#### Society includes disability through accommodations, not because they value disability, but because they want to normalize disability. Accommodations are designed to allow disability to approximate normalcy in the name of progress and inclusion. Efforts to achieve access through accommodation signal inclusionisms goal of forcing disabled people to desire and remain knowable under normalcy. \*A Mitchell and Snyder 15\*C

**David T. Mitchell (GWU Professor of English) and Sharon L. Snyder (faculty member in the Department of Disability and Human Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago) The Biopolitics of Disability Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment. University of Michigan Press**

This opening chapter continues a conversation begun in the introduction by examining **disability’s grudging admission to normative social institutions** **through** inherently neoliberal forms of redress. We perform this analysis by mapping some key coordinates ofpoliticized **normalization strategies** extant in post-Fordist capitalism largely **intended to ameliorate** wider **historical exclusions** from the body politic. In order to do so, we address four related systems of integration for disabled people that **ultimately result in further** degrees of **marginalization** for the many: 1) deinstitutionalization efforts undermined **by** austerity cuts to key services such as in-home personal assistance care; 2) liberal leftist backlash against the homogenizing aesthetics and ecological unfriendliness of universal design as a principle of accessibility to public spaces; 3) international disability-based claims of American exceptionalism that operate by shaming developing countries with respect to their neglectful treatment of disabled people; and 4) nationalist-inflected media portrayals of celebrity cyborgs who are provided as false evidence of the rehabilitation-military postindustrial state’s inclusion commitments to **providing** hyper-**compensatory supports for disabled people**. All of these issues arise within the geopolitics of neoliberalism **as a** result of **claim**s that **disability integration** in postindustrial countries **is now complete and a** preeminent **sign of** their **successful arrival at modernity**. The analyses to come refer to two key nodal points in the neoliberal management of disability: (1) “ablenationalism” with regard to the use of disability by nations and multinational 36 corporate/charity industries as a basis for promoting American exceptionalism abroad; and (2) representational spaces of cyborgian overcompensation we call “the able- disabled” wherein excessive displays of body supplementation are trafficked globally as signs of **the completion** (even transcendence) **of the** limitations of disabled bodies. Both of these tactics prove operative within the logic of democratic rights-based models of inclusionism as they take the **integration of impaired bodies** (either **through the granting of formerly withheld** civic **rights** and/or prosthetic supplementation) as the foundational **mark**er of **inclusionism’s critical accomplishment**. **The hope spurred by these misleading** representational **tactics** **signify** the long overdue historical address of **devalued embodiments pinning for love by nation states** **in which their lives have been** excessively circumscribed, excluded, abused, neglected, as well as **socially and materially eviscerated**. How does **the effort to gain entrance** to the democratic franchise of citizenship **function[s] as a tenuous tactic for** accomplishing more meaningful levels of participation by disabled people? The power of this tactic, we argue, primarily rests on **making disability knowable** within theparameters of heteronormativity (i.e., to see disability as less differentiated from other conditions of embodiment and, therefore, **within the range of the “normal**” rather than deviant). Thus, the normalization of disability in the political arena has, for better and worse, shaped progressive goals with respect to the demands of neoliberalism. A weak strain of **accommodation develops as a result of efforts to flatten out the dynamic materiality of disability through** claims of its likeness to other forms of diverse embodiment and **approximations of normalcy**. In his blog entry on Stims, Stammers and Winks, Zach Richter explains “Ableliberalism” as the contradictory premise that support for disability assists corporate and governmental interests but not necessarily disabled people themselves: Whenaccess is put into action in disability policy, its function is not actually to support disabled people but often either to make money from disabled people (and fuel the social services and healthcare industries), to make it look like the government is supporting disabled people or to normalize disabled people. We will extend this analysis into our case studies of austerity cuts, universal accessibility backlash, and the ablenationalism to come, but for now suffice 37 it to say that **neoliberal disability couches its rhetoric of assistance in terms that mask the institutional interests it serves**. Throughout these discussions we trace disability from a scapegoated and incarcerated form of difference within liberal eugenics to a limited form of **inclusionism** within late liberal capitalism. Our argument regarding this historical transition in the social treatment of disability centers on a shift from Fordist to post-Fordist economic contexts in the West. Nonnormative positivist methodology provides an ability to chart profound alterations in disability’s social utility when economic emphases alter from a concentration on normative modes of mass production to an alternative emphasis on mass market-based consumption strategies. This ouster of disability’s nonnormative materiality from normative modes of participation—that is, the nonnormative operations of those occupying peripheral embodiments—**has resulted in the incapacity to recognize disability as a site of alternative value and as a potentially disruptive force within neoliberal regimes of toleration**.

