

Dr. Andrew Joseph Pegoda (“AJP”)

Professor: Dr. Patricia Webb

ENG 522: Composition Studies

15 April 2022

*On the one hand, man is a body, in the same way that this may be said of every other animal organism. On the other hand, man has a body. That is, man experiences himself as an entity that is not identical with his body, but that, on the contrary, has that body at its disposal.*

—Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann  
*The Social Construction of Reality* (1966)

*Disabled and ill bodies only ever receive conditional acceptance to the extent that their attitudes, behaviors, and conditions are “cripnormative.” Cripnormativity rewards what is deemed acceptable and thought “cool,” what is not-too-disruptive and not-too-expensive, and who is a “victim” of biology or of a tragic accident but who also takes responsibility....Cripnormativity insists that there are “proper” and “improper” ways for the crip to exist.*

—Andrew Joseph Pegoda  
“Cripnormativity: How We Think (and Don’t Think) About Disability” (2021)

### Crippling Composition:

#### An Annotated Bibliography Organized Chronologically

**Rose, Mike. “The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University.” *Cross-Talk in Comp Theory*, edited by Victor Villanueva, National Council of Teachers of English, 2003, pp. 547-569.**

Originally published in *College English* in 1985, Rose writes concerned about common assumptions that judge writing only “in terms of the presence of error” and wants to challenge ideas of correctness (547). Like other scholarship specifically in dialogue with Disability Studies, Rose is interested in making the invisible—namely power dynamics in the writing classroom—visible. Rose ultimately argues that inclusion is essential, that writing must be seen as an art, and that writing belongs to a full academic discipline of its own, Composition Studies.

Of relevance here, Rose considers the history of remedial education and says, “‘Remedial’ quickly generalized beyond the description of students who might have had neurological problems to those with broader, though special, educational problems and then to those normal learners who are not up to a particular set of standards in a particular era at particular institutions” (556). He criticizes ahistorical, exclusionary, “quick-fix” programs still (remember he is writing in the 1980s) being pushed on “entering freshman suffering from severe handicaps” (559).

Rose then turns to issues of literacy. After discussing definitions and the perennial problem of “why can’t they write,” he advocates abandoning the term *illiteracy* because of its assumptions that ignore that learning is an on-going process. In a particularly blunt and casual tone, Rose adds:

Please understand, it is not my purpose here to whitewash the very real limitations a disheartening number of our students bring with them. I dearly wish that more of them were more at home with composing and could write critically better than they do....And I wish to God that more of them read novels and poems for pleasure. But it is simply wrong to leap from these un-requited desires to claims of illiteracy. (561)

“The Language of Exclusion” is not ostensibly about Disability Studies, but touches on tangential issues relevant in this bibliography—the framing of remedial education and the framing illiteracy, both of which disproportionately impact and misunderstand crip individuals. This article also helps see how much conversations have evolved when it comes to those who are below what is deemed the normal, standard, expected abilities and helps to acknowledge some of Disability Studies’s historical roots.

**Patterson, Kathleen A. “‘Embodied Curriculum’: Teaching Disability Studies in the First Year Composition Classroom.” *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, 1994, [files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED380811.pdf](https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED380811.pdf).**

From my eyes as a disabled academic theorist, Patterson’s conference paper from 1994 immediately shows how much has changed in the intervening almost three decades: Conversations shift from wanting to include some crippled voices to conversations about crippling the entire profession. It also shows change from Rose’s article a decade earlier by further welcoming difference. She highlights a few transformative historical moments—deinstitutionalization and mainstreaming in the 1970s and 1980s and the Americans with Disability Act in 1990—and laments Composition Studies for not updating its cannon and for not creating scholarly writing on the incorporation of disabled people into the curriculum.

In particular, she delivers a simple then-revolutionary argument: Composition courses can be completely structured around texts by and about disabled individuals. She explains that such writings cover an array of desired rhetorical modes and perspectives and outlines possible pathways for such a themed section. Suggested approaches—literary, rhetorical, historical, sociological, political science, popular culture, multiculturalism—for the Composition Studies classroom are outlined with detailed lists of possible texts, which include academic articles, films, novels, OpEds, poems, and short stories. These example texts, Patterson explains, importantly go beyond pity for disabled people and both challenge stereotypes and show that disability is an inevitable condition of life if a person lives long enough. Patterson urges her colleagues to demand better, inclusive textbooks from publishers and editors. Since such books were unavailable,

Patterson says she made her own Reader focused on disability for Composition Studies—certainly, one of, if not the—first of its kind.

