies, “bodies whose debili-tation is required in order to sustain capitalist narratives of progress” (169). We want to add to this analysis of differential availability for injury by widening the category of “expendable bodies” or “bodies whose debilitation is required” by larger economic forces to make room for many more of us than might at first appear to belong there. Cripistemology further unwinds the spring between debility and capacity, not only by recognizing the ways one popula-tion’s capacity depends on the debility of others, but also by recognizing the ways capacity depends on debility within a single individual’s body or life (a recognition that remains, however unstably, indebted to sitpoint theory). For example, I (Lisa) have limited my willingness to travel over the past year, after many years of traveling to visit family or give lectures on other campuses, and constantly aggravating my chronic back pain. Now that I am less willing to travel, my family perceives my physical situation as having gotten worse, but my physical situation has actually stayed the same: it varies. Scoliosis-related disability is episodic, not linear, a matter of intensities, sensations, and situations, not illness and cure. Limiting my travel resulted not from worsening symptoms but from changing perceptions of personal responsibility to engage capacity in the service of obligatory family time and holiday ritual (smile!), or in my role as diversity worker in the neoliberal university and aspiring guest lecturer in the academy at large, when that capacity risks prolonged physical pain and debility. Driving or flying long distances hurts. It also means risking a recurrence of incapacitating back problems comprised of muscle spasms, mobility impairment, slowed productivity, and other costs of rehabilitation. If it seems, at times, as if it’s always something—if not back pain, then dizziness, nausea, anxiety dreams, eye infections, inflamed ligaments in the arches of my feet—those somethings arrive with less frequency and less disabling force when I slow down, redefine “able,” and turn down the invitation to speak or visit. I am not unable to travel; I am frequently unwilling. The inter-implications of capacity and debility have led me to this place of crip willfulness, which sounds like a mean place of stubborn resistance, but feels like a calm relinquishing of fantasies that I can force things (situations, bodies, emotions, sensations) to be other than they are. It is a refusal to insist—a refusal to act in accordance with the system of compulsory able-bodiedness—that requires individuals to mask, suppress, and disregard discomfort in the process of determining what is possible, of what we are capable. “You cannot always close the gap between how you do feel and how you should feel,” willfulness theorist Sara Ahmed writes. “Behind the sharpness of this ‘cannot’ is a world of possibility.” Ahmed reclaims “killjoy” as a site of productive misalignment with cultural instructions to be (or act) happy in oppressive circumstances. If a cruelly optimistic culture insists that we fake it till we make it, the crip killjoy refuses to play along. Describing the decision not to travel in terms of debility (I cannot) remains, however, much easier on my relationships and professional standing than describing it in terms of capacity (I will not), and, recalling Puar, my commitment to “insistently rendering bare the instability of the divisions between capacity-endowed and debility-laden bodies” (“Prognosis,” 169) works better to bolster decisions internally than to frame them to family members or supervisors. In such lived environments, I become a stealth cripistemologist.

#### Cripistemology is a critique of epistemology itself.

Puar 2014. Jasib Puar In Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Jasbir K. Puar Part of what I find so exciting about the term cripistemology is its potential to swerve from a grounding in a knowledge production project that seeks to counter other forms of epistemic violence by producing its own known objects. That is to say, cripistemology does not have to reproduce the violence of the mandate of Western knowledge as able to know its object. Nor does it need to presume, through infinite redress or what I have called the “epistemological corrective” of intersectionality, that if we have perfect knowledge we will have justice. Instead I read the “crip” in cripistemology as a critique of the notion of epistemology itself, a displacement not only of conventional ways of knowing and organizing knowledge, but also of the mandate of knowing itself, of the consolidation of knowledge. This supplements a cripistemology with “crip(s) at the beginning or center of the production of knowledge” by offering another reading of cripistemology as a matter of debilitating contemporary forms of knowing with forms of unknowing, sensing, refusing to know, akin to Jack’s formulation, and, further, a matter of challenging the status of knowledge itself. What this entails for me, unlike Jack’s “negative forms of knowing” or a politics of radical passivity, is proliferating cripistemology affirmatively and prolifically rather than reactively within a dialectic. Disability studies is already successful in this vein, undoing conventional ways of knowing and knowledge of the body, of capacities, of human and species variation. But I am thinking of something wilder: an overwhelming of modes of knowing such that what constitutes knowing itself becomes confused, disoriented, dissembled. If we are to refuse not only our place at the table but what the table itself mandates, we can afford nothing less.

### Cripistemology of Pain

#### The alternative is to engage in a cripistemology of pain and notions of suffering

#### **Disabled people have been systematically excluded from more “formal” processes of knowledge production. A criptestimolgy of pain allows crip folks to deconstruct traditional forms of knowledge and articulate their experiences.**

Patsavas 2014 Patsavas, Alyson. "Recovering a Cripistemology of Pain." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 203-18. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.16. (WL BFI)

A cripistemology of pain, as I am defining it, is a process of knowledge production that situates pain within discursive systems of power and privilege. The structural conditions that underwrite the devaluation of lives with pain (and by extension disabled lives) must be exposed and critiqued. The method referenced by this term combines the process of “cripping,” which “spins mainstream representations or practices to reveal able-bodied assumptions” (Sandahl 37), with a philosophical commitment to “standpoint epistemology,” which acknowledges that the subject positions from which we produce knowledge matter. With particular attention to the power dynamics inherent in processes of knowledge production, standpoint epistemology privileges experience as a source of knowledge and grants that marginalized positionalities offer unique vantage points from which to expose systems of oppression. This philosophy of knowledge is a centerpiece of feminist epistemology, derived in part from Sandra Harding’s argument that knowledge grounded in women’s experience and the women’s movement is better than supposedly “neutral” knowledge (The Science Question, 142). She calls this an argument for “strong objectivity” (“Rethinking,” 69). Similarly, a cripistemology of pain is produced from the socially situated experience of disability and is committed to exposing ableist values regarding pain. Rather than making an a priori claim to “authentic” or “true” knowledge, a cripistemology of pain produces knowledge from experience while simultaneously claiming a specific positionality to mark the limits of the knowledge claims produced. The assumption that we “know” another person’s experience is, arguably, one of the most pernicious manifestations of privilege. Therefore, in citing myself as a white, queer, middle-class woman I am not reaffirming identity-based categories or claiming a static identity position. Rather, I name my position as a way (imperfectly) to contextualize my experiences and call attention to the privilege, biases, and influences that (explicitly or implicitly) frame (and limit) the knowledge claims that I make. These knowledge claims are necessarily partial.2 Without rehashing the debate about the use of experience as a basis of knowledge, I want to call attention to the privilege embedded within these critiques. Disabled people have been systematically excluded from more “formal” processes of knowledge production. Our experiences have frequently been devalued and dismissed, particularly when it comes to pain.3 Yet experience is often the most accessible resource disabled people can leverage when it comes to knowledge production. In response to critiques of standpoint epistemology, Harding clarifies that the importance of this approach lies in its focus on “Which politics advance and which obstruct the growth of knowledge; and, for whom (for which groups)” (“Socially,” 30–31). The dismissal of experience as a basis of knowledge is part of a politics that obstructs knowledge of/by/ for disabled people, as systems of privilege facilitate biomedical knowledge about pain at the expense of experiential knowledge, not just by excluding but by devaluing that form of knowledge. Refusing that hierarchical arrangement of knowledge, I work from what Robert McRuer calls a critically queer and severely disabled position (31). McRuer contends that such positionalities materialize “precisely those bodies that are best positioned to refuse ‘mere toleration’ and to call out inadequacies of compulsory able-bodiedness” (31). In that sense, I propose an analytic that builds from pain—my “critical ” and “severe” pain—foregrounding an experience often considered the most unincorporable disability experience.

### Crip The Classroom

#### The alternative is to Crip the Classroom.

Rakova 2016. Rakova, Kira. "3 Ways to Help Combat Ableism and Mental Health Stigma in Schools." Everyday Feminism. October 6, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/10/ableism-saneism-in-schools/>. (WL BFI)

1. Integrate Mental Health and Disability into School Curriculums. While some states and schools may cover disability and mental health within specific courses or units, like my high school did, schools should integrate these topics continuously. How this would look in practice would largely depend on the subject matter. For example, classrooms can integrate books written by, about, and depicting disabled folks. Political science and history classes can and should discuss the historical and contemporary reality of violence against disabled people and individuals with mental illnesses, such as police violence against mentally ill individuals. Relatedly, classes could discuss various social justice activist movements like the Section 504 Sit-In of the 1970s. However schools may choose to do it, the narratives and – again – lived experiences of disabled folks and individuals with mental illnesses need to be integrated into the overall curriculum. It isn’t enough to mention the American Disabilities Act or to showcase one narrative as inspiration porn. Schools should seek to destigmatize disability and mental illness through continued discussions and education. 2. Support the Voices of Disability and Mental Health Justice Activists. It’s important for non-disabled students to contextualize disabilities and mental illness as reality. By bringing in individuals to hold discussions about their work for disability and mental health justice, these movements become much more real. For disabled students and those with mental illnesses, being able to hear about others’ experiences can be incredibly validating and empowering. It’s a reminder that they’re not alone. For able-bodied and neurotypical students, understanding real experiences of disability and mental illness helps dismantle stereotypes and combat stigma**.** I am by no means advocating for an inspiration-porn type of assembly, but rather a chance for children (and adults) to learn about the work (and especially activism) of disabled individuals and those with mental illnesses, especially if students have been studying their particular work in the classroom. This will also help schools fight stereotypes regarding mental illness and disability. Having a person talk about invisible disabilities can broaden students’ understanding of disability and help validate the narratives of specific students. Similarly, engaging in a discussion about eating disorders with people of color can help dismantle the idea that eating disorders only affect white women.

#### The academy still isn’t inclusive to alternative educational pathways, solving really isn’t that hard and minor implementations such as additional technology can solve.