#### **Inclusnism in society only forces disabled people to desire normalcy leading to re-i**njuring ourselves

**Campbell 08**. Dr Fiona Kumari Campbellis a Senior Lecturer in the School of Health and Wellbeing at the University of South Queensland <http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/21024/50540_1.pdf> “Exploring Internalized Ableism using Critical Race Theory” Disability and Society, Vol. 23 (2), p. 151-162 NT 16

**Internalized oppression is not the cause of our mistreatment; it is the result of our mistreatment**. It would not exist without the real external oppression that forms the social climate in which we exist. Once oppression has been internalized, little force is needed to keep us submissive. **We harbour inside ourselves the pain and the memories, the fears and the confusions, the negative self-images and the low expectations, turning them into weapons with which to re-injure ourselves, every day of our lives. (Mason, as cited Marks, 1999, p.25). Internalised ableism means that to assimilate into the norm the referentially disabled individual is required to embrace, indeed to assume an ‘identity’ other than one’s own – and this subject is repeatedly reminded by epistemological formations and individuals with hegemonic subjectifications of their provisional and (real) identity**. I am not implying that subjects have a true or real essence. Indeed the subjects' formation is in a constant state of fluidity, multiplicity and (re)formation. However, disabled people often feel compelled to fabricate ‘who’ they are – to adopt postures and comportments that are additional to self. The formation of internalised ableism cannot be simply deduced by assessing the responses of individuals to Althusser’s famous interpolative hailing “Hey you, there” (Althusser & Balibar, 1979). Whilst a subject may respond to “Hey you there, crip!” – it is naïve to assume that an affirmative response to this hailing repressively inaugurates negative disabled subjectification. In fact the adoption of more positive or oppositional ontologies of disability by the subject in question may be unexpectedly enabling. As Susan Park (2000: 91) argues “what is at stake here is not so much the accuracy behind the hailing privilege, but the power of the hailing itself to instantly determine (or elide) that thing it is naming”. Nonetheless, censure and the cancellation of the legitimacy of oppositional subjectivities remains common place as Cherney reminds us with respect to Deaf culture: “If abnormal [sic] bodies must be fixed to fit within dominant cultural views of appropriateness then the Deaf celebration of their differences must be read as an illegitimate model of advocacy”. (Cherney, 1999, p. 33). Foucault’s (1976; 1980) theorisation of power as productive may provide some offerings from which to build a conversation about internalised ableism. I am not so much interested in the ‘external’ effects of that power, but for the moment wish to concentrate on what Judith Butler aptly refers to as the ‘psychic life’ of power. She describes this dimension: … an account of subjection, it seems, must be traced in the turns of psychic life. More specifically, it must be traced in the peculiar turning of a subject against itself that takes place in acts of self-reproach, conscience, and melancholia that work in tandem with processes of social regulation (Butler, 1997b, p.19). In other words, the processes of subject formation cannot be separated from the subject him/herself who is brought into being though those very subjectifying processes. The consequences of taking into oneself negative subjectivities not only regulate and continually form identity (the disabled citizen) but can transcend and surpass the strictures of ableist authorizations. Judith Butler describes this process of the “carrying of a mnemic trace”: One need only consider the way in which the history of having been called an injurious name is embodied, how the words enter the limbs, craft the gesture, bend the spine …how these slurs accumulate over time, dissimulating their history, taking on the semblance of the natural, configuring and restricting the doxa that counts as “reality”. (Butler, 1997b, p. 159) The work of Williams and Williams-Morris (2000) links racism experienced by AfricanAmericans to the effects of hurtful words and negative cultural symbols on mental health, especially when marginalized groups embrace negative societal beliefs about themselves. They cite an international study by Fischer et al (1996) which inter alia links poor academic performance with poor social status. Although using different disciplinary language Wolfensberger (1972) in his seven core themes of SRV, identified role circularity as a significant obstacle to be overcome by disabled people wanting socially valued roles. Philosopher Linda Purdy contends it is important to resist conflating disability with the disabled person. She writes My disability is not me, no matter how much it may affect my choices. With this point firmly in mind, it should be possible mentally **to separate my existences from** the existence of **my disability**. (Purdy, 1996, p. 68). The problem with Purdy’s conclusion **is** that it is **psychically untenable**, not only because it is posited around a type of Cartesian dualism that simply separates being-ness from embodiment, but also because this kind of reasoning disregards the dynamics of subjectivity formation to which Butler (1997a; 1997b) has referred. Whilst the ‘outputs’ of subjectivity are variable the experience of impairment within an ableist context can and does effect formation of self – in other words ‘disability is me’, but that ‘me’ does not need to be enfleshed with negative ontologies of subjectivity. Purdy’s **bodily detachment appears locked in**to a loop that is filled with **internalised ableism**, a state with negative views of impairment, from which the only escape is disembodiment; the penalty of denial is a flight from her body. This finds agreement in the reasoning of Jean Baudrillard (1983) who posits that **it is the simulation**, the appearance (representation) **that matters. The subject simulates what it is to be ‘disabled’ and** by inference ‘abled’ and whilst **morphing ableist imperatives, in effect performs a new hyper reality of be-ing disabled. By** unwittingly **performing ableism disabled people become complicit in their** own **demise – reinforcing impairment as an outlaw ontology.**

#### Don’t let them claim that because it’s accessible because I’m competing in debate. Debate is a game that’s rigged for abled bodies. We’re forced to approximate the ideal debate yet because of my disability I can never become it. Stenzel 19

**(Logan Stenzel, a former debater, 11/15/19, Not Another Non Topical Aff v2, NDCA,** [**https://hsld19.debatecoaches.org/Lakeville/Stenzel%20Aff**](https://hsld19.debatecoaches.org/Lakeville/Stenzel%20Aff)**)**