In what can only be a reflection of discrimination at the time, she tells her colleagues that like “gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class, [and] religion,” disability is socially constructed, is important, and is a valid identity occupied by real people and says, “Although the concept of a culture of disability may seem foreign, it is no more so than other ‘cultures’ comprised of people who share social (rather than ethnic or racial) characteristics and experiences (1, 14).

“Embodied Curriculum” represents an early effort to crip the curriculum of First Year Composition. Its sound arguments—disabled people being worthy of dignity and disability being a natural part of life that directly impacts everyone at some point or in some way—are (more) “obvious” by standards and by accepted knowledge in 2022 but were clearly not in 1994. Thus, its contribution to Composition Studies was to set a stage for the field and for its practitioners to begin seeing the previously invisible as pertains to disability. I am reminded of studying scholarship about enslavement as an undergraduate in 2008 and being amazed upon learning that the first book (*Sugar Plantations in the Formation of Brazilian Society: Bahia, 1550–1835* published in 1985) that said, in a buried sentence, “slavery was bad” was met with resistance by scholars for being too radical.

In the years since the 1990s, Disability Studies has become its own branch of English Studies. “Embodied Curriculum” should serve as an on-going reminder to be mindful of current blind spots in our knowledge, scholarship, and teaching—not to mention everyday prejudices. Perpetual open-mindedness and learning are what matter.

**Brueggemann, Brenda Jo, et al. "Becoming Visible: Lesson in Disability." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 52, no. 3, 2001, pp. 368-398.**

This fascinating and then-groundbreaking, now landmark, article is a collaboration between Brueggemann, Linda Feldmeier White, Patricia A. Dunn, Barbara A. Heifferon, and Johnson Cheu, all self-described professors of composition. Although she is not cited, these authors share Patterson's desire to advance Disability Studies as one additional and vital part of discourses surrounding Composition Studies. "Becoming Visible" specifically grew out of the 1999 Conference of College Composition and Communication and is a clarion call to examine privilege and to be more open-minded toward writers with learning disabilities and with other talents: "[C]omposition professionals may, unwittingly, be privileging a way of knowing with which we ourselves are most comfortable, perhaps not realizing that our students have other talents we might use even as we teach writing" (379).

This article's philosophy and overall arguments is captured in two beautiful sentences. "Issues of disability matter in [C]omposition [S]tudies and classrooms, first, because we have a long, proud history of making the invisible visible and of examining how language both reflects and supports notions of Other" (370-71). "Because we already challenge the binaries of theory/practice, writing/thinking, and self/other, we should be well equipped—even eager—to embrace the critique of the (false) able/disabled binary that is articulated by disability scholars (371).

In other words, these scholars argue that disability is socially constructed (and a way to expose other social constructions/artificial binaries) and that Disability Studies is a natural extension of existing work in Composition Studies. In five subsections,

“Becoming Visible” provides specific arguments and details about key moments in disability history and the common occurrence of “passing” as non-disabled, about specifics of how disability is socially constructed, about how popular rhetoric sometimes uses disabled people as scapegoats (including imagined disabled people, as in the case of Somnolent Samantha) or rhetoric that suggest accommodations are effectively sanctioned cheating, about teaching students about disability and making such tangibly visible to them and handling backlash, and about being disabled in the classroom. Of special note to students of Composition Studies, these authors reporting finding—which is unsurprising by knowledge in 2022—that “college students...with language-related learning disabilities...are often made to feel stupid, lazy, or even morally degenerate because of the kinds of errors they make in their writing” (376).