Freeman 2015. Freeman, Daniel. "Ableism and the Academy: What College Has Taught Me About My Disabled Body." Model View Culture. October 12, 2015. Accessed April 26, 2017. <https://modelviewculture.com/pieces/ableism-and-the-academy-what-college-has-taught-me-about-my-disabled-body>. (WL BFI)

To be fair, there *are* colleges and universities that have given their students with disabilities the opportunities and technologies that they need to be successful students and people. In my experience, though, there’s much more work to be done. Giving out accessible technology to students with disabilities is a start. But what about teachers using a captioning service for their lectures? What about having large-print copies of the lectures available to any student that needs them? Or, more generally, why can’t professors let students move around the classroom as they need to? I understand that some of these concepts are just not cost effective. I understand that they may even seem counter-productive to learning. What the academy needs to understand about accessibility and the question of “access” itself, however, is that access is just as capacious as disability is. One student’s accessibility needs will not match another’s — not exactly. So supporting *all* students’ accessibility needs *will* cost money if the right services (and the people to carry out those services) are to be provided. Even 25 years after the ADA was passed by Congress, the academy refuses to understand that mere compliance with the law does not equal fair or adequate service. I’m talking about housing regulations for students with disabilities in addition to testing and classroom accommodations; I’m talking about the architecture of buildings and the (lacking) presence of walking signals at crosswalks which vocalize the action for people who are blind or hard of hearing. I’d also like to say that there should be more curb cuts so fools like me don’t have their slower, clumsier foot snag the curb whilst walking and fall on their face. The point is that accessibility in the academy should go beyond the classroom, just like learning does. What accessibility should look like in the academy? Technology and people working together in order to make everybody — every body — feel at home in a place that isn’t home.

### Dwell with Disability

#### The Alternative is to Dwell with Disability

Chandler 12 (Eliza, “Cripping Community: New Meanings of Disability and Community” Nomorepotlucks. Issue 19. Jan/Feb 2012. <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/cripping-community-new-meanings-of-disability-and-community> (WL BFI)

Ableism, to be sure, is pervasive. And although stories of how ableism is felt and how it persists are not necessarily the ones I want to tell, I believe that these are the stories with which we must begin. Again, I follow Hall (1997) when he says that we cannot think about how identities are constituted without thinking about how social subjects are represented. We know that disability is represented in a myriad of ways and by a myriad of social functions as a problem in need of a solution. And I can tell you as a disabled person who is communally connected to other disabled people, that disability is not experienced as a problem, by everyone, all of the time. To recognize that my experience of disability does not match its representation is, first of all, likely not surprising, but also not reason for me to disengage with how my embodiment is represented. As Hall says, “culture lays the terrain in which identities are formed” (1997, p. 291). And, given that ableism informs our cultural sensibility, the pronouncement or arrival of disability identities and the enactment of crip communities with disability as their binding tie, is not yet recognized as sensible (Titchkosky, 2002). Disability identities and crip communities are formed despite of or maybe because of disability’s pervasive cultural understanding as a condition to be cured or killed.[3] In the beginning of this article, I cited my experience on the streets as one of the ways that I strongly sense or, I would even hazard, that I “know” that ableism circulates. My experience is also one of the ways that I sense/“know” that disability is done differently, communally. I experience crip community in different ways, in different places, and with different people. But for this article, as I do in my research, I wish to focus on how crip community is formed through unstructured enactments. I attend to the emergence and experience of community through enactments for I believe that such attention explicates how crip community “crips” community. This is to say that rather than being tied to a structure, institution, or common identity, crip communities are structured by and through communal enactments. In other words, they happen anytime people come together through the common desire to dwell with disability. In this way, crip community can be enacted anytime, in any place, with anyone, disabled or not.[4] In the preface to his book, Community, Zygmunt Bauman writes, “Out there, on the streets, all sorts of dangers lie in ambush; we have to be alert when we go out, watch whom we are talking to and who talks to us, be on the look-out every minute” (2000, pp. 1-2). In the space of the streets, enactments of disability as violence lie in ambush. The geographies of the street may feel unsecure, unsteady, hostile, and even unfamiliar. In these inhospitable spaces, I may feel unwelcomed, undesired, uncommon. I expect these enactments of disability as violence, but I don’t know when or where or how they will occur, and, in this sense, they “lie in ambush.” Because being on “alert,” that is, expecting the enactment of the normative meaning of disability, feels so familiar, when disability is enacted otherwise, when I feel that people are drawn to me by a desire to dwell with disability, it feels different. In these communal enactments, I feel safe; I feel comfortable; I feel desired; I feel secure, I feel differently from how I commonly feel when I am in the normative terrain, whether or not I am being ambushed or anticipating being ambushed by a normative enactment of disability. Recall my earlier description of the verb “to crip”: to open up desire for what disability disrupts. Crip communities disrupt the assumption that we can “know,” unquestionably, who our communal members are, and therefore, who they are not. We assume that communities are bound by members who share the same or similar identities. However, the unpredictable and ever-shifting character of disability requires us to consider its identity as also instable. As Hall asserts, “one thing identity does not signal is a ‘stable core’ of the self, unfolding from beginning to end through all the vicissitudes of history without change” (1996, p. 1). In crip community, one member may experience their disability as progressing or as a “becoming” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004), an ever-shifting embodiment that allows them to relate to their community and their communal others in different, never stable ways. Another may not currently be disabled, or currently be disabled in a particular way, and become disabled, or become disabled differently, either with time or through an accident. Another may have a disability that comes to them one day or moment, and leaves the next, ever-returning and ever-leaving. Still, another may be disabled and not be easily identifiable as such. And in community motivated by a desire for disability, disability can be an “inter-subjective experience” that is, enacted between two members, one disabled the other not, owned by no one, cradled by both (Weiss, 2008, p. 4). Disability teaches us that just as embodiments shift, so, too, do our communal experiences and relations. Ableist logic circulates, it is pervasive within the normative terrain, and traversing this terrain through an embodiment that is so often recognized as a problem in need of solution can be uncomfortable, even dangerous. However, as poet Dionne Brand tells us, “different geographic stories can be told,” and through them, we can achieve a different “sense of space” (Brand quoted in McKittrick, 2006, p. xxvii). I propose that crip communities, as we make them, are spaces in which we can create and perpetuate new stories of disability and new ways for disability to matter. More than this, attending to the ways that crip communities “crip” community, and to be open to that which disability disrupts, can unwork and rework how we ‘know’ community and how we understand communal structures beyond and against iterations of them as assuredly knowable, predictable, identifiable, or constant. Instead, we can imagine community as fleeting, boundless, and productive. Crip communities, unstable as they are, can open us up to new ways of understanding what it is to be crip and what it is to be in community.

#### To dwell with disability is to know the experience of others, it is to put the crip at the center of a unique form of knowledge production

Duggan 2014. Lisa Duggan in Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Lisa Duggan The call to place “crip” at the beginning or the center is not a call to add disability to an intersectional matrix of race, gender, class, sexuality, nationality, religion. It is a call to step aside, provisionally, to imagine theory and politics from the capacious “standpoint” of disability. This is a moment in the formulation of new ways of thinking and acting politically, not an endpoint. Disability is not to be separated from other social formations; indeed it cannot be. But in order to think in new ways, for just a moment, we place “crip” at the starting/central place in our imaginings. This is akin to the Combahee River Collective’s move to reimagine the political world from the perspective of black women, not to set aside other perspectives but to expand the whole. It is also akin to Gayle Rubin’s move in “Thinking Sex,” a move to the side and not away from or out of feminism(s) in order to allow “sexuality” to be thought in new ways. This call to place “crip” at the start/center is also not a call to know more, or more definitively, about disability. It is a call to rethink, or reformulate, or recast our thinking along different lines, at least provisionally. It is a call to intellectual, political, and affective creativity. This call runs up against at least two contra-dictory challenges. First, how do we formulate a “crip” perspective that takes ability/disability at its broadest points of inclusive meaning, embracing fully our understanding that disability is produced in and through a social world that organizes abilities in invidious and hierarchical ways? But second, how do we then also attend to the very particular bodyminds, in their very particular variations and in their particular places and times, that contend with the material and affective impact of the historical and contemporary world? How do we write crip history, both personal and collective? It is important not to denigrate either project, but to constantly reformulate each in relation to the other in order to push the boundaries of disability studies and politics in radicalizing ways.

### Rage

#### Anger and fury functions as a response to silencing and marginalization and continues to solve against oppressive ideologies within society – Blackness and Feminism Prove

St. Pierre 2014 11-3-2014, "Where is the fury in the stuttering community?," Did I Stutter?, <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/where-is-the-fury-in-the-stuttering-community> (WL)

My speech pathologists taught me self-acceptance. Self-love. They told me it didn’t matter what other people thought of me. I should just ignore them. “They’re ignorant,” I was told. Sunday School taught me to forgive those who mocked me. Let it go—they’re not worth your time. The one thing I was never told that was that I could get angry. Fury is a proper response to injustice and oppression, to silencing, stereotyping, and co-option. All emancipatory movements of the twentieth century—civil rights, disability rights, feminism, and queer liberation—have been fueled by anger focused into resistance. As the legendary Audre Lorde writes, “Anger is an appropriate reaction to racist attitudes, as is fury when the actions arising from those attitudes do not change.” [1] For so long, disabled people have been treated as objects of charity and welfare, expected to accept the scraps society doles out with a thankful tear in our eye. In contrast, the disability rights movement teaches us to “piss on pity” and be outraged at our exclusion and marginalization. So where the hell is the fury in the stuttering community? We are jesters in music and film. People mock, stop, and dismiss our words. We are inspirational when we overcome our “tragedy” and lazy when we do not. We are regularly not treated as equal citizens, denied time, jobs, and respect. I should be livid when your discomfort makes me hate myself. When you tell me to sit down halfway through my class presentation. When you don’t absorb anything I’ve said because you’re too busy feeling sorry for me. When you medicalize my body and claim to be the expert on my speech. I should be outraged at everyone who helps, in a million little ways, to create and sustain a world that oppresses dysfluent speakers. Yet for all of this the stutterer is trained (with stickers and (social) gold stars!) to be mild-mannered and submissive—to accept ourselves. Does no one find this absurd? This is domestication, not liberation! We as a community are far too easily satisfied. Oh, it’s certainly permissible if I occasionally get angry at *myself*, if it leads me to work harder and persevere. But direct that anger towards the world? Ruffle some feathers? Dare to make our frustration political? All of a sudden we are stuttering out of line. All of a sudden we are unruly, dangerous. (We will not, by the way, be towed back in line through claims that we’re just playing the victim card or being lazy. In every movement, these have always been cowardly responses used to maintain the status quo.) Here’s what anger does. It focuses us. It enlivens us. But most of all, it centers attention where it needs to be: on the injustice of the stuttering experience. My tongue is not the problem. My tongue has never been the problem. Getting angry lets me remember this. Anger is a rallying cry. In the fight for gender equality, anger remains a driving force behind suffrage, workplace equality, and bodily autonomy. In the civil rights movement, anger fueled leaders from Martin Luther King, Jr., to Malcolm X, to Audre Lorde in rallying the multitude and making sure they will no longer be ignored. Anger continues to be a life-giving force in the face of marginalization, as, for example, recent events in Ferguson have shown. In the disability rights movement, anger forces those who are “abnormal” and subhumanized to be confronted, at least for an instant, as persons. When those who are institutionalized without their consent, medicated against their wishes, isolated, ignored, diagnosed, stigmatized, rehabilitated, sterilized, denied education, criminalized, and left in poverty with no escape beyond the bureaucratic welfare and intermittent charity of those caregivers and systems disabled people too often find themselves utterly dependant on, anger is a lifeline in demanding that injustice be recognized and that oppressed peoples be heard on their own terms*.* Anger is a bastion for communities who refuse to simply smile and be grateful. Anger fuels change. Anger can be this for stutterers. It’s time to take back our speech.

