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#### Education reform elides bodily difference – demands for equity and accountability obfuscate the bodies that actually shape the educational system

**Erevelles 11** [Nirmala Erevelles is a Professor in the Social Foundations of Education and Instructional Department of Education Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at the University of Alabama, 2011, “Disability and Difference in Global Contexts,” pg. 66-67, accessed 7.12.2017]//TRossow

In this chapter, I argue that “her shape and his hand” (Patricia J. Williams, 1991, p. 19) still continue to cast a shadow on the “vast networking of our society . . . our lives and laws” (p. 19), or, as in this particular context, educational policy. Continuing the discussion in Chapter 1 , I demonstrate once again how historical continuities and discontinuities continue to haunt the present in very material ways. Specifically, I will explore how educational policy as an embodied social phenomenon is similarly rooted in a contradictory history that **demands the simultaneous submissive visibility and ruthless erasure of the bodies of colonized others**—a demand that is enacted with a casual acceptance of “the habit of his power and the absence of her choice” (p. 19). Thus, more than 50 years after **Brown v. Board of Education** , the “savage inequalities” (Kozol, 1992) manifested in the distribution of educational resources, and the widening achievement gap between elite students and those marked oppressively by race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability, are **met with a complacency** that accepts these enactments of power and erasure as natural and normative.¶ Education policy makers would, however, **loudly proclaim their commitment to the daunting task of ensuring equity and excellence for all students notwithstanding their differences**. They would argue that the reforms they have put in place demand “accountability” from administrators, teachers, and other educational personnel to uphold the democratic goals of US public education as documented by copious pages of assessment data. But **nowhere from among the mountains of data they have amassed is there a recognition that behind the numbers are bodies**—restless, unpredictable, passionate, and not always docile.¶ In this chapter, I argue for a different kind of policy analysis from the vantage point of transgressive embodiment, what Wanda Pillow (2003) has described as an embodied policy analysis. An embodied analysis **foregrounds the erasure of material bodies** in educational contexts (student, teacher, and/or administrator), and describes how **educational policies serve to control, shape, regulate, and reproduce them.** Such a position stands counter to traditional policy analysis that is committed to a **technical rationalist framework with claims to scientific and ideologically free** (“the **view from nowhere**”) methodologies (Marshall, 1997; Pillow, 2003). Thus, even though educational contexts teem with diverse bodies, **traditional policy analysis prefers to focus on outcomes and standards, rather than having to deal with unruly, messy, unpredictable, and taboo bodies**—bodies that are shaped by, and, in turn, shape the social, political, and economic contexts they inhabit (Michalko, 2002; Pillow, 2003).¶ Placing the body as central to an analysis of “accountability” **shifts the focus from test scores and normative standards to those bodies who take these tests and to those who interpret these test scores**, to those bodies who attempt to meet these normative standards, and to those who administer them, and especially to those bodies who reject/resist these same disciplinary measures. In other words, an embodied policy analysis will ask the following questions: To whom is public education accountable? Through whose authority are these standards/goals/outcomes deployed? How do these practices of power constitute normative and deviant subjectivities? And what processes are in play to neutralize and/or erase oppositional subjectivities? Such an analysis of “accountability” would run counter to normative educational policy analyses that are animated by the haunting of “her shape and his hand.”

#### 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**.

#### \*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)**

**(Spec is Here**

**CSA: Mollow**

**Offense should be weigh between best methodology of fighting ableism**

**Prefiat comes first and the K Before theory)**

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.

.

#### Disability is the master trope of human disqualification that structures oppression

Siebers 9 (Tobin Siebers, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, p. 5-8)