“Becoming Visible” also advocates for pedagogy that recognizes “Universal Design” (i.e., a pedagogy that aims to make all material broadly accessible by default). Brueggemann, et al. write, “Those called ‘normal’ also learn along a continuum of difference and would be better challenged if classrooms became more interactive, student-centered, multimodal, and collaborative” (380). Palmer and Thompson (2013) later also urge the adoption of Universal Design, not to recognize and honor more ways of learning and creating, but to abandon *disability* and *accommodation* as relevant practices, in what I would call, if/where actualized, neo-erasure.

**Gould, Kathleen. “What We Talked about When We Talked about Disability.” *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2008, pp. 27-37.**

This short piece comes from Gould’s experiences creating and teaching “Themes in Literature: Illness and Disability in Literature.” This article is notable for its attempts

to embrace “opportunit[ies]...for consciousness raising” (28) after Gould noticed students ignoring and disparaging disabled students and observed a growing number of people with reported depression. She reports having used texts such as *Girl, Interrupted* and “The Yellow Wallpaper” to embrace discussions about public perceptions of disabled and ill bodies. This approach encouraged students to think more critically about invoking religion (“prayer cured me,” for instance) and about using personal experience with illness to make claims of broad expertise.

Gould’s article is almost entirely experiential. Indeed, it seems she might be doing some harm in her attempts to destigmatize disability. Not understanding the difference between actual social and/or medical learning disabilities, she writes of using *retarded* in the classroom as a “matter of habit” (32). And in a poor attempt to normalize disability, Gould derogatorily writes, “I would consider myself ‘mentally challenged’ in a physics class, for example” (32). Without commenting about invisible cognitive and physical disabilities, among other things, she later adds, “Students have commented that they wished there were more disabled students in the class. If this were the case, I *fear the somewhat intimidating effect* this might have on class discussion” (35; emphasis added). So Gould in part, it seems, wants to read and write about disability without visibly, proud disabled people.

Thus, unlike predecessors Rose (1985), Patterson (1994), and Brueggemann, et al. (2001), I do not see Gould’s discussion of disability in an affirming or a constructive light. Certainly, the article is important and brings attention to non-normative or ill bodies, but unfortunately, Gould does not use a crip-positive approach.

**Palmer, Judith and Jan Thompson. "First-Year English: Welcoming Different Learners to the Table." *CEA Critic*, vol. 75, no. 3, 2013, pp. 293-302.**

Palmer and Thompson are both First Year Composition professors at Landmark College, a private college in Vermont that only admits disabled students, and aim to promote the widespread adoption of Universal Design. They open with somewhat defensive, legalistic concerns about "caring deeply...yet not wishing to lower course standards in order to accommodate special needs students" (293). "Special needs students," they argue, is an umbrella term for anyone and everyone with diagnoses that includes attention or autism disorders, dyslexia, and other learning disabilities. They then add, "[W]e acknowledge that federal laws obligate us to address disability issues" (293).

The first section unfolds with brief historical comments about federal laws pertaining specifically to disabled students enrolled in institutions of higher education and ends with yet another comment that undermines their stated purpose of promoting access: "In the event that a [disabled] student *manages to attain* passing or even high grades, federal laws also dictate that we *cannot then withdraw* accommodations from that student" (294; emphasis added). Such is undermining because of the suggestion that disabled students cannot do well and then the assumption that they should not do too well.

The second section provides a synthesis of the difficulties disabled students commonly experience—slower reading or frequent misspellings, for instance—and offers general suggestions, such as increased structure and among others. And this section ends with yet more comments that further Other disabled students. Palmer and Thompson frame disability as only being biological, which conflicts with the well-established social

model of disability and the social construction of disability at the time of their writing and established in core texts, including Susan Wendell's *The Rejected Body: Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability* (1996). Palmer and Thompson add, "[Disabled] students generally *want* to learn and excel" (295; emphasis in original).

The third section of "First-Year English" is strongest but still denies disabled people recognition as autonomous learners with agency. While Universal Design is typically promoted as a vehicle toward making education more equitable for all learners, these professors offer it as a way to homogenize disabled students with other students and to make accommodations a thing of the past. Specifically, Palmer and Thompson outline the ten core components of Universal Design as advocated by the Center on Postsecondary Education and Disability at the University of Connecticut that professors can adopt. Some of these include: "Explicit Instruction and Expectations," "Scaffolding of Assignments," "Using Varied Modalities," and "Offering Choice." They emphasize that such varied pedagogies can benefit all students.