# Framing

### Debate Space Key

#### Debate offers a unique space to talk about disability. The conversation provided by the 1NC allows us to interrogate the world as we know it.

Stevens 2015. Stevens, Maddy. "Ableism." Premier Debate Today. November 19, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/11/19/ableism/>. (WL BFI)

We need to stop treating disability as something that must be disclosed or proven. You do not have the right to ask someone how they are disabled if they have not offered that to you. Their hesitance to disclose that information should not be regarded as evidence that they are lying for ballots or sympathy, it should be respected as the understandable concern for how others will treat them and how this will impact their reputation or credibility. This also entails that we stop making assumptions about ability based off of little to no interaction. Just don’t go there. Stop privileging academia over the accounts of disabled people. Disabled persons are much better situated than outside, unaffected intellectuals to understand and explain some facet of their identity. Knowing whether you are on the right or most informed side of an issue isn’t a matter of having a billion scholars who back that up; the accuracy of a solution or the description of a phenomenon is determined by those who are affected by it. Want to know whether people first language is better or worse than the alternative? Read the testimony of the people who are affected by those discourses, go to the source, and credit disabled people (especially since academia won’t). Coaches need to make it clear that particular attitudes are unacceptable and unwelcome on their teams. The team should be a safe place where students have support and the resources they need to get better. It should not be a place where their intelligence and abilities are demeaned. If students don’t have a team, they don’t have a support group. If students don’t know if they can trust their coaches to help rather than dismiss them, they won’t come to them for help. Debate should be a site of empowerment, engagement, and education, not a place for aggressions (micro or otherwise) to be tolerated and normalized. Transforming the learning environment starts with a personal transformation. Coaches must realize that their narrative is not the only one, and must be willing to make concessions for student comfort. This means changing discursive patterns when they’ve been problematized, setting standards for the kids under your care to adhere to, and letting students find what they love and helping them understand it rather than shutting them down. Criticisms of ableism have the power to reclaim a history that has been stolen from disabled people; putting ableism at the forefront recognizes the existences that society has tried to eliminate and reclaims the spaces from which we have been erased. This conversation is essential to understanding the world as we know it, our interactions, our structures, our beliefs. Interrogating ableism demands that we recognize disability, demands that we include disabled persons; the emphasis on this discussion asserts disabled lives as important and vital, and forces the recognition that our inclusion is necessary for any solution. The population at large has a long way to go in accommodating and accepting the identities of everyone, and one article targeted towards debaters isn’t going to change that, but I think this community is a great place to start. As so many LARPers will tell you, debaters should act as, and may one day be, policymakers, so the precedents set here don’t stay here. Even if nothing ever spills over, making the debate space safer and more inclusive, and giving more people a space of advocacy, seems an admirable enough goal on its own.

### K Comes First/2NC Solvency

#### The criticism must come first, Cripestemology is a starting point for everything else. Any continuation of so called “best practices” will always leave disabled students behind.

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

For the purposes of developing a curricular cripistemology, the most critical yet least well understood aspect of DSE is the reform of pedagogical content. Why is curricular reform the first step rather than a later evolution in making crip/queer content integral to educational lessons? To address this question, we argue that curricular reform must come first because it changes faculty and students’ facility with crip/queer ways of knowing. Such an approach leaves normative educational goals of disability assimilation behind and espouses the implementation of curricula that forward productive alternatives provided by crip/queer cultures, histories, and art. Even the most normative curriculum offerings come replete with “fantasies of otherness and difference, alternative embodiment, group affiliations, and collective desires” (Halberstam 119). Halberstam’s insight is critical to curricular cripistemologies too, because it identifies crip/queer bodies as integral to education rather than as an auxiliary student population in need of “special help” (i.e., normalization). While the pedagogical projects cited here as the basis for our findings have occurred in diverse venues, we consistently adopt three basic principles critical to deepening curricular cripistemologies as a productive experience: 1. Our approaches can be adapted to any existing educational content because crip/ queer experiences exist as a latent realization and our pedagogies are insufficiently honed to analyze them; 2. Training teachers to recognize and adapt pedagogy that draws out crip/queer content works most effectively as an active collaboration with crip/queer practi-tioners of DSE; 3. The architectural modifications and technological fix-it approaches of today’s inclusionism, while important, continue to perpetuate access to heteronormativity as the most worthy goal and, therefore, cannot overcome deficiencies of content not re-imagined to represent crip/queer experiences and histories. Each of these principles requires a significant level of educational re-invention to implement in an impactful manner. They effectively ask contemporary educators to fail in the implementation of foundational “best practices” long believed central to pedagogical inclusionism. In achieving this failure, curricular cripistemologies fashion a more rigorous educational experience for all students, including crip/queer students. Curricular cripistemologies leave the empty goal of normalizing disabled students behind by shifting the educational emphasis with respect to crip/ queer findings in four palpable ways.

# Blocks

### AT: Permutation

#### Saying that you can do any part of our advocacy is the same logic used by companies to avoid lawsuits.

#### The Permutation is just what it always has been, crafting accessibility and inclusion as an afterthought, if the affirmative actually cared about the negative advocacy it would have been included in the aff in the first place. If anything, you just reproduce neoliberal geographies.

Fritsch 2013. Fritsch, K. "The Neoliberal Circulation of Affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair." Health, Culture and Society 5, no. 1 (2013): 135-49. doi:10.5195/hcs.2013.136. (WL BFI)

The ISA also produces disability through its appearance after a retrofit has been done. For Jay Dolmage (2012; 2013), the retrofit, an addition or alteration to something that has already been built, is part of the logic of neoliberalism. Disability is accommodated by adding ramps onto the side of a building or around the back, instead of at the main entrance, relegating disability as a form of difference “supplemental to society” (Dolmage, 2013, p. 1). Disability is included as an afterthought; welcome, but only by way of the side entrance. The ISA often appears after a retrofit has been done, allowing disability to appear only to orient disability to disappear through the side entrance. The retrofit offers a quick and temporary fix through cheap additions or alterations rather than designing with disability as a routine part of spatial organization. While capitalism has produced inaccessible geographies (Gleeson, 1998) and thus excluded disabled people, the retrofit acts as a bandage solution, a charitable form of inclusion without changing too much. The retrofit shows the ineffectiveness of capitalism to contend with crises of its own making, even as capitalism constantly adapts (Dolmage, 2013). At the same time, the ISA produces disability by disguising the way disability is capacitated and debilitated within a neoliberal capitalist economy. Much like the overcoming and forgetting of suffering associated with the rehabilitating war veterans (Stiker, 1999; Fritsch, 2013), the ISA covers over the ways in which disability is incurred by capitalist social relations whether by way of poverty, war, austerity measures, environmental destruction, or other debilitating processes (Sothern, 2007; Erevelles, 2011; McRuer, 2012; Chandler, 2013). By making disability appear to be an individualized problem, or as Alison Kafer puts it, “casting disability as a monolithic fact of the body” (2013, p.3), the ISA makes its innocuous appearance on buildings, buses and bathroom stalls without so much of a hint of the ways in which disability often only comes to appear by way of a lack of access to adequate health care, an exploding land mine, a revoking of social benefits, a loss of labour rights, or dirty water.

#### Additionally, the permutation is just an an extension of a violent, and ineffective educational process where the focus has always has been directed towards retrofitting accessibility. The criticism always comes first.

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

Leaving Technology’s Fixes Behind The passage of the 1972 consent decree in Philadelphia reaffirmed the right of all disabled children to have access to public education in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Since that time, the focus of integration efforts has not been curricular reform; rather, the emphasis has targeted retrofitting inaccessible architectures and adapted learning technologies. Such interventions identify the learning environment and the learner rather than the practice of pedagogy as the desired object of change, as if a computer program will somehow magically integrate crip/queer students into a classroom that has no tradition of productive differentiation from which to draw. Yet, in point of fact, we have seen little accomplishment in the cultivation of reciprocity between crip/queer, non-disabled students, and curricular content. A necessary dialectic has gone missing. The reasons for this absent conver-sation varies. However, the end product most consistently takes the shape of crip/queer students being left to navigate educational universes parallel to their non-disabled counterparts. Inclusionist approaches tend to turn disability into a puzzle of accommodations and a nest of potential litigation actions to be pre-emptively warded off by school administrators, social workers, and special education (SPED) bureaucrats. In Reading Resistance, Beth Ferri and David J. Connor discuss how a case-by-case approach within SPED and resistance to implementation of the ADA inherently benefits the status quo (18). Thus, the individualized solutions offered by Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) tailored to student needs rarely become systemic. As such, these efforts fail to assist future generations of students by offering them access to alternative pedagogical delivery methods such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Research project funding for disability inclusion initiatives consistently underwrites the purchase of technologies such as software to mitigate against teachers accomodating more flexible strategies in pedagogical methods. Alternatively, projects not based on curricular cripistemologies leave behind false hope in technological fixes. Instead they promote the development of content about disability as a first-order necessity.