But **I’m blind** and competing in debate so it must be accessible right? **While disabled students are let in the door, we are met with constant ability checks**. We are constantly **judged by our ability to conform to debates rigid standards.** We struggle to approximate the ideal debater only to realize **that we will never meet every criteria of debate. I spent (a)** all of last **year attempting to spread, a perquisite to being a ‘circuit’ debater** but problematically, to speak at 350 words per minute you have to read at 350 words per minute. That’s **a reality that is never possible for me. But I forced myself to spread cases by memory to be a ‘circuit’ debater.** I could **only ever get to 315 words per minute after hundreds of hours of spreading and memorization drills. The constant exposure to ability checks within the space forced me** to learn **to accept subpar conditions** in order **to approximate the ideal debater. This is a space where those who do things differently are constantly questioned.** This is **a space where I have never felt like I truly belong, this is a space where I have never felt comfortable with my blindness, this is a space where I have never felt comfortable doing what I need to do to engage in the space fully.** But screw it, I didn’t memorize the aff. Richter 15

#### **\*T And The aff advocates for curricular cripistemologies to break down inclusionism. This involves the development of teaching pedagogies that deviate from core teachings by foregrounding crip content as fortunate failure. This pedagogical incoherence offers options for constructing alternative ethical frameworks for living outside of the goals of inclusionism by creating useable crip/ queer maps that are otherwise absent from normative teaching approaches \*A Mitchell and Snyder 2\*C**

**David T. Mitchell (GWU Professor of English) and Sharon L. Snyder (faculty member in the Department of Disability and Human Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago) The Biopolitics of Disability Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment. University of Michigan Press**

The pedagogy of **curricular cripistemology** depends upon the insights of human interdependency illustrated in the examples above. It **is neither a discourse of “specialness” where**inwe learn to value disabled people as “human” too, nor tolerate their incapacitieswhen 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 where**in **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 cripistemologies 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**.

#### And This isn’t just another abstract k aff. The affs method can be implemented in tangible ways that improve the lives of both disabled and non-disabled people. Mitchell and Snyder 3

#### 

**David T. Mitchell (GWU Professor of English) and Sharon L. Snyder (faculty member in the Department of Disability and Human Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago) The Biopolitics of Disability Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment. University of Michigan Press**

Research project funding for disability initiatives consistently underwrite the purchase of technologies such as software to mitigate against teachers having to adopt the strategies of **Universal Design for Learning** (UDL) into their pedagogical methods. Alternatively, **projects** **based on curricular cripistemology** **promote** the **development of content about disability as** **a** first order **necessity** to the accommodation of diverse learning styles. In Crip Theory, Robert McRuer demonstrates how reading and writing from the body helps to promote alternatives to **standardized** educational **approaches**. Par- ticularly those promoted in the homogenizing goals of the “corporate univer- sity” and tax funded public school systems that emphasize finished products as synonymous with learning (168). Such approaches **adapt everyone to the goal rather than the diversification of true engagement** based on the ways in which trans-gender, disabled, and/or queer lives fail to fit the oedipal mold of, say, the five paragraph essay. Or, rather, the accomplishment of making these experiences fit the mold of standardization voids the significance ac- corded to what Kevin Floyd theorizes in The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism as “the social labor” of fashioning alternative subjectivities (75). Almost by definition, the UDL structured classroom promotes the unique knowledge precipitated by the ontology of diverse embodiments (“About UDL” cast.org). UDL, first and foremost, requires a systematic negotiation of needs across any assembly of students with and without disabilities. Because disabled students do not necessarily know their own access requirements and university programs are often not equipped to accommodate them ahead of time, accommodations prove to be uneven at best. The opening weeks of **a** 49 **UDL structured classroom** inevitably **entail[s] an active negotiation of the ways** in whichreading materials, classroom **discussions**,and visual media **will be made accessible to all**. Many faculty complain of the wasted time such strategizing entails. But commitment to UDL is seen as part of the point of a DSE-based education itself. Open discussions of multi-pronged access bring information about disabilities into the conversation from the start as well as tutoring students in the provision of UDL-based training as a founding stone of access equity. For instance, a student who was deaf or cognitively disabled often in- volved assignment of a real-time captioner by disability services to the class- room. The real-time captioner functions as a real-time stenographer of class- room conversations and lectures. While the university approached real-time captioning as a specific accommodation for a particular kind of disabled student, **the UDL classroom recognizes an opportunity to assist all participants in** the rigorous **engagement** with academic ideas. An active exchange of ideas in the classroom often results in students losing track of the nuances of a discussion; alternatively, the sharing of real-time captioning notes on-line following class allows an ease of review that lessens anxiety about retention of information. **When blind** or visually impaired **students required audio description** of images, **all students found** themselves abreast of **details that they might have otherwise missed**. Language used in a lecture that escaped some listeners would prompt a request to repeat the information in alternative ways. Such variations in approach to academic materials created the kind of pedagogical flexibility that began to seem all too missing from standard classroom environments. Rather than describe the nuances of disabled lives from afar, students often brought their own experiences to bear on what would otherwise appear as medically neutral narratives of “medical disor- ders.” **Such efforts demonstrate the ways that UDL pedagogies benefit all students as opposed to serving as expensive interventions on behalf of a few disabled students**. A similar point might be made on behalf of a curricular cripistemology as an opportunity for the advocacy of the hiring of teachers with disabilities in school systems (including disabled people of color). There has been a longstanding resistance to recognizing this argument as valid criteria for hiring individuals as representative of a growing student population – par- ticularly one made up of a sizeable number of young people from all socio- economic strata with disabilities including a disproportionate number of racial minorities. Further there is a running commentary in Education circles that, in co-taught classrooms, the regular education teacher is in charge of the development of curricular materials. In fact, neither Gen Ed nor SPED has not yet embraced the idea that Special Educators might make a contribution to the co-taught classroom related to the content delivered. Rather their ex- pertise is exclusively located with content delivery methods on behalf of a 50 couple students who might struggle with more unilateral pedagogical ap- proaches. A seriouscommitment to the development of curricular cripistemologies might go some distance toward revaluing human differences as something other than embodiments that should be disguised, diminished, or hidden away as unwanted accessories. After all, Demodocus’s contribution to Phoenician culture comes not only by virtue of his own embodied experience but through his ability to use that experience as an entry into the exploits of even the most able-bodied athlete. A true curricular cripistemology plays the entire room and promises to widen the arena of embodiment for all.