An additional note is important. Person-first versus identity-first debates are especially common in the 2020s, with the identity-first model prevailing because "of course people are people." Said differently, this article uses person-first phraseology and has sentences such as "persons with disabilities" instead of "disabled people," which functions, according to most arguments in the crip community and arguments from feminist theory, to degrade and to minimize disabled bodies (298).

This article, published by the College English Association, shows how difficult and slow meaningful change is, how seemingly unaware people are to their own biases and assumptions, and how much opportunity remains to have a Composition Studies that

is mindful of disabled people. While Palmer and Thompson want to “welcome different learners to the table,” they do not consider asking crip individuals to collaborate in the design of said table. And of note, they do not cite any articles simply focused on Composition Studies. Palmer and Thompson clearly missed the books on crip pride!

**Browning, Ella R. “Disability Studies in the Composition Classroom.” *Composition Studies*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2014, pp. 96-117.**

Browning opens her article by quoting (or, *epigraphing*) Brueggemann, et al.’s (2001) words about the cornerstones in Composition Studies that make people and power visible, that emphasize praxis, and that challenge structuralist binaries. Browning argues that perspectives from Disability Studies should be adopted in all composition classrooms and that this can be done without having to completely rewrite lesson plans or without having the academic freedom to control curriculum decisions.

Browning critiques “add-and-stir” or “retrofitting” approaches that aim to include disability by adding a single article or film about disability or by making a single allowance for disabled students. Citing Brueggemann’s work again, Browning details with artifacts from students how composition instructors working within any model can incorporate disability simply by obliging students to consider disability through every moment of the class. Readers are especially challenged to “thinking critically about every aspect of their classrooms” (97). Building on Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson and Brueggemann’s *Disability and the Teaching of Writing: A Critical Sourcebook* (2008), Browning boldly longs for professors to incorporate disability by being mindful of everything and then by rebuilding and transforming everything. This requires that professors adjust their gaze and the gaze of their students to problematize assumptions

about disability and its impact and occurrence, especially by considering how any given topic relates to disability and by acknowledging the multitude of stakeholders. Readers are given eight questions to grapple with. These questions are all informed by an appreciation for cultural relativism, for equity, and for the idea that learning and writing is a process. While the concluding questions do not acknowledge labor issues, labor is addressed earlier in the article. Browning also advocates for adopting the social model of disability that sees disability as another valid way of being, unlike the medical model which equates disability with a “we shall overcome” mindset.

“Disability Studies in the Composition Classroom” is a fascinating article. Its orientation is crippositive. Readers can tell that Browning has a true commitment to celebrating such inclusive changes and to helping others make changes, even if only small at first or within institutional confines. My only reservation is that it could have been two separate articles—one about disability history and details for transforming Composition Studies, the other offering a specific model for the First Year Composition classroom (perhaps, especially given where the author’s sympathies clearly lie, with added critiques of professors forbidden from assigning any readings or assignments of their own choice).

**Wood, Tara. “Crippling Time in the College Composition Classroom.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 69, no. 2, 2017, pp. 260-286.**

Wood specifically cites and builds from Rose’s “The Language of Exclusion” (1985) and from Brueggemann, et al.’s “Becoming Visible” (2001), as well as from more philosophical texts beyond the scope of this bibliography, most notably James Charlton’s

*Nothing about Us without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment* (2001) and Robert McRuer's "Compulsory Able-Bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence" (2002).

Wood explains how considering crip time and abandoning academic time is relevant—including for composition classrooms where work is often scaffolded and/or completed outside of class—because of how demands related to health and disability disrupt normative expectations and might render someone unable to make progress for a few days. For example, a migraine might make it impossible for a student to study. Wood also offers that timed, graded in-class writing is inherently unfair. As Alison Kafer says:

Crip time is flex time not just expanded time but exploded; it requires reimagining our notions of what can and should happen in time, or recognizing how expectations of “how long things take” are based on very particular minds and bodies....Rather than bend disabled bodies and minds to meet the clock, crip time bends the clock to meet disabled bodies and minds. (qtd in. Woods 268)

In an important step that shows how crip time can inform all pedagogies and benefit all students, Wood later elaborates: “Crippling time means tapping into that awareness and harnessing its potential, not only for particular students but also for the greater possibility that it may release our own pedagogical approaches from the limiting constructs of normativity (273). In other words, a crip time praxis is a way Disability Studies can benefit all students by recognizing that time is arbitrary and privileges the few.