### AT: What words do we use instead?

**Many of these come from Lydia Brown.**

**http://www.autistichoya.com/p/ableist-words-and-terms-to-avoid.html**

Absurd

Awkward

Asinine   
Bad   
Bleak   
Boring   
Bullish   
Callous   
Careless   
Confusing   
Contemptible   
Coward   
Crappy   
Dense   
Disgusting   
Dull   
Enraged   
Evil   
Extremist   
Furious   
Gross   
Half-hearted   
Horrible   
Ignoramus   
Ignorant   
Impolite   
Inane   
Incomprehensible   
Inconsiderate   
Inconsistent   
Infuriating   
Insensible   
Insipid   
Irrational   
Jerk   
Livid   
Mean   
Nasty   
Nefarious   
Nonsense   
Nonsensical   
Obtuse   
Outrageous   
Overwrought   
Paradoxical   
Pathetic   
Petulant   
Pissant   
Putrid   
Rage-inducing   
Reckless   
Ridiculous   
Rude   
Silly

Scornful   
Self-contradictory   
Shameful   
Terrible   
Tyrannical   
Unbelievable   
Unconscionable   
Unheard of   
Uninspired   
Unoriginal   
Unthinkable   
Unthinking

Vile 

### AT: Speaking for Others

#### We’re not speaking for others. Cripistemology is unique because the production of knowledge concerning disability is not formed from disabled people alone, being near disability is a unique pedagogical approach, our advocacy does that.

Johnson 2014. Johnson, Merri, and Robert Mcruer. "Cripistemologies: Introduction." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 127-48. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.12. (WL BFI)

Cripistemology, as we imagine it, does not assume epistemic privilege for the disabled person; it is quite clear in Lorde’s memoir that certain ways of knowing are actively blocked for some women living with cancer. Lorde does not blame individual women for such blockage; she, like Macharia after her, rightly blames the systems through which we move. Still, Lorde and many others do foreground the ways in which disability experience in relation (“tangible floods of energy rolling off these women toward me,” Lorde writes [39]) produces new/different/better knowledge. Nor does cripistemology restrict epistemic privilege to the disabled person. Janet Price and Margrit Shildrick are among the many others who write about disability-in-relation, specifically about a deepening understanding of disability through their relationship as a disabled and nondisabled person. Rejecting the idea “that there is some privileged standpoint from which disabled people alone can speak—as though theirs is the only ‘authentic’ understanding of the specific embodiments in question” (64), they still invoke personal experience (“the medically deteriorating condition of one of us” [69]) as one epistemologically useful ground for insights into grand matters (“the disunity at the heart of all human beings” and the disruption of “the illusion of corporeal and psychic wholeness, and the sense of bodily separation” [69]). On a smaller scale, Shildrick describes learning about touch, care, and corporeal boundaries in proximity to Price, whose multiple sclerosis has resulted in “decreased sensation across large areas of her body” (69) and a “fluctuating sense of touch” (72). These bodily traits left Shildrick on uncertain friendship ground: “I found it difficult to know at any given moment whether a greeting hug was still experienced as a sign of affection, given and returned, an unfelt and therefore meaningful gesture or even a more or less painful assault” (72). What we take from their narrative is not only the intended point about “the instability of the disabled body” and “of all bodies” (72), but also that the production of knowledge about disability comes not only from being disabled but from being with and near disability, thinking through disabled sensations and situations, whether yours or your friend’s. We are familiar with the solace and learning that take place in the context of crip intersubjectivity. Both of us have gotten better at managing boundaries as a result of our own collegial friendships, for example, with Anna Mollow. Most recently, Lisa learned to assert limits of time, energy, and physical and psycho-logical stamina as a direct result of practice in asking how best to accommodate Anna’sEnvironmental Illness. Learning about Anna’s EI had the unexpected benefit of making Lisa willing, finally, to ask for accommodations of her own physical and psychological conditions, not only from seeing Anna model this work, but from realizing the joy produced by working with and around the needs of someone you care about. Disability knowledge—embodied and relational—is about disability (knowing how long Anna can be on the phone, knowing how long Lisa can type at a desk in a given day) and extends beyond disability (knowing how to say no, realistically assessing timeframes for specific tasks, incorporating self-care into the equation). Price and Shildrick write toward the very large-scale insight “that ethics itself must be rethought” (73); their call for “thinking together and otherwise” (74), for us, echoes parts of the virtual roundtable that launches this double issue, as some participants imagine cripistemology as confusing what any one individual might think, generating alongside that confusion doubt, uncertainty, or failures to know. The possibility of better ethical models inhabits this dimension of the term, as the failures or necessarily partial quality of knowledge generates pressure on each of us to ask, rather than assume, what encounters require of us.

### AT: Acceptance

#### Acceptance is a band aid for self-loathing that will never solve. – Prefer Empowerment

St. Pierre 2014 Against Self-Acceptance <http://www.didistutter.org/blog/against-self-acceptance> (WL)

The idea of "accepting" ourselves and our stutter is one we have heard all our lives. It is a way of managing the shame and self-loathing that so-often comes with stuttering, and is the basis of many self-help groups. I struggled with accepting myself my entire life. It was continuous and difficult work since I quite literally hated myself. I cannot count how many "failed" conversations filled with stuttering, facial tics, and averted eyes ended with me walking away, repeatedly muttering "stupid Josh, stupid Josh, stupid Josh" in order to cope with extreme embarrassment and shame. If I ever did come to accept myself it was never for very long. Acceptance is a bandage for a much larger problem. Perhaps the very notion of accepting ourselves depends on us first admitting that there is something wrong with us and how we speak. Self-acceptance starts with a concession. Do non-stutterers have to accept themselves, fluency and all? This idea of course seems silly. It is only because we admit that we are abnormal that we have to start picking up the pieces. While we are often told that self-acceptance is the way to deal with self-hate, I think that self-acceptance actually just puts a different coat of paint on self-loathing. There is still something rotting underneath. Perhaps this is why we struggle with accepting ourselves over and over and over again. But what if there is actually nothing wrong with you, nothing to accept, nothing to fix? Empowerment and acceptance are not the same thing.

### AT: Curing/Fixing Disability

#### **Disability isn’t an illness in need of a cure, it is something that we should embrace**

Robinson 2014, Rich 9-1-2014, "We need dynamic optimism to cure disease, not simple acceptance," No Publication, <http://www.cw.ua.edu/article/2014/09/we-need-dynamic-optimism-to-cure-disease-not-simple-acceptance> (WL)

One day soon, the ALS challenge will look quaint. The power of social media and generosity will be supplanted by hard science and procedure. Hope will yield to reality. This future is basically seen as a forgone conclusion in our media and culture. The zeitgeist says that we will eventually cure paralysis and bring sight back to the blind. So it will be. It’s inherently optimistic and full of hubris. Like Icarus, we can too often fly close to the sun in our dreams and visions of what tomorrow can bring. Instead of fearing failure, we should endeavor to land on the sun and harness it.¶ I believe in this future. No human being should have to go through life as an observer in a foreign field; all should have the chance to thrive. Call me an idealist if you must, but I prefer “21st century realist.” And I’m not alone. Our generation believes in a sort of dynamic optimism, which has been fueled in the crucible of life experience. Many of us have experienced the wide reach of disability and disease–either in our own lives or in those close to us. Parents blindsided by cancer, uncles withered away from AIDS and best friends who injected their bellies with ?insulin at lunch.¶ But wai t, it gets very complicated. You see, not everyone views the future the same way. Allow me to focus on one particular developmental disability – autism, for the remainder of this column.¶ “Autism isn’t an il lness in need of a cure,” Ari Ne’eman, the president of the Autistic Self Advocacy Network, said in a New York Times Magazine cover story recently. It’s important to know that Ne’eman is autistic, although he is incredibly high-functioning and was even appointed by President Obama to serve on the National Council on Disability.¶ He is also a “millennial,” born in 1987. His organization doesn’t believe that we should try to cure autism, but should instead learn to embrace it for what it is and adapt. I understand this view and think we should be more understanding and accommodating as a society. The Americans with Disabilities Act is too weak, for example, and our educational system is ill-equipped to truly educate developmentally delayed youths–and many normally functioning children too, coincidentally.¶ No doubt Ne’eman is part of autism, one side of the story. But my brother is another side of the story as well. He is not nearly as well-adjusted. His path in life is harder to hoe and more uncertain. And while I salute Ne’eman for his success, I also reject his group’s views as unworkable ?and offensive.¶ I think of all the different people that I’ve met with developmental disabilities. I think of their families and the immense struggle that life can be for them. I also think of Eagles’ Wings, the Tuscaloosa-based non-profit that hopes to house 30 disabled adults, some of them children of elderly people with ?few alternatives.¶ But mostly, I think of my hero. When I’m back home, I go to my brother’s room before going to sleep every night. Sometimes, I’ll nudge him a bit in the wide darkness to wake him and bend down to whisper.¶ “We are brothers. We are the same.”¶ He pauses for a second, deeply thinking about what it means. He repeats it back as I cross the ?darkness out of the room.

### AT: Co-option

#### The alternative won’t get co-opted, the biggest threat to the alternative is the arguments you make which attempt to ‘rehabilitate’ disability into a able bodied and nuerotypical mold.