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. Aesthetics studies the way that some bodies make other bodies feel. Bodies, minimally defined, are what appear in the world. They involve manifestations of physical appearance, whether this appearance is defined as the physical manifestation itself or as the particular appearance of a given physical manifestation. Bodies include in my definition human bodies, paintings, sculpture, buildings, the entire range of human artifacts as well as animals and objects in the natural world. Aesthetics, moreover, has always stressed that feelings produced in bodies by other bodies are involuntary, as if they represented a form of unconscious communication between bodies, a contagious possession of one body by another. Aesthetics is the domain in which the sensation of otherness is felt at its most powerful, strange, and frightening. Whether the effect is beauty and pleasure, ugliness and pain, or sublimity and terror, the emotional impact of one body on another is experienced as **an assault on autonomy** and a testament to the power of otherness. Aesthetics is the human science most concerned with invitations to think and feel otherwise about our own influence, interests, and imagination. Of course, when bodies produce feelings of pleasure or pain, they also invite judgments about whether they should be accepted or rejected in the human community. People thought to experience more pleasure or pain than others or to produce unusual levels of pleasure and pain in other bodies are among the bodies most discriminated against, actively excluded, and violated on the current scene, be they disabled, sexed, gendered, or racialized bodies. Disabled people, but also sex workers, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people, and people of color, are tortured and killed because of beliefs about their relationship to pain and pleasure (Siebers 2009). This is why aesthetic disqualification is not merely a matter for art critics or museum directors but a political process of concern to us all. An understanding of aesthetics is crucial because it reveals the operative principles of disqualification used in minority oppression. 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.

#### Legal solutions fail – legal structures are predicated on the negative ontology of disability

Campbell 5 (“Legislating Disability: Negative Ontologies and the Government of Legal Identities” in “Foucault and Government of Disability” edited by Shelley Termain, p. 118-120)

With respect to disability, it would seem that such “legal fictions” give rise to a false or distorted ontology, which is formulated on the basis of bio- medical realism, and in whose terms disability is construed as a lack or negative valence. The “fiction” in this case is the suggestion that a negative ontology of disability coupled with a biomedical orientation toward dis- ability prescriptions and evaluative rankings is necessary (i.e., a prerequisite) for the efficient administrative management and legal delimitation of “disability.” A poignant example of the continuing recitation of this kind of legal fiction of disability can be found in the introduction to a special journal issue guest-edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Basser Marks (2000). According to these authors, Most people with disabilities would share the view that being disabled is not a desirable state to be in, and even agree that disability should, where possible, be prevented. However, the suggestion that this carries negative implications about the entitlement to rights, or the values, respect and dignity of people with disabilities, should be resisted. While it may seem paradoxical, it is essential to meet the challenge of truly valuing those who are disabled at the same time as taking action to prevent or limit dis- ability. (2000, 2; emphasis added) The pursuit of legal liberal rights discourse that Jones and Basser Marks encourage **is deployed within the context of a negative ontological frame- work** of disability and an assumed permissibility to performatively enact injurious speech. Insofar as Jones and Basser Marks ground their arguments in this context on an a priori assumption that disability is not to be countenanced, they bear testimony to the pervasive and normalizing effects of such negative formulations as key to the maintenance of ableist rationalities; in addition, these authors reveal the recuperative and totalizing tendencies and tensions in the flawed logic of ableist liberalism (see Foucault 1980a, 98). This logic allows the rhetoric of rights to “have it both ways,” that is, to simultaneously hold out the promise of equalization and to rein- scribe negative ontologies of disability that continually produce and effect subordination. The very inclusiveness of the neoliberal conception of “citizenship” hinges upon governing disability according to an ethics of normalization and minimization. The individual of Western neoliberalism is an increasingly commodified entity. Within neoliberal societies, individuals are increasingly packaged and marketed (like inanimate objects) in terms of their respective “use-values” that become a measure of their respective worth.10 Recent technological “advancements” hold out the possibilities of “elevating” the bodies (and minds) of individuals designated as disabled to the level of “nearly able.” Thus, we could argue that “enhancing” and “perfecting” technologies are really means with which to assimilate by way of morphing ableism.11 A technological dynamic of morphing creates the illusion (that is, an appearance) that the “disabled” body transmogrifies into the “normal” body, effecting a corporeal recomposition and re-formation of subjectivity. Though this sort of fantastic reimaging occurs at an onto- logical level, the violence of some technological applications is profoundly direct and immediate. Robert Carver writes: Footbinding was a method to attract a good husband and secure a hap- pier life. At the speech and hearing clinic, I was trained to bind the mind of my daughter. Like the twisting of feet into lotus hooks, I was encouraged to force her deaf mind into a hearing shape. I must withhold recognition of her most eloquent gestures until she makes a sound, any sound. I must force her to wear hearing aids no matter how she struggles against them. The shape of a hearing mind is so much more attractive. (1990, n.p.) In fact, an inducement to cooperate with treatments, surgery, and fittings may not be necessary due to the enduring hegemonic compulsion toward ableist normativity. Individuals with disabilities (and, in many cases, their families) develop a sense of responsibilization, a sense of correct ethical con- duct, that is, a “regime of truth” about what it is to be a “proper” citizen. These judgments about the “correct” way in which to conduct oneself are often shaped by (or, despite) one’s awareness of the ontological, epistemological, and political effects of resistance or transgression against such prescriptions (cf. Foucault 1988, 1997). In this regard, let us briefly consider a juridical move made within the U.S. context, but which could easily be replicated in the Australian context in which I am writing, namely, the introduction of the legal category of voluntary/elective/chosen disability.

