Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences
Volume 8 Issue 1: 338-348
ISSN Print: 2705-4527
ISSN Online: 2705-4535
Web: https://www.quest.edu.np

The Politics of Normalcy and Culture

Udaya Raj Paudel

Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal
udayapaudel7@gmail.com

Received: 28 January 2026
Revised: 24 February 2026
Accepted: 04 March 2026
Published: 30 March 2026

How to cite this paper:
Paudel, U. R. (2026). The Politics of Normalcy and Culture. *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 8(1)*, 338-348. https://doi.org/10.3126/qjmss.v8i1.92649

Copyright © by authors and Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences.
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License.
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Open Access

Abstract

Background: The notion of normalcy is often treated as natural and universal; however, it is a socially and culturally constructed concept shaped by power, discourse, and institutional practices. Societal definitions of "normal" function as standards through which differences in body, intellect, race, class, and gender are evaluated and frequently stigmatized. This links the politics of normalcy closely with the politics of culture.

Purpose: This paper aims to critically examine how normalcy is constructed and how it operates within cultural systems to produce hierarchy and exclusion. It focuses on disability as a central example while extending the analysis to broader cultural processes involving identity, power, and social classification.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The study adopts a qualitative, interpretive, and theory-driven methodology based on textual and conceptual analysis. It engages with key contributions from disability studies, cultural studies, and Marxist and poststructuralist theory to analyze how norms and meanings are historically produced and maintained.

Findings: The study finds that categories of "normal" and "abnormal" are historically contingent rather than fixed. Disability is shown to be socially constructed through cultural values and institutional practices, not merely biological conditions. Additionally, culture is revealed as a non-neutral domain where meanings are produced, contested, and institutionalized, reinforcing hierarchies related to class, race, gender, and identity.

Conclusion: The paper concludes that the politics of normalcy and culture are deeply intertwined, operating through processes of classification, exclusion, and hierarchy. However, these structures are not immutable and can be challenged through critical theory and inclusive cultural practices. Recognizing the constructed nature of normalcy enables the development of a more democratic and inclusive understanding of human diversity.

Keywords: Normalcy, disability, culture, stigma, identity

1. Introduction

The concept of normalcy appears deceptively simple. It seems to name what is natural, ordinary, average, and socially desirable. Yet the closer one examines the term, the more unstable it becomes. What counts as normal in one society may be treated as abnormal in another; what is considered ordinary in one historical period may appear deviant in the next. Despite this instability, societies repeatedly organize themselves around standards of bodily fitness, intellect, sexuality, behavior, class position, race, language, and gender identity, and then use those standards to classify people into hierarchies of value. In that process, certain bodies and lives become privileged, while others are stigmatized as deficient, abnormal, dangerous, or burdensome. The politics of normalcy is therefore not merely descriptive. It is a politics of power that shapes institutions, cultural values, and social attitudes (Davis, 1997b; Coleman, 1997).

Disability offers one of the clearest entry points into this politics. Across long stretches of history, disabled people have been segregated, pitied, feared, punished, or erased not simply because of bodily or sensory difference, but because dominant cultures interpreted those differences through ideological frameworks. Deafness, muteness, blindness, mental difference, or physical impairment were often treated as signs of divine punishment, moral failure, intellectual lack, or civic uselessness. In ancient Greece and Rome, as many scholars have shown, the worth of a person was closely tied to martial vigor, speech, rationality, and civic performance; those who did not embody those standards were frequently marginalized or eliminated (Edwards, 1997; Winzer, 1997). Disability, then, was never only a medical issue. It was constructed through cultural narratives of utility, purity, danger, and social value.