Mcruer and Johnson 2014. Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

David Serlin. One of the gravest, and perhaps most overtly ahistorical, moves that any feminist or queer disability studies can make is to assert that the containment of crip ways of knowing—the domestication of cripistemologies—emerges from neoliberalism, or whatever iteration of late capitalism activists and scholars have charged with transforming material and social relations since the 1980s. Long before the terms independence, autonomy, and self-care were swallowed up and exploited by neoliberalism, the forces of rehabilitative habitus and somatic sameness were responsible for bludgeoning cripistemologies into familiar forms of generic submission. While feminist, queer, and transnational disability studies have recovered differential bodily subjectivities as sources of meaning-making, differences now often get distilled down into forms of identity politics, a process that neutralizes those morphological and cognitive differences that constitute pre-identificatory categories of disabled experience. This is a scenario not dissimilar from those LGBT activists whose focus on rights and representations has obscured and diluted the counter-identificatory effects of queer phenomenology. How, then, might we conceptualize new relationships between physical impairments, spatial environments, and psychic or cognitive subjectivities that are not contingent on disabled identity as a primary modality of legibility? The sensorial and intersubjective dimensions of disability may produce cripis-temologies for which disability is but one differential of identity, not its sole form. Legislation like the Americans with Disabilities Act offers the promise of a level playing field in order to neutralize body differences legally and fulfill the promises of liberal modernity. But such legislation refutes differential cripistemologies as a function of liberal modernity’s need for somatic sameness.

### AT: Intersectionality

#### Cripistemology is intersectional

Mcruer and Johnson 2014. Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Jennifer James I was immediately intrigued by a “cripistemological” approach to cultural studies and social critique. The voices invited to speak in this conversation intrigued me even further: a group of “queer, trans, feminist, and disability and critical race theorists” collectively considering how varied “ways of knowing” might “converge.”

### AT: Speaking for Others

#### Experience, while important, is not key in the authentication of knowledge, the primary authors of cripistemology agree.

Mcruer and Johnson 2014. Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Emma Kivisild. If stories and storytelling are fundamentals of knowing, it follows that autoethnographic writing is an epistemic endeavor—or perhaps a cripistemic endeavor. Yet, I reject the presumption that having a disability in itself gives a necessary perspective on certain issues. Whether I was a queer disabled feminist at any point in time might not affect my memoir. However, the crip memoir is affected by what Trinh Minh-ha might call the situated i of my disability. My motorized chair, homophobic doctors, no curb cuts, the hope of new treatment, the academy, support groups: from these i learn. It’s crip learning, utilizing a crip lens through which i look back 30 years to re-member and re-evaluate politics and identity. Is it this i that sits at the convergence of queer, feminist, and disabled epistemologies? Cripistemologies are epistemologies of slipperiness and clouds of meaning. So even though experience is not necessarily a way to authentic knowledge, is it a way to slide at the edges, inhabit the clouds?

### AT: Policymaking/Roleplaying

#### Actual policy debates determine what happens to the disabled, but people with disabilities are excluded from these discussions. Discussing disability is integral to recognizing other individuals as entitled to dignity

Berube 2003 (Michael, Paterno Family Professor in Literature at Pennsylvania State University. “Citizenship and Disability.” Alternet, May 1, 2003. <http://www.alternet.org/story/15809/citizenship_and_disability> –Veeder)

Imagine a building in which political philosophers are debating, in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the value and the purpose of participatory parity over against forms of authoritarianism or theocracy. Now imagine that this building has no access ramps, no Braille or large-print publications, no American Sign Language interpreters, no elevators, no special-needs paraprofessionals, no in-class aides. Contradictory as such a state of affairs may sound, it's a reasonably accurate picture of what contemporary debate over the meaning of democracy actually looks like. How can we remedy this? Only when we have fostered equal participation in debates over the ends and means of democracy can we have a truly participatory debate over what "participatory parity" itself means. That debate will be interminable in principle, since our understandings of democracy and parity are infinitely revisable, but lest we think of deliberative democracy as a forensic society dedicated to empyreal reaches of abstraction, we should remember that debates over the meaning of participatory parity set the terms for more specific debates about the varieties of human embodiment. These include debates about prenatal screening, genetic discrimination, stem-cell research, euthanasia, and, with regard to physical access, ramps, curb cuts, kneeling buses, and buildings employing what is now known as universal design. Leftists and liberals, particularly those associated with university humanities departments, are commonly charged with being moral relativists, unable or unwilling to say (even after September 11) why one society might be "better" than another. So let me be especially clear on this final point. I think there's a very good reason to extend the franchise, to widen the conversation, to democratize our debates, and to make disability central to our theories of egalitarian social justice. The reason is this: a capacious and supple sense of what it is to be human is better than a narrow and partial sense of what it is to be human, and the more participants we as a society can incorporate into the deliberation of what it means to be human, the greater the chances that that deliberation will in fact be transformative in such a way as to enhance our collective capacities to recognize each other as humans entitled to human dignity. As Jamie reminds me daily, both deliberately and unwittingly, most Americans had no idea what people with Down syndrome could achieve until we'd passed and implemented and interpreted and reinterpreted a law entitling them all to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. I can say all this without appealing to any innate justification for human dignity and human rights, and I can also say this: Without a sufficient theoretical and practical account of disability, we can have no account of democracy worthy of the name.

### AT: We're Accommodating/Accessible

#### You’re not accessible/accomodating, if you were accessible, it would have been in the 1AC. Claiming accessibility now still means that disability is an afterthought, an afterthought of thoughtless charitable inclusion which is still only accessibly via the backside.

Fritsch 2013. Fritsch, K. "The Neoliberal Circulation of Affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair." Health, Culture and Society 5, no. 1 (2013): 135-49. doi:10.5195/hcs.2013.136. (WL BFI)

The ISA also produces disability through its appearance after a retrofit has been done. For Jay Dolmage (2012; 2013), the retrofit, an addition or alteration to something that has already been built, is part of the logic of neoliberalism. Disability is accommodated by adding ramps onto the side of a building or around the back, instead of at the main entrance, relegating disability as a form of difference “supplemental to society” (Dolmage, 2013, p. 1). Disability is included as an afterthought; welcome, but only by way of the side entrance. The ISA often appears after a retrofit has been done, allowing disability to appear only to orient disability to disappear through the side entrance. The retrofit offers a quick and temporary fix through cheap additions or alterations rather than designing with disability as a routine part of spatial organization. While capitalism has produced inaccessible geographies (Gleeson, 1998) and thus excluded disabled people, the retrofit acts as a bandage solution, a charitable form of inclusion without changing too much. The retrofit shows the ineffectiveness of capitalism to contend with crises of its own making, even as capitalism constantly adapts (Dolmage, 2013). At the same time, the ISA produces disability by disguising the way disability is capacitated and debilitated within a neoliberal capitalist economy. Much like the overcoming and forgetting of suffering associated with the rehabilitating war veterans (Stiker, 1999; Fritsch, 2013), the ISA covers over the ways in which disability is incurred by capitalist social relations whether by way of poverty, war, austerity measures, environmental destruction, or other debilitating processes (Sothern, 2007; Erevelles, 2011; McRuer, 2012; Chandler, 2013). By making disability appear to be an individualized problem, or as Alison Kafer puts it, “casting disability as a monolithic fact of the body” (2013, p.3), the ISA makes its innocuous appearance on buildings, buses and bathroom stalls without so much of a hint of the ways in which disability often only comes to appear by way of a lack of access to adequate health care, an exploding land mine, a revoking of social benefits, a loss of labour rights, or dirty water.

### AT: Accommodations Solve

#### Accommodations are granted through ablebodied interpretations of the world, disability is a performance and a continual threshold to be met in order to be given accommodations. Even then Accommodations come with strings attached and internalize self hatred.

Farinas 2016. Farinas, Caley, and Creigh Farinas. "4 Ways Ableism in My Elementary School Left Me Completely Traumatized." Everyday Feminism. April 22, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2016/04/ableism-elementary-school/>. (WL BFI)

2. The School Staff Fought Against Giving Me Accommodations. By law, schools are required to grant me and other disabled students here in the United States access to the curriculum. But in order to be able to access it, most of us need some accommodations. For me, my needs were two-fold in this area. Not only did I need the accommodation of being allowed sensory stimuli to enable me to focus in class, but I also needed accommodations for my dysgraphia. I have dysgraphia, which impacts my ability to write by hand (or get my thoughts onto paper in general). I can’t do fine motor control in my fingers, and so my letters don’t look good and take me a long time to produce, and the way I have to clamp onto a pencil to make it so I can control it at all is very painful. As a result of this, I was eventually granted the accommodation of using a keyboard with a tiny screen in my classes and for my homework instead of having to write. Here’s the thing, though. My teachers pushed back hard against this, not just in getting the accommodations put into my individualized education plan, but after the fact, too. You see, in order for this system to work, I had to be able to print off my work for the teacher to read. The trick is, though, they wouldn’t allow me to print from their computers, even if the work was for their class. I needed to print my homework and essays, all school-related, but because they didn’t want me on their computers (what did they think I was going to do, hack them?) they wouldn’t allow it and would become angry. Many times I was unable to print out my homework and then penalized for not having my homework. I know it makes more work for teachers to accommodate me, as they told me on many occasions. But, I mean, that’s kind of their job — to help me access my education. Yes, they have to do a lot of crappy paperwork, but that’s not a reason to not help me. And because of the pushback I got, sometimes, I would just have to handwrite my work, defeating the entire concept of the accommodation and causing me incredible pain. I don’t know how to explain how hard writing is for me. I will say this: When in middle school I was required to draw a free hand map of Europe, it was bad enough that I thought about breaking my own arm. The pain seemed about the same as what I was already experiencing by trying to meet inaccessible standards for abusive teachers, and if I did then I wouldn’t have to do this anxiety of trying to get all the flipping fjords of Norway right. Yet since I only had typing accommodations, which were not technically drawing accommodations, I had to do the assignment anyways. Ultimately I chose not to go ahead with breaking my arm. But it was a close thing.

### AT: More Disabled Students Going To College

#### Your argument about more disabled folks going to college is misconstrued and only accounts for upper class white people.