#### \*T And The Neg 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**.

#### \*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.**
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#### Education reform elides bodily difference – demands for equity and accountability obfuscate the bodies that actually shape the educational system

#### Erevelles 11

#### [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 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**

#### Disability is the master trope of human disqualification that structures oppression

Siebers 9 (Tobin Siebers, “The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification”, p. 5-8)

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. Aesthetics studies the way that some bodies make other bodies feel. Bodies, minimally defined, are what appear in the world. They involve manifestations of physical appearance, whether this appearance is defined as the physical manifestation itself or as the particular appearance of a given physical manifestation. Bodies include in my definition human bodies, paintings, sculpture, buildings, the entire range of human artifacts as well as animals and objects in the natural world. Aesthetics, moreover, has always stressed that feelings produced in bodies by other bodies are involuntary, as if they represented a form of unconscious communication between bodies, a contagious possession of one body by another. Aesthetics is the domain in which the sensation of otherness is felt at its most powerful, strange, and frightening. Whether the effect is beauty and pleasure, ugliness and pain, or sublimity and terror, the emotional impact of one body on another is experienced as **an assault on autonomy** and a testament to the power of otherness. Aesthetics is the human science most concerned with invitations to think and feel otherwise about our own influence, interests, and imagination. Of course, when bodies produce feelings of pleasure or pain, they also invite judgments about whether they should be accepted or rejected in the human community. People thought to experience more pleasure or pain than others or to produce unusual levels of pleasure and pain in other bodies are among the bodies most discriminated against, actively excluded, and violated on the current scene, be they disabled, sexed, gendered, or racialized bodies. Disabled people, but also sex workers, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people, and people of color, are tortured and killed because of beliefs about their relationship to pain and pleasure (Siebers 2009). This is why aesthetic disqualification is not merely a matter for art critics or museum directors but a political process of concern to us all. An understanding of aesthetics is crucial because it reveals the operative principles of disqualification used in minority oppression. 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.

#### Legal solutions fail – legal structures are predicated on the negative ontology of disability

Campbell 5

legal fictions” give rise to a false ontology disability is construed as a lack The “fiction is that a negative ontology of disability coupled with a biomedical orientation is necessary for administrative management of “disability legal liberal rights discourse **is deployed within the context of a negative ontological frame- work** of disability to enact injurious speech normalizing effects of such negative formulations mainten ableist rationalities This logic allows the rhetoric of rights to hold out the promise of equalization and to rein- scribe negative ontologies that produce subordination individuals are marketed in terms of their use-values judgments about the “correct” way to conduct oneself are shaped b one’s awareness of the ontological, epistemological, and political effects of resistance

#### 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**

social phenomenon **demands** **visibility and** **erasure of** **others** **Education** manifested distribution widening gap between elite students and those marked by disability **commitment** **ensuring** **excellence for** **students notwithstanding** **differences** **nowhere from among the mountains** **have amassed** **behind** **numbers are bodies** **foregrounds** **erasure** **educational policies** **reproduce them** **policy analysis prefers** **outcomes** **than** **taboo bodies** **from test scores** **to those bodies who take these tests**