At the same time, the politics of disability cannot be separated from the wider politics of culture. Culture is often celebrated as the feature that distinguishes human beings from animals, as the realm of education, refinement, art, and shared meaning. Yet culture is also a field of exclusion. It creates norms, authorizes values, disciplines behavior, and distributes status. In the modern liberal humanist tradition represented by Matthew Arnold and later Leavisite criticism, culture was frequently defined as "the best which has been thought and said," a formulation that implicitly treated the tastes and practices of educated elites as universal standards (Arnold, 1998; Bertens, 2001). Such definitions did not merely praise refinement; they also downgraded popular, working-class, feminine, colonized, and Non-Western forms of life as inferior, chaotic, or uncultured. Culture, in that sense, becomes a means of distinction and rule.

More recent cultural theory has unsettled these assumptions. Poststructuralism, Marxist cultural studies, disability studies, feminist theory, and postcolonial criticism have all insisted that culture is not a neutral repository of excellence but a site of ideological struggle. Meanings are not fixed in texts or practices; they are articulated through discourse, institutions, and power relations (Storey, 1998). Raymond Williams's influential description of culture as "a particular way of life" expanded the field from elite art to everyday practice, making it possible to analyze how class, race, gender, disability, and identity are socially produced rather than naturally given (Williams, 1998). Within this expanded field, disability emerges not as a biological essence but as a cultural and political category formed in relation to norms of productivity, beauty, intelligence, speech, and autonomy.

This paper argues that the ideology of normalcy is a social construction that contains no inherent or universal meaning, and that the politics of culture sustains this ideology through classed, gendered, racialized, and power-laden distinctions. The paper proceeds in two related movements. The first part focuses on disability and normalcy, examining how bodily difference has historically been transformed into stigma, inferiority, and exclusion. The second part broadens the inquiry to culture itself, exploring how debates over culture, class, identity, and power reveal similar mechanisms of hierarchy and normalization. The aim is not merely to show that exclusion exists, but to demonstrate that exclusion is organized through discourse. The "normal" is not discovered; it is made. Once made, it appears self-evident, and that appearance enables dominant groups to naturalize their authority over those who differ (Goffman, 1997; Davis, 1997a).

The significance of this argument extends beyond disability studies. Whenever a society privileges one language over another, one class over another, one race over another, one gender norm over another, or one cultural identity over another, it is engaged in the politics of normalcy. Such politics does not always operate through open violence. It often works through school curricula, literary canons, media representation, religious values, law, medicine, family expectations, and everyday habits of perception. To expose those processes is to challenge the assumption that hierarchy is natural. It is also to open the possibility of a more democratic culture in which human difference is not reduced to lack, stigma, or deviation.

For that reason, this paper combines disability studies with cultural theory. Disability studies reveals how bodies are interpreted through power; cultural theory reveals how power itself is embedded in norms, institutions, and systems of meaning. Together, they help us see that normalcy is not a neutral average but a political achievement, and that culture is not merely a realm of beauty or refinement but a contested domain in which social difference is organized, authorized, and resisted (Bertens, 2001; Lauter, 2001c). The politics of normalcy and the politics of culture are therefore inseparable. Both are concerned with who gets to define the human, who gets included within the category of value, and who remains marked as other.

2. Literature Review

Scholarship on disability has decisively challenged the older tendency to treat impairment as a purely individual or medical defect. One of the foundational interventions in disability studies is the claim that disability is socially produced. Lennard J. Davis, for example, argues that the very category of the normal emerged historically through statistical thinking, industrial modernity, and the social desire to regulate bodies according to an average (Davis, 1997a). His insight is crucial because it shows that normalcy is not a timeless human truth but a historically specific discourse. Once the average body became a norm, those who did not fit within that norm could be named “abnormal,” “deviant,” or “disabled.” This naming process had profound effects on institutions such as education, medicine, labor, and the family. What appeared to be a neutral measurement of bodies was, in reality, a mechanism for producing social hierarchy.

Erving Goffman’s work on stigma complements Davis’s historical account by examining the social interactions through which difference becomes discrediting. For Goffman, stigma is not simply a mark attached to an individual; it is a relational process in which a society defines certain attributes as tainted or undesirable, thereby reducing a person “from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one” (Goffman, 1997). This formulation is particularly valuable because it shifts the focus from bodily condition to social interpretation. A body or trait becomes stigmatized only within a framework of norms that measures it against an accepted standard. Thus, the problem is not difference in itself, but the politics of value that turns difference into deficiency.