Reid and Knight 2006. Reid, D. K., and M. G. Knight. "Disability Justifies Exclusion of Minority Students: A Critical History Grounded in Disability Studies." Educational Researcher 35, no. 6 (2006): 18-23. doi:10.3102/0013189x035006018. (WL BFI)

These statistics represent an increase in postsecondary students reporting a disability. Yet they obscure two important aspects of the link between the placement of ethnic minority students in special education in high school and their transition to college. First, the statistics mask the inequity of ethnic minority students' overrepresentation in special education in high schools and their subsequent underrepresentation in college. Second, the statistics do not reveal how access to postsecondary education is based on the intersection of race, class, and disability and the inadequate services provided to labeled students in high school. Closer ex- amination of these statistics shows how the history of disproportionate representation of minorities in special education pervades the intersections of race and class with access to college for students also labeled disabled. Significantly, the number of students labeled LD who attend college has increased from 16% to 40% of the college students with disabilities in the past 12 years, and this group continues to grow (Henderson, 2001). Notably, however, this statistic represents a White, upper-middle-class increase in postsecondary attendance and attainment: In comparison to college freshmen without dis- abilities, students labeled LD were more often from White families whose annual income exceeded $100,000 (Henderson)

### AT: Technology Solves

#### Adding technology will never solve as long as ableism is still embedded within pedagogical systems. Only the criticism solves, you’re just a bandaid.

Only the criticism solves, you’re just a bandaid

Hehir 2003. Thomas Hehir. Beyond inclusion: educators' 'ableist' assumptions about students with disabilities compromise the quality of instruction. School Administrator, March, 2003 [www.kidstogether.org/BEHeard/Beyond%20inclusion-ableist.doc](http://www.kidstogether.org/BEHeard/Beyond%20inclusion-ableist.doc) (WL BFI)

Though research strongly indicates that students with a learning disability need more intensive services in reading than their nondisabled peers, wholly focusing their special education program on reading is nor appropriate. For students with a learning disability, this reflects the ableist assumption that special education's role should be to change disabilities. These children also should have access to the rest of the curriculum with appropriate accommodations and supports. Though there are effective ways for students with LD to access the same classroom curriculum as their peers by using adaptive technology, schools must modify deeply held beliefs about acceptable student performance in order for them to benefit from these technologies.

#### Tech for disabled folks is made to normalize us so disabled folks are safer and more convenient to look at, also technology goes hand in hand, tech is always advancing for able bodied folks and only after crip folks change does anything happen.

Mitchell 2014. Mitchell, David, Sharon Snyder, and Linda Ware. “[Every] Child Left Behind: Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 3 (2014): 295-314. Accessed April 26, 2017. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.24. (WL BFI)

As a corrective to inclusionist objectives that began whole-heartedly in the mid-1990s, scholars in DSE such as ourselves have pursued the development of an alternative curricular cripistemology. Curricular cripistemologies imagine another kind of inclusion that entails an approach to making crip/ queer subjects not just integrated but integral to the contemporary curricular knowledge base (Stiker 32). As an alternative to engaging existing inclusionist methodologies as largely an application of assistive technology—the formali-zation of “technology’s fix” to the integration of disabled students, discussed later—we argue that curricula need to contextualize the lives of crip/queer people in order to create a receptive atmosphere for productive engagements with embodied differences in school. A functioning curricular cripistemology entails teasing out and making visible otherwise latent crip/queer themes as a primary ordinal in a multi-tiered approach. Based on experiences in a variety of pedagogical training settings, curricular cripistemologies involve the development of a systemic, replicable, non-normative pedagogy in combination with the active participation of crip/ queer subjects.

### AT: States/Local

#### States can’t be trusted to do what’s best for disabled students – history proves.

Hehir 2002. Hehir, Thomas. "Eliminating Ableism in Education." Harvard Educational Review 72, no. 1 (2002): 1-33. doi:10.17763/haer.72.1.03866528702g2105. (WL BFI)

It is noteworthy that, before this federal requirement, most states excluded most students with disabilities from these important accountability systems (Thurlow, 2000) — this at a time when most states were implementing various forms of standards-based reform. A number of explanations may address this exclusion. It is possible that disabled students were viewed as not capable of achieving standards. Another explanation might be that the performance of disabled students was not important to track. Both of these explanations clearly reflect ableist attitudes, that disabled students are either incapable or unimportant. Another explanation is that in high-stakes environments school districts may actually be placing more students in special education to avoid accountability (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1989). A more positive view might be that states simply did not know how to accommodate students with disabilities in assessments. There are many technical is-sues involved in the inclusion of students with disabilities, especially those who receive accommodations (Koretz & Hamilton, 2000). Though the truth probably lies somewhere among these views, the exclusion of students with disabilities from state and local assessment systems may result in their exclusion from the curriculum and thus reinforce the status quo of low expectations, leaving students with disabilities seriously undereducated.

### AT: Oppression Olympics

#### Disability rights movements are intrinsically connected via language and structural systems to other forms of oppression.

Cohen-Rottenberg 2015. Cohen-Rottenberg, Rachel. "10 Questions That Come Up When You're Called Out for Ableist Language – Answered." Everyday Feminism. December 27, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://everydayfeminism.com/2015/12/questions-called-out-ableism/>. (WL BFI)

9. ‘Aren’t You Playing Oppression Olympics Here?’ No. I’ve never said that one form of oppression is worse than another, and I never will. In fact, I am asking that people who are marginalized on the basis of the appearance or functioning of their bodies – on the basis of gender identity, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class, size, age, and disability – get together and talk about the ways in which these oppressions weave through one another and support one another. If you do not want disability used against your group, start thinking about what you’re doing to reinforce ableism in your own speech. If you do not want people of color to be called feeble-minded, or women to be called weak, or LGBTQIA+ people to be called freaks, or fat people to be called diseased, or working-class people to be called stupid – all of which are disability slurs – then the solution isn’t to try to distance yourself from us and say, “No! We are not disabled like you!” The solution is to make common cause with us and say, “There is nothing wrong with being disabled, and we are proud to stand with you.”

### AT: Author Indicts

If disabled people were truly heard, an explosion of knowledge of the human body and psyche would take place. Instead, disabled people’s knowledge is dismissed as trivial, complaining, mundane (or bizarre), less than that of the dominant group.

### AT: No Spillover

#### **Even if nothing ever spills over, making the debate space safer and more inclusive, and giving more people a space of advocacy, seems an admirable enough goal on its own. That’s the Stevens 15 Evidence**

# Cards About Disability in Debate

#### The affirmative’s talk of changing education is still a blatant refusal to critically examine and change the way in which we engage in the debate space right now. The debate space, right here right now is a unique format to introduce new pedagogies of accessibility.

Richter 2015. Richter, Zahari. "2 Disability analyses of Policy Debate." (dis/qu)iesence. July 23, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://zachrichter.weebly.com/awkward-gestures-blog/-2-disability-analyses-of-policy-debate>. (WL BFI)

1. The Inaccessible game. One part of my experience with policy debate is a reflection of my experiences as a disabled gamer. Like with the Nintendo 64 controller or later, the keyboard or mouse, I just could not figure out how to hold the controller. Intercollegiate debate also has an inaccessible interface. Video game controllers: expect you to move in certain ways, to hold the mouse and hold multiple fields of attention, attain a certain level of game space feeling and knowledge with the visuals, sounds and uses of the controller. Debate, similarly, relies on nonverbal and verbal engagements with the judge or person opposite them in the room---these engagements have steeper learning curves for some than others because communication itself is a culturally soaked activity. Like using a mouse is bad on my dexterity, using a face is bad for my communicative impairments. I did my best debating when I could shake my body into an emotional-speech inferno. When I was allowed to not use a flow, I gave better speeches. The multiple activities of taking notes and speech preparation illegitimately favor those with certain types of spatial and study based intelligence and brutally punish those whose learning styles or form of intelligence departs from debate norms. Video games also, would punish players for incomplete knowledge or use of the controls, but in video games, I would enter cheat codes because it is better to see some of the game than be held back terribly due to dexterity and spatial limits. Debate sees an unusual part of the academy where highly scholarly activities are taking place, but note-takers are not available and assistance with the material or the translation of it into other forms is also not available. In this way, like video games, debate on the basis of their justification of competitiveness builds inaccessibility into its game. The inaccessibility of the debate space in a broad way is due to the twin combinations of institutional over-arrogance: the snobbery of knowledge in the academy, the brutishness of professional sports. A true conversation has to be had about inaccessibility in the debate world, about whether organizations such as the NDT should advertise that they exclude disabled people on the basis of not having access services built in. Campbell has written about inaccessibility as having negative health effects upon the disabled, it also has negative social effects, isolating disabled people for over-reacting to the elitist condition of the place. Then, most debaters in the debate world who are disabled hide it because of the scorn placed upon it. And even this try at hiding sometimes falls apart and they are left having to scrounge for excuses. Compliance is hardly a step. Disabled people are widely excluded from debate on the basis of the narcissism among debaters that think of their activity as a touchstone for future leaders. Accessibility would bring in a far wider population and further activate debate as tool for wider radicalization. The affirmation of the disabled person in the debate space could open prisons, nursing homes and hospitals to participate, then informing and persuasively empowering other forsaken members of the disabled world. 2. Debate as trauma: how debate traumatizes and how debate changes trauma. Debate or the competitive policy debate that I participated in almost always takes place in a school and involves contestants speaking loudly and often emotionally at each other about politics at a high and fast volume. This amounts to the taking of the childhood classroom intimidation to its furthest level; in a debate when you make a mistake you may anger up to four other people in the room, staring at you. The rapid-fire exchanges, the emotionality of debate are part of what make it memorable but also how it gives the formative childhood traumas of the school house a new lease on life through repetitions of scolding by both classmate and teacher. The fast speech also offers an air of intensity. The hyperbolous building upon adolescent schoolyard nightmares by debate with the high degree of academic veneer coating its language, result in debate losses seeming to resonate back to failures of intellect that put into question self-value that was already fecked by repeated miscommunications.  For many of us, debate rounds on important things echo in our dreams for years afterward. Then, the echoing of traumatic debate experiences across time can be felt in the form of how the voice and body react to argumentative encounters. Hostile debate norms literally code the reactions former debaters when they get into an argument. A fierceness can often be heard when you hear a former debater arguing. For the debater, who has used interpersonal communication as a fencing stick for two competitors to brandish intellectually against each other, to show weakness in an interaction is to lose. Debate expectations and rules seem to stick to the body; even when debate life is filled with critiques of those rules. The traumatic stickiness of the habits of the debate world as well as its psychosocial intensity justify all the more clearly why debate norms need to be overhauled.