In contrast to the other scholarship discussed thus far, crip voices guide the research Wood offers to the conversation. Notably “Crippling Time” is the first article in this bibliography to focus on voices from those (supposedly) being considered, and Wood specifically laments how disabled voices “have been silenced” (265). (Can an author

claim alliance with and support for a group without privileging their voices? Thus, my polemical *supposedly* parenthetical critique two sentences ago.) She collected over two thousand minutes of audio from thirty-five semi-structured interviews with students. She offers quotations from these students throughout her article and shows how these crippled bodies experience a nonnormative time and how they long for professors who are informed by actual experience and research, not by myths suggesting that students take advantage of accommodations, that students with accommodations receive unfair advantages, or that post-accommodation classrooms are achievable and desirable.

Wood ultimately argues that on-going conversations between disabled students and their professors are necessary for equitable educational experiences and that these conversations belong in every classroom, including the writing classroom. Crip time is one framework for advancing these discussions and practices, practices and discussions that must challenge and go beyond normative, default accommodations, such as double time on quizzes or assistance with note-taking, that often belong solely in lecture classes. Wood issues a charge to professors generally and to Composition Studies specifically: “[W]e must pay attention to how we construct time; otherwise, we may enforce normative time frames upon students whose experiences and processes exist in contradiction to such compulsory measures of time” (260-61). She specifically advocates for “increasingly flexibility, avoiding rigidity, and lowering the stakes of writing” (270).

**Ho, Ai Binh T., et al. “Crippling Neutrality: Student Resistance, Pedagogical Audiences, and Teachers’ Accommodations.” *Pedagogy*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2020, pp. 127-139.**

Al Binh T. Ho, Stephanie L. Kerschbaum, Rebecca Sanchez, and Melanie Yergeau research and teach within Composition Studies and all out themselves as

disabled, the first writers to do so in this bibliography. Their article, published in January 2020, uses a synthesis of research from Brueggemann, Sami Schalk, and others to form a backdrop for their experiences working with students and navigating the physical space of a classroom. Their article is similar to those published by *Conditionally Accepted*, which was founded in 2013 and then acquired by *Inside HigherEd* in 2016.

They discuss students and fellow professors who marginalize them and see disability as an overriding state of being characterized by inferiority that only impacts the Other. Students have made insulting comments to them such as, “I’m mildly insulted someone with a communication disorder would teach us how to communicate” or “She’s smart for a deaf woman” (127-28). They further explain: “We have been repeatedly told by colleagues that our impairments are a ‘human problem rather than a disability problem.’ ...as a means to situate disability as a problem that is nobody’s problem” (133).

In terms of the writing classroom, Ho, et al. specifically want instructors to reassess their assumptions about spoken and written English (and what is “correct”) compared to other languages, such as American Sign Language. They discuss disabled people who may stutter, who may have computer-generated voices, or who were forcefully made to talk and conclude that “[n]one of these modalities has a neutral relationship to standardized English” (131). They also challenge rhetorical practices of audience that seldom recognize the disabled people in a given audience or disabled people as an audience of their own.

They argue that neutrality—or the process of making crippled bodies appear as “normal” bodies—is often desired but is realistically either impossible or associated with unintended and negative consequences. Ho, et al. write, “The demand for ‘neutral’

teachers acknowledges that many students do not know how to engage with people who are different from them” (137). By extension, throughout this piece they embrace the social model of disability. Some examples include how a given room can create visible disability if it has stairs or if it has fluorescent lights and include how livelihood is intertwined with realistic access to medications and physicians