Lerita M. Coleman extends this discussion by emphasizing that stigma reflects the value judgments of dominant groups and that these judgments are fluid, contextual, and historically variable (Coleman, 1997). Her work is important because it shows that stigmatization is not confined to disability. Homosexuality, poverty, racialized appearance, alcoholism, bodily size, mental illness, and many other differences may become stigmatized depending on the priorities of a given society. The wider implication is that normalcy functions as a disciplinary ideal, not as a neutral description. The stigmatized subject is pressured to assimilate to dominant norms, while the stigmatizer gains symbolic authority by appearing to embody the standard.

Historical studies of disability further reveal how deeply these politics are embedded in social life. Martha L. Edwards’s discussion of deafness in ancient Greece shows how sensory difference was interpreted through assumptions about speech, reason, and civic capacity. Because speech was tightly linked to intellect and public life, deaf people were often seen as naturally voiceless, intellectually diminished, and

politically insignificant (Edwards, 1997). Margaret A. Winzer similarly documents the harsh treatment of disabled infants and children in the classical world, where the value of the body was measured against utility, military strength, and civic worth (Winzer, 1997). Such studies demonstrate that disability cannot be understood apart from cultural values. A deaf child was not devalued because deafness inherently signifies inferiority; the child was devalued because the society defined hearing, speaking, and martial usefulness as necessary conditions of value.

The literature on culture and ideology reveals parallel patterns. Matthew Arnold's account of culture as "the best which has been thought and said" established one of the most influential liberal humanist definitions of culture in the nineteenth century (Arnold 7). While this formulation appears universal, later critics have shown that it privileges elite taste and institutional authority. Hans Bertens notes that Arnold's notion of culture can be read as a move in the struggle for power, especially the power to define what counts as valuable, educated, and civilized (Bertens, 2001). F. R. Leavis and the Leavisites developed this logic further by insisting that true culture remained a "minority keeping," threatened by mass civilization, commercial entertainment, and popular taste. Culture, in this framework, becomes a mechanism of differentiation through which an educated minority preserves symbolic authority over the majority.

Raymond Williams's work marks a decisive break from this exclusive model. By redefining culture as "a particular way of life," Williams shifted attention from elite aesthetic objects to everyday practices, social relations, and collective meanings (Williams, 1998). This move democratized cultural analysis and enabled critics to examine not only canonical literature but also popular forms, working-class practices, media, education, and ordinary social habits. Williams's intervention is especially relevant to the present paper because it helps connect disability to broader cultural politics. If culture includes everyday life, then the way a society treats disability, race, class, and gender is not secondary to culture; it is part of culture's central operation.

Marxist cultural studies strengthen this insight by examining how culture reproduces social division while also serving as a terrain of contestation. Paul Lauter argues that educational and cultural institutions have ideological functions: they shape acceptable behavior, regulate thought, and distribute access in ways that often serve dominant interests (Lauter, 2001a; Lauter, 2001b). Stuart Hall's work on articulation and ideology similarly insists that meaning is produced within relations of power rather than discovered as an innocent given (Storey, 1998). Culture thus becomes a site where class, race, gender, and national identity are negotiated. The significance of this for the politics of normalcy is clear: dominant groups do not only control resources; they also control the frameworks through which certain groups are made to appear civilized, rational, educable, able-bodied, or normal.

Postmodern and poststructuralist approaches deepen these critiques by rejecting universal and stable categories of identity. Instead of treating man, culture, truth, or normalcy as transparent essences, these approaches ask how such categories are constructed through discourse and sustained through institutions. Cultural studies after the 1960s, drawing on Marxism, Gramsci, deconstruction, and discourse theory, increasingly emphasized hegemony, everyday life, and the politics of meaning (Storey, 1998; Bertens, 1997). From this perspective, disability can be read alongside race, class, and gender not because all forms of oppression are identical, but because they are all mediated through systems of classification that authorize some ways of being and subordinate others.