#### The battle for accessibility in debate is part of broader stuggle for disabled people to be recognized as humans outside of debate.

Richter 2016. Zahari Richter. The Disabled Person’s Struggle In Round & Beyond: Taking Back Formerly Ableist Educational Spaces In The Post-Ada Generation. National Journal Of Speech & Debate Volume 4: Issue 3 April 2016, Symposium: Accessibility, Disability & Debate <Http://Site.Theforensicsfiles.Com/Njsd.4-3.Pdf> (WL BFI)

The disabled person’s movement in debate is just one more node of a spread-out disabled person’s movement to end ableist segregation on an institutional level and to point out and oppose the lesser funding received in disability ghettos condoned by the government. The initial framing that my analysis draws upon is the language of the social model of disability that explicitly indicts institutional segregation for suppressing disabled public presence and disabled accomplishment, as well doing violence regularly to disabled people of all different types. Debate as an enterprise has been un-reflexive about the level of accessibility at events and has only recently enjoyed several controversies beginning in debate rounds that have challenged the systematic inaccessibility that plagues the inter-collegiate and inter-high school leagues. This panel was organized to offer solutions, but many of my fellow panelists have noted that some issues with debate, such as the lack of American Sign Language options, are intractable––the debate world has systematically and routinely refused to act on or consider possible solutions. These issues are particularly revelatory in terms of what Charlton describes as the “hierarchy of disability” that structures which types of disabled people make it into which spaces.13 By and large, those able to access debate are those disabled people who have had invisible disabilities, such as learning disabilities or psychiatric issues. Disabled people impaired in other ways, such as blind and deaf debaters, are present in lesser numbers, receding down to developmentally disabled people who are never present in the debate world. Due to debate’s existence, enveloped by a culture of high achievement, there is an implicit expectation that debaters who are too disabled should not debate. This type of suggestion ignores the centrality of a forensic education to the necessary self- advocacy that disabled people must undertake in order to receive education, medical help, and often to interact with the public. In-round advocacy has a similarity to plying your case to a superior; this interaction with power is very basic and is key to life within the current systems. I frame the battle for accessibility in policy debate as part of a wider battle for accessibility in education and, wider than that, a battle for accountability for the harms that the modern nation-state and corporation has dealt to the disabled person. In many educational institutions of higher and preparatory learning, the communicative situation of the classroom is organized such that order is favored over wider inclusion. The field of educational studies has been a driving influence in disability studies because of the effort of enlightened educational thinkers, such as Doug Biklen and others, to support alternative mediated forms of communication as well as those involved in the inclusive education movement. People involved in debate have long placed the activity as intended for the elite and, as a consequence of that decision, have felt no need to include impaired people. However, in the contemporary ideology connected to disability rights of self-advocacy, one finds a way of being disabled that is indeed more involved in argumentation and advocacy than nondisabled existence. In the agreement that is classroom accommodations, the education system places an onus upon the disabled person to persuasively engage their instructors in order to receive needed access.

#### Debate is an important space to talk about these issues - retag

Stevens 2015. Stevens, Maddy. "Ableism." Premier Debate Today. November 19, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/11/19/ableism/>. (WL BFI)

Understanding that our approach to disability is produced by those who actively benefit from the identification and control of those populations is an important starting point for any discussion. The recognition that the assignment and treatment of disability is not neutral is at least enough to encourage us to keep an open mind when we engage in questions like “what role does ableism play?” and “how do we create a more inclusive community?” We must approach this subject with the concession that our knowledge is wrong, and we must be ready to accept the narratives and input of disabled people if we are to reach any true solution. This holds especially true within the debate space, particularly if we agree to any given author’s assertion that we are educators within this space. Because ableism is so particularly entwined with academia (whether it be through outright contempt or through subtle exclusion), it is incredibly important that we recognize the role we all may play in facilitating certain harmful norms. Debate is a space for advocacy, but we attach all sorts of conditions and stipulations for even just agreeing to hear something out. The speaker has to present a certain way, they can’t stutter or pause, as that shows a lack of preparation, and they should maintain eye contact or it shows a lack of conviction in their arguments. These are arbitrary standards rooted in ablenormativity, there is nothing natural about eye contact nor is it necessarily more persuasive. Having a harder time reading or pronouncing words is no reason to invalidate a performance and is no indication of lack of ability. We need to recognize that our process for validating some arguments over others may be rooted in either the politics of credibility (those mentioned above) or within our own biases. Ableism is insidious, and is often easy or convenient to ignore. Many of us will recognize surface issues, but fail to grasp the underlying motivations or how to correct the problem long term (for instance, most people will agree that it’s wrong to call someone ‘retrded’, but will continue to use the word ‘idot’, despite the fact that both have been used in an institutionalized, medical context, both have been a label of identifying disabled persons for institutionalization or for the forfeiture of rights, and that they’re literally synonymous). As a result, people often fail to recognize ableism in action and we reject the indications that would tell us otherwise. Ableism’s normalization comes through a consistent dehumanization of disabled persons and the persistent discrediting of our narratives. Because of this, it’s incredibly important for us to promote the outcry of the disabled. These discussions force us to acknowledge that there is a problem, they make us confront the impacts that we have so easily and for so long overlooked, and demand we reevaluate the understandings we once had. Every day, disabled people are killed, locked away, or stripped of our rights. Doctors and parents kill us out of “mercy”, school systems abandon us, governments deny us, society sweeps our unsightly or inconvenient lives under the rugs (The US literally had laws that prevented “grotesquely disabled” people from being in public until the 1970’s). Any educational forum has the obligation to take us seriously, to recognize us. As educators within a debate round, you do that by setting aside your biases, setting aside your outside inclinations of what oppresses disabled people or doesn’t, and listening to those who would tell that story.

Stevens 2015. Stevens, Maddy. "Ableism." Premier Debate Today. November 19, 2015. Accessed April 27, 2017. <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/11/19/ableism/>. (WL BFI)

Most debaters are familiar enough with ableism to pick up on an obvious link for a discourse k somewhere in their backfiles, but fail to recognize that it’s just the tip of the iceberg. Ableism is not just a list of words, it’s a pervasive system of oppression that seeks to identify, isolate, institutionalize, and even erase disability. Language is one of the ways through which ableism solidifies its power over divergent existences, however, the analysis of its influence and range of power is not completed merely by establishing what words we shouldn’t use (especially since many people don’t take the time to understand why that rhetoric is harmful, and because the list is ever expanding to accommodate new discursive additions). It is vital that we examine our understandings of disability and abandon monolithic and inaccurate constructions, that our analysis extends to an interrogation of norms which we often take for granted, both within debate and society at large, and that we work with disabled members of our community to reach solutions. There are many standards, expressions, and norms which seem innocuous, but which reveal an underlying harmful mentality upon inspection. Many of these things have become so far ingrained and accepted that to even challenge the appropriateness of them is to incur indignation and outrage against oneself. We operate under a paradigm of “able until proven otherwise”. Sometimes it’s easy to identify disability because the person matches the paradigm we have for being disabled, in other words, they have an identifying trait of disability which we cannot reason away. More often than not, disability is not easily ascertained. People who have so called “invisible disabilities” often fly under ablenormativity’s radar, so abled people accept us as one of them. Because we do not “look disabled”, people do not check themselves in conversations, and will have discussions about disabled existence as though it is an abstract concept, or will make jokes they would not say in front of someone they identify as disabled, and will voice opinions which they believe you, as an able individual, will share. I’ve debated rounds where, after reading an advocacy dealing with disabled empowerment, I was criticized for commodifying the ballot because I did not concede. This criticism assumed that I was speaking for others, and demanded that I either disclose my identity in a potentially hostile space against my initial inclination or admit to taking advantage of oppression. In forums where I have disclosed and discussed my disability, I have been met with skepticism and scrutiny, because I do not live up to every criteria in The Able Person’s Check List: Disability Edition. Both of these instances represent a time when ablenormativity informed an audience that it was impossible for disability to exist among them, and that it was especially impossible for a disabled individual to compete, educate, or exist alongside, or as well as, them. The notions we have of disability have been informed by a mostly able academia, a mostly able media, and a mostly able society. In this way, we have come to know about disability through the lens of those who are accepted and thus are in control, rather than those who are affected and who are kept subdued by such constructions.

# Aff Arguments

### Academia Exclusion Turn

#### Most disability literature is not representative of disabled people’s experiences because disabled people are excluded from academia.

**Kitchin 2000**, [Rob, “The Researched Opinions on Research: Disabled People and Disability Research,” *Disability & Geography*, v15, #1, pp25-47]

Many disabled academics, such as Oliver (1992), are unhappy at the widespread exclusion of disabled people from disability discourse and call for the adoption of research strategies that are both emancipatory (seeking 'positive' societal change) and empowering (seeking 'positive' individual change through participation). They suggest that current research on disability issues is flawed and problematic in a number of respects. Most crucially, they argue that disability research is not representative of disabled peoples' experiences and knowledges**.** This is because, as noted, the vast majority of research is conducted by non-disabled researchers.They contend that it is only disabled people who can know what it is like to be disabled and so only disabled people who can truly interpret and present data from other disabled people. Moreover, they argue that research concerning disability research is invariably researcher-orientated, based around the desires and agendas of the (non-disabled) researcher and able-bodied funding agencies, rather than subject(s) of the research (disabled people; Sample, 1996). Indeed, Oliver (1992) argues that **t**he traditional 'expert' model of research represents a 'rape model of research' that is alienating, and disempowcrs and disenfranchises disabled research participants by placing their knowledge into the hands of the researcher to interpret and make recommendations on their behalf; that researchers are compounding the oppression of disabled respondents through exploitation for academic gain.

### Antiblackness

#### Cripistemology leaves out anti-blackness in its analysis, thus leaving no room for people of color within its movement.