“Crippling Neutrality” is an interesting and important article, especially being by and about disabled professors in the Composition Studies classroom, professionals Gould (2008) might (un)consciously deem *retarded*. However, the focus is too broad for such a short essay, and at the same time, the information is unnecessarily repetitive. For instance, they open by announcing a focus on intersectionality and disability (and consequently, positionality)—that is how people with disability also have a class, a race, and a sex/gender, etc.—but talk about disability on its own. And what they fully mean by theme of “neutrality” throughout their applications of the term does not exactly work. *Neutrality* suggests not having opinions or thoughts on a subject, not having an investment, or not caring, perhaps. The article would be much more effective with a theme of “cripping normativity” as these authors clearly care, are actively critiquing normativity, and critiquing those very invested in and blind to the normative structures of what bell hooks and I, with the added words in parenthesis, call the Imperialist White Supremacist Capitalist (Heteronormative Ableist Theistic) Patriarchy.

**Selznick, Hilary. “Performing a *Metis* Pedagogy in the Rhetoric and Writing Studies Classroom.” *Disability Studies Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2020. [dsq-sds.org/article/view/7225/5498](https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/7225/5498).**

Published in March 2020, Selznick provides a brief (the article is less than two thousand words) overview of being disabled and adopting a crip-informed pedagogy in her “Disability, Rhetoric, and the Body” upper-division class. She says her Disability Studies class was the first such class at Western Michigan University. She names her pedagogy *metis* based on valuing student choice and input and on the assumption that “all rhetoric is embodied, the straight and normal body is a fantasy, and a futuristic disability studies is made possible with new rhetorics” and with the goal of “disrupt[ing] both normative constructions of disability of writing” (par. 3). She adds, “In order to make this pedagogy possible, I had to first think sideways and crooked. I had to find my inner trickster” (par. 3).

Most of the article gives brief comments on interpersonal/intrapersonal interactions between students and on the type of work assigned to students. Selznick notes, “As their bodyminds became used to each other’s bodyminds existing in the same space for two hours and twenty minutes a week, and as they depended on one another to make the class work, students started to sit closer together” (par. 4). (Although not explained in her article, *bodyminds* is a concept in Disability Studies that recognizes the connection between a person’s mind and their body and sees them as a single entity.)

Selznick reports how they made language crooked by challenging normative definitions and by reading various texts by and about crippled authors; made writing crooked by presenting the same information through different modalities and by studying the implications of medium; and made rhetoric crooked by recognizing how “all rhetoric is embodied....and the ways in which our bodyminds shaped our writing as well as our belief systems” (par. 7).

Selznick also discusses her experience as the disabled professor teaching this class. Similar to Ho, et al. (2020) she analyzes her performance as an educator and her performance having an invisible crippled body. Selznick's university denied her perfectly reasonable accommodation request for a stool. She describes her experience of briefly having a visibly crippled body while wearing a prescription boot and how she felt "relief for the recognition of being disabled and shame for wanting that recognition so badly" (par. 12).

Collectively, again similar to Ho, et al., this article is interesting and a welcome addition to the literature that merges Disability Studies and Composition Studies. It is a notable example of applying Crip Theory to the general teaching philosophy and to the specific curriculum. It is a voice from a disabled scholar, too. But, "Performing a Metis Pedagogy in the Rhetoric and Writing Studies Classroom" misses important opportunities to communicate a clear pedagogy. *Metis* and *crooked* do not work as framing devices and are not adequately explained or footnoted/cited. These terms are not even defined. I have never heard of them before. And these terms do not appear in Lennard J. Davis's landmark *The Disability Studies Reader*, last updated in 2017. In the case of *crooked*, a clearer, established term could have been *subverted*.

**Zdenek, Sean. "Transforming Access and Inclusion in Composition Studies and Technical Communications." *College English*, vol. 82, no. 5, 2020, pp. 536-544.**

Published in May 2020, Zdenek's article is qualitatively different compared to the other articles in this bibliography. He provides a very compact synthesis of thirty-eight publications (from thirty-six authors or sets of authors) while desiring a Crip Studies-informed Technical and Professional Communication Studies and longing for a Technical

and Professional Communication Studies-informed Crip Studies. He says the different areas need to talk to each other. Zdenek argues that Disability Studies “has the potential to transform and reimagine writing” and that such requires “expansive questions of access and inclusion that can unite our fields and enable new insights” (536).