#### \*T And Curricular Cripistemologies is a materialist nonnormative positivism that recognizes disability as a viable alternative to normalcy. Rather than focusing on accommodating disability to be normal we must attend to ways that disability disrupts normalcy through its messy realities. Instead of being imprinted by dominant social beliefs disability can create alternative worlds of possibility \*A Mitchell and Snyder 4\*C

**David T. Mitchell (GWU Professor of English) and Sharon L. Snyder (faculty member in the Department of Disability and Human Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago) The Biopolitics of Disability Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment. University of Michigan Press**

Neoliberalism is diagnosed as the arrival, during the latter half of the twentieth century, of what Henry Giroux calls “hyper-market-driven societies [that] organize identities largely as consumers.” As such, neoliberalism offers few spaces from which to “recognize (our)selves outside of the values, needs, and desires preferred by the market” (Disposable Youth xiv). Within 5 this limiting framework of consumptive recognition, however, neoliberal governance systems have opened up some opportunities for the potential inclusion of formerly excluded groups such as people with disabilities. The contention of this book is that meaningfulinclusion is only worthy of the designation “inclusion” if disability becomes more fully recognized as providing alternative values for living that do not simply reify reigning concepts of normalcy. While an egalitarian concept of disability has sought to free disabled people from the restraints of able-bodied oppression (i.e., ableism), a nondialectical materialist account of disability—that which we refer to throughout this book as **nonnormative positivism**—**pursues disability as something other than the oppressed product of social constraints** (Snyder and Mitchell, Cultural Locations 10). Nonnormative positivisms extend a methodology developed by philosophers of new materialisms such as Diana Coole and Samantha Frost as a “multimodal materialist analysis of relationships of power”; **such approaches open up the** matter and **materiality of embodiment** as exceeding its social scripts of limitation, and, via this opening, one may better recognize diverse temporalities by examining their more enduring structures and operations as well as their vulnerability to ruptures and transformations—all the while acknowledging that they have no predestined, necessary, or predictable trajectory. (36) Within this account new materialisms involve a more fleshy grappling with the nature of materiality itself; how bodies go about inhabiting their messy dynamicsin ways that exceed the stigmatizing ramifications of seemingly deterministic social beliefs. While none of the contributors included in Coole and Frost’s collection apply new materialist approaches to disability, we demonstrate that disability could serve as a critical fulcrum of such work in future philosophies of materiality. To return to our thesis, then: Disability studies scholars are caught in their lives and their theories between two zones of negativity without something akin to “nonnormative positivisms.” Without **alternative materialist approaches** there exist few ways to **identify the creative interdependencies at the foundations of disability** alternatives for living addressed in our existing traditions of thought. Disability studies, in the years **to** come, must be able to address what crip/queer bodies bring to the table of imagining the value of alternativelives, particularly lives that exist at the fraught intersections of 6 marginalized identities such as disability, race, gender, sexuality, and class. As Nirmala Erevelles argues in Disability and Difference in Global Contexts, under examination such intersections **reveal** themselves as “mutually constitutive of each other” (45).3 There is a great need foranethicalmethodology from which disabled people canarticulate **how their lives bring something new into the world that may otherwise go unrecognized**. Nonnormative positivisms provide alternative spaces from which to discuss options for living within alternative embodiments (those designated here by lives lived in peripheral embodiments) as a critical third rail of disability experience. The work of **nonnormative positivisms** servesas a site for an alternative ethicstobe **articulate**dabout **why disabled lives matter** and how we might revise, reinvent, and transform narrow normative practices,beliefs, and qualificationsof who counts. **Right now**, **disability** studies andglobal **disability rights** **movements** find themselves having to **argue that disabled people must be allowed to pursue their lives** much **as able-bodied people do** in order **to prove worthy of acceptance and** as recipients of **equality of treatment**. **This** may be so but, for our purposes in this book, we want to argue that **such a goal is too small and** often **further solidifies the unchallenged desirability of normative lives**.Crip/queer lives explicated through **nonnormative positivisms** are those that **believe another world is possible and such worlds will not come** into existence **unless we vigilantly attend to the nuances of disabled lives as viable alternatives**. The Biopolitics of Disability situates its inquiries along this Möbius strip of relations between disabled bodies, internalized scripts of embodied normativity (their biopolitical imprinting), and the creative ways in which lives experienced within differential bodies transform the environments of which they are a part. The non-normative positivism we employ operates in tandem with that which disability studies scholar Tobin Siebers theorizes as “complex embodiment.” For Siebers, “Disability creates theories of embodiment more complex than the ideology of ability allows, and these many embodiments are each crucial to the understanding of humanity and its variations, whether physical, mental, social, or historical” (“Disability and the Theory of Complex Embodiment” 271). Both approaches involve a more rigorous engagement with the ways in which disabled people experience their material lives as alternatively embodied. For Siebers and ourselves **these** parallel methodologies shift our approach to non- normative materialities as actively existing in relation to environments and beliefs rather than as passified objects of social forces 7 exclusively sculpted from the outside in (Snyder and Mitchell, Cultural Locations 5–11). Disability, within **non-normative positivist approaches**, hosts debilitating social beliefs born of anxieties about the radical vulnerability of embodiment (i.e., stigma, suffering, and impairment), but also **function**s **as a disruptive force of resistance in sedimented systems of privilege** accorded to normative bodies within nationalist imaginaries of ableism. Consequently, new materialist approaches offer an enrichment of the way alternative cognitions/corporealities allow us to inhabit the world as vulnerable, constrained, yet innovative embodied beings rather than merely as devalued social constructs or victims of oppression. Within nonnormative positivisms, **the materiality of disability is foregrounded as** a site of creative dynamism and **bodies become more than** inert corporealities (**inactive matter**) **imprinted by cultural beliefs**. Instead, disabled bodies become active switchpoints as their alternative navigations offer an opportunity to perceive that, in Elizabeth Grosz’s words, “the capacity to act and effectivity of action is to a large extent structured by the ability to harness and utilize matter for one’s own purposes and interests” (“Feminism, Materialism, and Freedom” 148).**tions of what oppresses disabled people or doesn’t, and listening to those who would tell that story.**