Mcruer and Johnson 2014. Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Jennifer James I was immediately intrigued by a “cripistemological” approach to cultural studies and social critique. The voices invited to speak in this conversation intrigued me even further: a group of “queer, trans, feminist, and disability and critical race theorists” collectively considering how varied “ways of knowing” might “converge.” Those of us speaking from any/all of those embodiments know one thing certainly: what it means to be rendered invisible. I was therefore surprised to discover what had gone missing when the epistemologies were named. “How, when, and where do queer, feminist, and disability episte-mologies converge?” How might we “respond to impairment . . . in queer, feminist, or crip ways?” Race, though originally mobilized as a key term, is absent. Nor can it be found within an expansive syntactical appendage (as in “such as queer, feminist, and crip, or others”). Has “racialized” knowledge— in my case, blackness—been unconsciously foreclosed as an impossible or undesirable or simply unthought way to know? Is placing black bodies “in motion” in relation to other bodies a useful way to conceptualize the outcomes of twentieth-century African American social movements? Put differently, if a black body moves into the “diversified” neoliberal US university but nobody sees it, did it actually move? And does intersectional praxis falter when we feel compelled to speak “as” one of one’s identities? Do those speech acts create discord with more idealistic theories of intersectionality? If so, is there a space for black academic anti-sociality in this cultural moment?

### Censorship Bad

#### **Freedom of speech is key to the future of society – censorship corrupts the first amendment and totalitarian states**

Roskoski and Peabody 91 [Matthew Roskoski, and Joe Peabody, debate coaches and former debaters writing on theory issues, critiques, and risk management; “A Linguistic and Philosophical Critique of Language “Arguments””; Florida State University; 1991; accessed 07/31/2015; <http://debate.uvm.edu/Library/DebateTheoryLibrary/Roskoski&Peabody-LangCritiques>.]

If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought - not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate. (Holmes 654). Certainly this principle would prohibit the enforcement of any language "argument." If one despised the rhetoric of a given debater enough to vote against that debater, then as Holmes suggests, the principles of the Constitution require one to refrain from censorship. The Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts articulated the essence of this argument so eloquently that their entire statement deserves repetition here: When language wounds, the natural and immediate impulse is to take steps to shut up those who utter the wounding words. When, as here, that impulse is likely to be felt by those who are normally the first amendment's staunchest defenders, free expression faces its greatest threat. At such times, it is important for those committed to principles of free expressions to remind each other of what they have always known regarding the long term costs of short term victories bought through compromising first amendment principles. (Strossen 487). Certainly debaters and debate coaches, whose entire activity is premised upon the freedom of expression, ought to be among the staunchest defenders of that freedom. When we are asked to censor the rhetoric of a debater, as the C.L.U. warns, we ought to think long and hard about the risks associated with playing fast and loose with free speech. As Brennan notes, the mandate "to inculcate moral and political values is not a general warrant to act as 'thought police' stifling discussion of all but state-approved topics and advocacy of all but the official position." (Brennan 577). Not only does the first amendment create a moral or deontological barrier to language "arguments", the principles it defends also create a pragmatic barrier. The free and sometimes irreverent discourse protected by the first amendment is essential to the health and future success of our society. History has borne out the belief that the freedom to challenge convictions is essential to our ability to adapt to change. As Hyde and Fishman observe, university scholars must be allowed to "think the unthinkable, discuss the unmentionable, and challenge the unchallengeable" because "major discoveries and advances in knowledge are often highly unsettling and distasteful to the existing order." This leads them to conclude that "we cannot afford" to impose "orthodoxies, censorship, and other artificial barriers to creative thought" (Hyde & Fishman 1485). Given the rapid pace of political and technological change that our society faces, and given that debates often focus around the cutting edge of such changes, the imposition of linguistic straitjackets upon the creative thought and critical thinking of debaters would seem to uniquely jeopardize these interests. This is not just exaggerated rhetoric, nor is it merely our old debate disadvantages in new clothes. Hyde & Fishman's claims have been repeatedly validated by historical events. Had Elie Wiesel debated in Germany, a "Zionist language" argument would not have been unlikely. As Bennett Katz has argued, The essentiality of freedom in the community of American Universities is almost self-evident... To impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation... Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die. (Katz 156).

### AT: Cripestimology

#### There are at least two problems with the criticism 1. Is that it fractures the disability 2. It relegates the use of disabled people exclusively to being knowledge producers.

Garland-Thomson 2014. Rosemarie Garland Thompson in Mcruer, Robert, and Merri Johnson. "Proliferating Cripistemologies: A Virtual Roundtable." Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8, no. 2 (2014): 149-70. doi:10.3828/jlcds.2014.13. (WL BFI)

Rosemarie Garland-Thomson I appreciate this conversation and its efforts at “structurally placing crip(s) at the beginning or center of the production of knowledge.” One particularly positive direction would pursue Jennifer Nash’s call to “imagine theoretical connections where we never imagined them.” David’s call to focus on “the subjective experience of bodily difference” seems just right in this regard. However, I need help understanding the risks and processes through which we imagine and accomplish these propositions. I need to know how, when, and where access leads to assimilation. Or how, when, and where resistance leads to exclusion. I find two worries in our critique. One concern is that accusations of false consciousness against some people with disabilities will fracture certain opportunities for solidarity upon which positive identity politics and social justice initiatives are built. (One thinks, for instance, of the accusation made against Deaf people who participate in Deaf culture and use cochlear implants or hearing aide technology along with sign language.) My second concern is that our critique risks relegating many people with disabilities who have a vivid, knowledge-producing “subjective experience of bodily difference” to a place of purity outside of contaminated structures. This is my objection to Julia Kristeva’s theorizing of the disabled subject as the ultimate unassimilable that must remain forever excluded even as she argues for inclusion as justice. Disabled people are her anchor for a theory of absolute social and political abjection. While I am certainly worried about dangerously regularizing access and wary of neoliberal appropriation, I’m also worried about particular kinds of material exclusions of people with disabilities in a social order not at least aimed toward the logic of human and civil rights.

### AT: STEM

#### **STEM topics impact disabled people moreso than non-disabled people and the unique experiences of crip folks bring important creativity to the stem field. It’s important for disabled people to be involved in STEM now more than ever.**

Wong 2015, Alice. "Q&A with STEM Professionals with Disabilities." Model View Culture. November 25, 2015. Accessed May 27, 2017. <https://modelviewculture.com/pieces/qa-with-stem-professionals-with-disabilities>. (WL BFI)

AW: With the numerous diversity efforts in STEM, what unique skills and perspectives do people with disabilities bring to these fields? Ronit: I think creativity and perseverance are two things people with disabilities can bring to STEM fields. That is what I feel I can contribute the most to genetic counselors and patients I see. Josh: I think it really depends on the specific field. In my case I help develop the technology used by other blind people. A sighted person simply would not have the same insight and understanding about the need, use cases, attitudes, and applications that I do as a blind researcher. I’m not sure if a disabled perspective has any impact on the pure sciences like theoretical physics, but it definitely can on applied sciences where people with disabilities will be the beneficiaries or recipients (or who will have to live with the barriers) of the tools and techniques being developed by STEM professionals. Alex: STEM topics impact us more personally than able-bodied folks: most of us rely on medical equipment that relies on solid engineering and construction to work, not to mention functioning support systems like a solid electrical grid. So we can bring a perspective of how important STEM is to people out in the real world, and that carries extra passion along with it. As for skills, a lot of us spend time working with that same equipment, so we know the intricacies of engineering better than a lot of people… Insight is a valuable skill. AW: How can STEM industry leaders, employers, and educators better recruit and accommodate people with disabilities into the workforce? Ronit: I think being open-minded is the only barrier to people with disabilities being employed or doing well in school. I have only done well when people around me are open-minded and most of that is due to my perseverance and convincing them as best I can to give me a chance to prove my skills. This, however, is very difficult and can be very depressing. If people got more education about people with disabilities, perhaps disabled people wouldn’t have to work so hard to convince others. Josh: Seek out qualified applicants with disabilities, hire them, and make sure they have the accommodations they need to contribute. We’re out here — just let us in and let us work! Why We Need People with Disabilities in STEM Many people assume that it’s not ‘safe’ or ‘accessible’ for students with a variety of disabilities to pursue STEM for study or career (or for pure enjoyment). With such a need to increase student engagement in science and the STEM workforce pipeline, students with disabilities can play a role in filling this need. Yet in the current discussion on diversity and STEM, as with so many diversity initiatives and programs in various fields, disability is usually excluded or thought of purely in terms of accessibility or accommodations. Reimagining disability as diversity, here are some important points made by Ronit, Josh, and Alex on STEM and people with disabilities: Social attitudes and discrimination are barriers just as disabling as physical inaccessibility or lack of services. Low expectations of students with disabilities can have a detrimental effect, narrowing future life chances and options even further. Adapting activities, curricula, and assignments is not as difficult as it seems; it merely requires imagination, creativity and flexibility. People with disabilities have always been problem-solvers and adaptable in difficult situations; the outsider perspective can bring valuable insight to STEM fields. People with disabilities have had to prove themselves over and over again to their non-disabled counterparts that they can do the same work just for the opportunity to be considered or included. People with disabilities can provide unique viewpoints in all STEM fields, from their user experience to their skills and ability to ‘think outside the box.’

### Not a Voting Issue

#### **Not a voting issue – in round education, cross-x, and out of round discussion solve, we won’t do it again**

## Perm

### Feminist Disability Theory

#### Perm – Feminist Disability theory is more intersectional and solves better

Slater 2012 Slater, Jenny. "Youth for Sale: Using Critical Disability Perspectives to Examine the Embodiment of ‘Youth’." Societies 2, no. 4 (2012): 195-209. doi:10.3390/soc2030195. (WL BFI)

Whereas feminist theory has forced us to re-examine the assumptions we make about women, and disability theory has challenged individual notions of disability, feminist-disability theory brings the two together, not additively, but alongside further intersections of race, class, sexuality, and so on [15]. Within feminist-disability theory, disability, like gender, is seen as a phenomenon that spans all aspects of life. Thus, feminist-disability theory does not only address issues directly concerning disability, but can be used as a lens to critically engage with wider cultural phenomenon. As Garland-Thomson ([15],p. 4) puts it, ―the cultural function of the disabled figure is to act as a synecdoche for all forms that culture deems non-normative‖, consequently, feminist-disability theory can help us critically challenge what may at first appear ̳natural‘. Adding disability to the intersectional work already done by feminist scholars adds depth to a critique of idealized bodies.