This article makes it very clear how much Disability Studies has developed during the past decades and outlines how future directions must be more mindful of technology and disability, such as with closed captioning. Conversations have evolved from initially internalizing that disabled people exist and have contributions worth learning about to now accepting disabled people who make decisions that tangibly shape the trajectory of Composition Studies.

**Hubrig, Adam and Ruth Osorio, editors. “Symposium: Enacting a Culture of Access in Our Conference Spaces.” *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 72, no. 1, 2020, pp. 87-117.**

Whereas previous articles in this crippled bibliography focus more specifically on the classroom, “Symposium,” published in September 2020, extends the conversation to include academic conferences, conferences where ideas debut and frequently find their way into classrooms. Hubrig and Osorio challenge colleagues to consider the harm done in their comments that amount to saying, “accessibility detracts from the conference experience” and “disabled people are expensive burdens” (88). The opening and all five following experiential-based sections collectively reject neoliberal ideas that commonly see accommodations and access as something to do once and be done with, as something individual, as something part of an impersonal/organizational process, or as something that scores mere diversity points. They argue for a “culture of access...[that] prioritizes

access in the service of love, justice, connection, and liberation” (88). In other words, in contrast to the visions offered by Palmer and Thompson (2013), writers in “Symposium” demand to be welcomed to the table without reservations and without bureaucratic obstacles and welcomed as the crippled people they are and with the desired accommodations.

The opening also details how to fully practice a culture of access that can readily apply in any space. The editors write, “[W]e define access as the dynamics, collective movement of creating spaces where multiple marginalized disabled people with a wide range of needs can engage in whatever manners they choose” (91). They suggest that access is dynamic, relational, intersectional, and political. In other words, informed by Disability Studies and rhetorical theory, “Symposium” challenges readers to see disabled and ill bodies and their accommodation needs as impacted by other identities, by layers of authority and privilege/oppression, by specific barriers in any given space, by expecting and accepting changes and differences, and by trusting without question.

In “The Sticky Note Snap,” Neil Simpkins details a protest he and other attendees staged at the 2019 Conference on College Composition and Communication in response to a sign announcing, “The CCCC Convention is accessible!” The disabled protestors covered the sign with sticky notes detailing how very inaccessible the conference remained.

In “The Importance of Keeping Conference Quiet Rooms Quiet,” Leslie R. Anglesey and Ellen Cecil-Lemkin outline how such rooms are often used by people for casual conversations which causes increased pain for those who need such a space for medical reasons.

In “Honoring Access Needs at Academic Conferences through Computer Assisted Real-Time Captioning (CART) and Sign Language Interpreting,” Margaret Fink, Janine Butler, Tonya Strelau, Stephanie L. Kerschbaum, and Brueggemann explain why collaboration between speaker and audience is important and detail the difference between American Sign Language and CART, explaining that going with the lowest bidder does not make for equitable access. They also highlight how captioning benefits everyone.

In “Please Stop Asking Why I’m Not Drinking: Academic Conferences, Alcohol, and Access,” Anonymous gives a heartfelt account and criticizes the ubiquitous role such beverages have at academic meetings and at job interviews. Again, informed by Disability Studies, Anonymous offers suggestions to people trapped in such a situation and to people hosting meetings.

In “We Are Here to Crip That Shit: Embodying Accountability beyond the ‘Word,’” Cody A. Jackson and Christina V. Cedillo write, “We cannot, we won’t, tolerate any longer your throwing your hands in the air and deeming injustice beyond your control” and later add, “Crippling our discipline requires a politics of risk” (109, 111). They ask their colleagues to embrace the “nothing about us without us” motto, including when it comes to the disabled. They also want people to remember that everyone oppresses other people and the work of liberation is on-going.

Collectively, “Symposium” is almost entirely praxis and really wants people to be more aware of their attitudes and behaviors toward crippled bodies. Its piece should prompt curiosity and reflection. It also suggests that there are high rates of illiteracy in the Composition Studies classroom when it comes to mindful inclusion of disabled and ill

bodies. How people treat students is likely a reflection of how they treat colleagues, and if anything, students are likely treated worse being in a subordinate power position.