Existing scholarship therefore converges on several crucial insights. First, normalcy is historically produced rather than naturally given. Second, stigma is socially organized through dominant value judgments. Third, culture is not politically innocent but implicated in hegemony, exclusion, and social reproduction. Fourth, institutions, discourse, and everyday practice sustain the categories through which difference is understood, such as disability, race, gender, and class. The present paper builds on these insights by bringing disability studies and cultural theory into closer conversation. Rather than treating disability as a narrow special topic and culture as an abstract humanist ideal, it reads both through the

politics of classification. In doing so, it argues that disability is one of the clearest examples of how cultures create and police norms, and that the critique of disability stigma can illuminate wider struggles over identity, value, and power.

Theoretical Background

The theoretical background of this paper combines disability studies, cultural studies, Marxist theory, and discourse-oriented approaches to power. At its center lies the claim that "normalcy" functions as an ideological construct rather than a natural fact. This claim requires at least four related conceptual moves: first, to understand normalcy as historically produced; second, to understand stigma as socially relational; third, to understand culture as a site of hegemony and contestation; and fourth, to understand identity as mediated through discourse, institutions, and material inequality.

The first major concept is normalcy. Davis's analysis is especially important here because he locates the rise of normalcy in modern statistical reasoning and the emergence of the average as a social ideal (Davis, 1997). Once bodies and capacities were imagined in relation to measurable averages, deviation could be named as deficiency. This means that "normal" is not a pre-social truth waiting to be discovered. It is an administrative and cultural invention that becomes naturalized through repetition. The theoretical consequence is significant: if normalcy is constructed, it can be deconstructed. What appears inevitable may actually be historical, contingent, and political.

The second concept is stigma. Goffman's theory of stigma clarifies how social identity is organized through recognition and discrediting. A stigmatized person is not simply one who possesses a different trait but one whose trait is read as disqualifying within a normative social order (Goffman, 1997). Coleman expands this by showing that stigmas vary across time and place and reflect dominant value judgments rather than inherent truths (Coleman, 1997). In theoretical terms, stigma is a technology of social order. It pressures people to conform to dominant norms while justifying unequal treatment toward those who do not conform. Stigma is therefore central to the politics of normalcy because it converts difference into hierarchy.

The third concept is culture. Against the liberal humanist idea that culture represents universal excellence, this paper adopts a cultural studies understanding of culture as a field of lived meanings, social practices, and ideological struggle. Williams's formulation of culture as "a particular way of life" allows us to examine the everyday practices through which values are distributed and identities are formed (Williams, 1998). Hall's concept of ideology and articulation further suggests that meanings are not fixed but produced within concrete historical contexts and relations of power (Storey, 1998). Culture thus does not merely reflect social divisions; it actively helps produce and naturalize them. Literary canons, educational institutions, family expectations, religious rituals, media representation, and bodily norms all belong to this field.

The fourth concept is hegemony. Drawing broadly on Gramscian and Marxist cultural studies, hegemony refers to the way dominant groups secure consent by making their values appear universal, common sense, and beneficial to all. Arnold's and Leavis's definitions of culture may therefore be read not as innocent celebrations of excellence but as hegemonic attempts to define who may speak for civilization and who must remain subordinate (Arnold, 1998; Bertens, 1997). Lauter's account of education as a mechanism for channeling behavior and thought similarly reveals how institutions help reproduce class hierarchy while presenting themselves as neutral or meritocratic (Lauter, 2001a). Hegemony matters for disability because able-bodied norms often operate in precisely this way: they are experienced as common sense rather than as a political preference for certain kinds of bodies and capacities.

Finally, the paper draws on an intersectional understanding of social difference. Disability does not exist outside class, race, gender, nation, or identity. A disabled person's experience is shaped by economic status, gendered expectations, access to education, racialized perception, and cultural location. Likewise,

the politics of culture rarely isolates one form of othering. The same social order that marks disabled people as deviant may also mark the poor as uncultured, colonized subjects as backward, women as secondary, and minorities as threatening. Theoretical analysis must therefore move across these categories without flattening their differences. The point is not that all forms of oppression are identical, but that they share mechanisms of normalization, exclusion, and representation.