#### 

#### 

#### **\*T And the process of the affirmative is what makes debate more accessible.. Disability studies gives the opportunity to create meaningful and universal access for all. A ballot for the affirmative is joining a process of struggle for access \*A Lanning 14\*C**

**Lanning 14 (Eric Lanning; Eric Lanning was a debater at the University of Houston and former National Debate Tournament Champion.> January 22, 2014, “What is Access?”, access debate, http://accessdebate.com/2014/01/22/what-is-access/ The website is now no longer working, but you can access an archive of the website through this link: https://web.archive.org/web/20151215072330/http://accessdebate.com/2014/01/22/what-is-access/ Brackets already in the article)**

I’ve been thinking a lot lately about what “access” means in the context of the debate community. I don’t have all (or even a lot) of the answers to this question, but I’m beginning to think that might be the point. We can’t figure this out alone. We need each other. **Disability Studies gives the means**, motives **and opportunity to** reframe this “dependence” as inevitable, necessary and valuable. What would it mean to **universally design debate**? What would it mean to ask and answer this question together? I believe that “**access**” is the process (not outcome) of answering that question over and over. It **is the process of destabilizing our assumptions about what debaters** “**are**” **and** “**do**”.  What assumptions do we make about debaters inherent “abilities” or natural “capabilities” when we debate in particular ways and in particular spaces? What changes should we make to debate practice and culture? These are questions that I am asking and answering in every negative debate – but **the** “**pre-requisite**” for me to asking and answering these questions in any debate was my own **[is] disability consciousness. The most portable skill debate ever gave** me **was consciousness**. **Debate gave** me a **vocabulary and audience to articulate** what my **lived experience with disability** teaches me everyday. It gave me the experience and environment to develop and explain my own consciousness of disability. For me, that is the beginning of access. Before we can debate about what access means, it is worth thinking about the status quo – what does it mean for debate to be “inaccessible” to particular debaters and particular identities?  What is wrong with the status quo? For many years and for most debaters, “ableism” was nothing more than a list of words you should not use: blinded, silenced, paralyzed, crazy, lame, disabled, crippled, etc. To be clear, I think that ableist language is problematic and constitutes a micro-aggression against disabled people that we should all work to stop. But it is about SO much more than language. Disability is an embodied experience. In a poem I wrote called “Broken” – I explain this distinction as, “disability is not something you have, its something you are” (If you’re interested in hearing/reading the entire poem, I’ve included a link at the end). This **recognition of the lived experience of disability** – of disability as a social and political fact – of disability as a category of human existence **is missing from our current debates** about ableism and access. One of the most meaningful and empowering contributions of disability studies is expressed in the mantra, “nothing about us without us”. It is a call to foreground and privilege the experience of disability. This is not to say that TABS (temporarily abled bodies) can’t participate and contribute to the conversation about access, but instead it is a call to reverse the history of marginalization [of] disabled people[‘s] experience in the academy and our society.  Obviously **not every debater has a lived experience with disability**, **but** **we all do research**. In debate, this research is a reflection of our priorities – **if you want to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem**: **read a book**! **Cut some cards**! Ask and answer (yourself) the question, “what is access”! In my negative debates this year, I’ve learned a lot about disability and access. I’ve learned that **the process of** “**debating** it out” **is powerful and revolutionary**. I’ve learned that my **opponent’s willingness to** listen and **engage** with my arguments **makes me a better advocate.** But even more than the potential of the debate round – I’ve been inspired by the potential of the debate community. I’ve had countless conversations, emails and chats with disabled and non-disabled debaters, coaches and judges that have fundamentally changed my answer to the question, why do you debate? Debate made me the person I am today. Everything I love about my self and my life is a result of my decision to debate. Why do I debate? For access. I debate because I believe in this activity and community. I believe we could and should make debate accessible to everyone, but we can’t do it alone. We need each other. I’ll end with a quote: “[**Access**] **is** not a thing that can be delivered by politician, policymakers or educators, but **a process of struggle that has to be joined**”

#### **We can’t avoid this discussion lest we perpetuate ableism ourselves, the ballot is key, Evans 12,**

(Dr. Shanara Reid-Brinkley, Rashad Evans, et al Amber Kelsie and Jillian Martin, November 12th, 2012, “An Open Letter to Sarah Spring,” <http://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2012/11/12/an-open-letter-to-sarah-spring> /))//gingE (reused by lexpr)

**Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral**. **We have tried to have discussions. These discussions have been regularly derailed—in “wrong forum**” **arguments, in the demand for “evidence,”** in the unfair burdens placed on the aggrieved as a pre-requisite for engagement. Read the last ten years of these discussions on edebate archives: Ede Warner on edebate and move forward to Rashad Evans diversity discussion from 2010 to Deven Cooper to Amber Kelsie’s discussion on CEDA Forums and the NDT CEDA Traditions page. **We have been talking for over a decade, we have been reaching out for years, we have been listening to the liberal, moderate refrain of “we agree with your goals but not with your method.”** **We will no longer wait for the community to respond**, **to relinquish privilege, to engage in authentic discussion**, since largely **the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to what “we all agree” is blatant structural** **inequity**. It seems that meta-debates/**discussions about debate are generally met with denial, hostility and—more often—silence**. **This silence is in fact a focused silence.** It is not people in the Resistance Facebook group that comprise these silent figures—it is (as has been described) “the old boys club.” **We have been quite vocal—and we believe that it is this very vocalness** (and the development of a diversity of tactics in response to status quo stalling tactics) **that has provoked response when response was given**. Sarah Spring’s cedadebate post is a case in point. The decision to change our speaker point scale is not in order to produce a “judging doomsday apparatus” (this kind of apocalyptic rhetoric might more aptly be applied to the current racist/sexist/classist state of affairs in this community), though we must admit that we are flattered that our efforts have affected the community enough to result in such a hyberbolic labeling. **It indicates that civil disobedience is still an effective tactic; the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious. We will continue to innovate and collaborate on tactics of resistance. This “crisis” in debate has no end in sight.** The rationale for changing the point scale was not simply to “reward” people for preferring the unpreferred critic. We recognize that MPJ produces effects, and we hoped that changing our point scale was a small but significant tactic that was available to the disenfranchised in this community. MPJ:

#### 

#### 

#### **\*T And The role of the ballot is to challenge ableism. Assumptions of ableism are inherent in systems of knowledge production thus ableism is an a priori question \*A Campbell 13\*C**

**Campbell 13 (Fiona Kumari Campbell, Adjunct Professor in the Department of Disability Studies at Griffith University. Wednesday 27 November 2013. Problematizing Vulnerability: Engaging Studies in Ableism and Disability Jurisprudence. Keynote speech at Disability at the Margins: Vulnerability, Empowerment and the Criminal Law)**

What is meant by the concept of ableism? The literature suggests that the term is often used fluidly with limited definitional or conceptual specificity. The work of Carlson (2001)5 and Campbell (2001) represented a turning point in bringing attention to this new site of subordination not just in terms of disablement but also ableism’s application to other devalued groups. **Ableism is** deeply **seeded at the level of knowledge systems** of life, personhood and liveability. **Ableism is not just** a matter of ignorance or **negative attitudes** towards disabled people; **it is a schema of perfection**, **a** deep **way of thinking about bodies**, wholeness and permeability.6 As such integrating ableism into social research and advocacy strategies represents a significant challenge to practice as ableism moves beyond the more familiar territory of social inclusion and usual indices of exclusion to the very divisions of life. Bringing together the study of existence and knowledge systems, ableism is difficult to pin down. Ableism is a set of processes and practices that arise and decline through sequences of causal convergences influenced by the elements of time, space, bodily inflections and circumstance. Ability and the corresponding notion of ableism are intertwined. **Compulsory ablebodiedness is implicated in the** very **foundations of social theory**, therapeutic jurisprudence, advocacy, medicine and law; or in the mappings of human anatomy. Summarised by Campbell (2001, 44) Ableism refers to; …A network of beliefs processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the bodily standard) that is projected as the perfect, speciestypical and therefore essential and fully human. Disability then is cast as a diminished state of being human. Writing today (2013) I add an addition to this definition: ‘The ableist bodily configuration is immutable, permanent and laden with qualities of perfectionism or the enhancement imperative orientated towards a self-contained improvability’. Sentiency applies to not just the human but the ‘animal’ world. As a category to differentiate the normal from the pathological, the concept of **abledness is predicated on** some **preexisting notion about the nature of typical** species **functioning** that is beyond culture and historical context. **Ableism** does not just stop at propagating what is typical for each species. An ableist imaginary **tells us what** a healthy body means – a normal mind, the pace, the tenor of **thinking and** the kinds of **emotions** and affect that **are suitable to express**. Of course these ‘fictional’ characteristics then are promoted as a natural ideal. This abled imaginary relies upon the existence of an unacknowledged imagined shared community of able-bodied/minded people held together by a common ableist world view that asserts the preferability and compulsoriness of the norms of ableism. Such ableist schemas erase differences in the ways humans express our emotions, use our thinking and bodies in different cultures and in different situations. This in turn enacts bodily Otherness rendered sometimes as the ‘disabled’, ‘perverted’ or ‘abnormal body’, clearly demarcating the boundaries of normal and pathological. A critical feature of an ableist orientation is a belief that impairment or disability is inherently negative and at its essence is a form of harm in need of improvement, cure or indeed eradication. Studies in Ableism (SiA) inverts traditional approaches, by shifting our concentration to what the study of disability tells us about the production, operation and maintenance of ableism. In not looking solely at disability, we can focus on how the abled able-bodied, non-disabled identity is maintained and privileged. Disability does not even need to be in the picture. SiA’s interest in abledness means that the theoretical foundations are readily [is]applicable to the study of difference and the dividing practices of race, gender, location and sexual orientation. **Reframing our focus** from disability to ableism prompts different preoccupations: • What does the study of the politics of ‘vulnerability’ tells us about what it me ty ans to be ‘non-vulnerable’? • Indeed how is the very conceptualisation of ‘autonomy’ framed in the light of discourses of ‘vulnerability’? • In representing vulnerabilias universal does this detract from the specificity of disability experiences? SiA examines the ways that concepts of wellbeing, vulnerability and deficiency circulate throughout society and impact upon economic, social, legal and ethical choices. Principally SiA focuses on the limits of tolerance and possessive individualism. Extending the theorization of disability, studies in ableism **can enrich our understanding of the** production of vulnerability and the **terms of engagement in** civic **life** and the possibilities of social inclusion. I now turn to unpacking the nuances and structure of a theory of ableism.

**The role of the judge is to introduce the best pedagogies of accessibility for the debate. Accessibility is pre-req to the debate space because if debate wasn’t accessible no one would join.**

**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.**

# **1AC - accessible formatting**

#### Society includes disability through accommodations, not because they value disability, but because they want to normalize disability. Accommodations are designed to allow disability to approximate normalcy in the name of progress and inclusion. Efforts to achieve access through accommodation signal inclusionisms goal of forcing disabled people to desire and remain knowable under normalcy. Mitchell and Snyder 15\*C’

#### 

#### 

disability’s grudging admission to normative social institutions through normalization strategies intended to ameliorate historical exclusions ultimately result in further marginalization by providing compensatory supports for disabled pesge of the “normal accommodation develops as a result of efforts to flatten out the dynamic materiality of disability through approximations of normalcy neoliberal disability couches its rhetoric of assistance in terms that mask the institutional interests it serves inclusionism has resulted in the incapacity to recognize disability as a site of alternative value and as a potentially disruptive force within neoliberal regimes of toleration

#### **‘Inclusnism in society only forces disabled people to desire normalcy** Campbell 08’

**Internalized oppression is the result of our mistreatment**.. **We harbour the pains and negative self-images turning them into weapons which re-injure ourselves, Internalised ableism means to assume an ‘identity’ other than one’s own to separate my existences from** **my disability**. **is** **psychically untenable** **bodily detachment appears locked in**t **internalised ableism**, of **it is the simulation** **that matters. The subject simulates what it is to be ‘disabled’ and** **morphing ableist imperatives, in effect performs a new hyper reality of be-ing disabled. By** **performing ableism disabled people become complicit in their** **demise**

#### **‘Don’t let them claim that because it’s accessible because I’m competing in debate. Debate is a game that’s rigged for abled bodies. We’re forced to approximate the ideal debate yet because of my disability I can never become it. Stenzel 19’**

**While disabled students are let in the door, we are met with constant ability checks**. **judged by our ability to conform to debates rigid standards. that we will never meet every criteria of debate. I spent (a)**  **year attempting to spread, a perquisite to being a circuit debater** **a reality that is never possible for me. But I forced myself to spread cases by memory to be a ‘circuit’ debater.** I **only ever get to 315 words per minute after hundreds of hours of spreading drills. The constant exposure to ability checks forced me**  **to accept subpar conditions** **to approximate the ideal debater. This is a space where those who do things differently are constantly questioned. a space where I have never felt like I truly belong, where I have never felt comfortable with my blindness, I have never felt comfortable doing what I need to do to engage in the space fully.**

#### **And The aff advocates for curricular cripistemologies to break down inclusionism. This involves the development of teaching pedagogies that deviate from core teachings by foregrounding cripcontent as fortunate failure. This pedagogical incoherence offers options for constructing alternative ethical frameworks for living outside of the goals of inclusionism by creating useable crip maps that are otherwise absent from normative teaching approaches Mitchell and Snyder 2**

curricular cripistemology is neither a discourse of “specialness” where we find the value of disability in overcoming social barriers Nor as an opportunity for political correctness where all bodies are valued for “diversity” Instead of strategies for culturally rehabilitating disabled people’s experiences into recognizable normativities cripistemologies critically assess how communities place limits on crip people’s participation social spaces superficially appear open to all cripistemologies unveil spaces of inclusion that paradoxically strictly police ways of being there is no inclusionism that does not come with a strategy of making estranged bodies better fit normative expectations cripistemologies promote failure as a worthy goal to reject the form-fitting mold of neoliberal normativities as under-performing

#### **And This isn’t just another abstract k aff. The affs method can be implemented in tangible ways that improve the lives of both disabled and non-disabled people. Mitchell and Snyder 3**

Universal Design for Learning projects based on curricular cripistemology promoted development of content about disability as necessity standardized approaches adapt everyone to the goal rather than the diversification of true engagement UDL structured classroom entail[s] an active negotiation of the ways discussions will be made accessible to all the UDL classroom recognizes an opportunity to assist all participants in engagement When blind students required audio description all students found details that they might have otherwise missed.Such efforts demonstrate the ways that UDL pedagogies benefit all students as opposed to serving as expensive interventions on behalf of a few disabled students

#### 

#### And Curricular Cripistemologies is a materialist nonnormative positivism that recognizes disability as a viable alternative to normalcy. Instead of accommodating disability to be normal we must attend to ways that disability disrupts normalcy through its messy realities. We must view disability as alternative source of value\*A Mitchell and Snyder 4\*C

**nonnormative positivism** **pursues disability as something other than the oppressed** **such approaches open up the** **materiality of embodiment** **alternative materialist approaches identify the creative interdependencies at the foundations of disability** **to** **reveal**  **how their lives bring something new into the world that may go unrecognized**. l **disability rights** **movements argue that disabled people must be allowed to pursue lives as able-bodied people do** **to prove worthy of acceptance** . **This** **further solidifies the desirability of normative lives**. **nonnormative positivisms** **believe disabled lives as viable alternatives**. **these** **proaches**, **function as a disruptive force of resistance in systems of privilege**

#### **And the process of the affirmative is what makes debate more accessible. Refusing to engage the aff is refusing to be part of the solution. Disability studies gives the opportunity to create meaningful and universal access for all. A ballot for the affirmative is joining a process of struggle for access. Lanning 14**

Disability Studies gives the means and opportunity to universally design debate access is the process of destabilizing our assumptions about what debaters are and do the pre-requisite [is] disability consciousness. The most portable skill debate ever gave was consciousness Debate gave vocabulary and audience to articulate lived experience with disability recognition of the lived experience of disability is missing from our current debates not every debater has a lived experience with disability but we all do research if you want to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem read a book Cut some cards the process of debating is powerful and revolutionary opponent’s willingness to engage makes me a better advocate. Access is a process of struggle that has to be joined

#### We can’t avoid this discussion lest we perpetuate ableism ourselves, the ballot is key, Evans 12,

**Lack of community discussion is neither random nor power-neutral**. **We have tried to have discussions. These discussions have been derailed—in “wrong forum**” **arguments We have been talking for over a decade We will no longer wait for the community to respond** **the community seems incapable of producing a consensus for responding to blatant structural** **inequity**. **discussions about debate are met with silence**. **This is a focused silence.** **the debate community should take it as an indication that our calls for change are serious.**

**And The role of the ballot is to challenge ableism. Assumptions of ableism are inherent in systems of knowledge production thus ableism is an a priori question. Campbell 13**

**Ableism is seeded at the level of knowledge systems Ableism is not just negative attitudes it is a schema of perfection a way of thinking about bodies Compulsory ablebodiedness is implicated in the foundations of social theory abledness is predicated on preexisting notion about the nature of typical functioning Ableism tells us what thinking and emotions are suitable to express Reframing our focus can enrich our understanding of the terms of engagement in life**

**The role of the judge is to introduce the best pedagogies of accessibility for the debate. Accessibility is pre-req to the debate space because if debate wasn’t accessible no one would join. Richter 2015**.

**debate** **has an inaccessible interface**. **because communication itself is a culturally soaked activity. The activities brutally punish those whose learning styles or form of intelligence departs from debate norms. note-takers are not available debate competitiveness builds inaccessibility into its game. most debaters in the debate world who are disabled hide it because of the scorn placed upon it.**. **Disabled people are excluded from narcissism among debaters Accessibility would bring a wider population and further activate debate as tool for radicalization. The affirmation of the disabled persuasively empowering other forsaken members of the disabled world.The stickiness of the habits of debate as justify clearly why debate norms need to be overhauled.**