Taken together, these concepts allow the paper to read disability and culture within one analytical frame. Normalcy establishes the standard, stigma punishes deviation, culture circulates the standard, and hegemony naturalizes the entire system. From this perspective, the politics of normalcy is one expression of a wider politics of culture in which dominant groups define the human, the civilized, the intelligent, the able, and the legitimate.

3. Methodology

This study uses a qualitative, interpretive, and theory-driven methodology based on close reading and conceptual analysis. It is not an empirical field study and does not rely on interviews, surveys, or quantitative measurement. Instead, it examines how disability and culture are represented, theorized, and politically organized in the uploaded source text and in the critical works it invokes. The paper therefore belongs to the field of literary and cultural criticism, where arguments are developed through interpretation, contextualization, and theoretical synthesis rather than statistical testing.

The first methodological step is textual analysis of the uploaded paper itself. That text develops two major claims: first that disability is socially and culturally constructed through the politics of normalcy; and the second that culture is inseparable from questions of class, identity, and power. The present paper reconstructs those claims, clarifies their conceptual implications, and expands them into a more systematic academic argument. In doing so, it treats the uploaded text not merely as raw content but as an argumentative foundation requiring refinement, restructuring, and theoretical elaboration.

The second methodological step is comparative theoretical reading. The paper places the uploaded text in conversation with disability studies, cultural studies, and Marxist/poststructuralist criticism. Texts by Davis, Goffman, Coleman, Edwards, Winzer, Arnold, Williams, Bertens, Lauter, and Storey are used not only as references but as interpretive frameworks through which the politics of normalcy and culture can be analyzed. This comparative reading makes it possible to move from historical examples to broader theoretical claims about power, stigma, hegemony, and social difference.

The third methodological step is critical synthesis. Rather than summarizing each thinker separately, the paper identifies shared concerns across the traditions: the production of norms, the role of institutions, the politics of representation, and the relation between culture and hierarchy. This method allows the paper to bridge disability studies and cultural theory in a way that foregrounds their common investment in exposing how dominant groups naturalize their own standards. The goal is therefore explanatory and critical: to show how norms are made, how exclusions are justified, and how such structures can be challenged.

Because this is an interpretive humanities paper, validity rests on argumentative coherence, adequate textual support, theoretical accuracy, and the ability to generate a persuasive account of the topic. The method is appropriate to the subject because the politics of normalcy and culture cannot be grasped solely through quantitative measures; they must also be understood through discourse, representation, and historical meaning.

4. Discussion and Analysis

The politics of normalcy begins with the power to define the standard. That power is rarely distributed equally. In most societies, the standard is generated by dominant groups whose ways of speaking, moving, perceiving, laboring, desiring, and belonging are treated as universal. Once universalized, those traits

cease to appear particular. They become "natural." The effect of this process is that difference is never encountered neutrally. It is seen through the lens of an already established norm. Disability is one of the clearest examples. A deaf person is not simply a person who hears differently; a deaf person becomes "disabled" in a society that treats hearing and speech as prerequisites for reason, communication, education, and civic worth (Edwards, 1997). The same logic applies to many other social categories: femininity may be defined against masculine norms, Blackness against whiteness, poverty against bourgeois standards of respectability, and popular culture against elite concepts of refinement. The politics of normalcy is therefore not confined to disability; it is a general mechanism of social ordering.

A historical perspective makes this clear. The examples from ancient Greece and Rome are important not because they are unusually cruel but because they reveal the cultural criteria which assigns value. In societies organized around martial strength, public speech, patriarchal authority, and civic usefulness, bodily or sensory difference could easily be translated into worthlessness. As the uploaded paper notes, Greek practices of infanticide, abandonment, and exclusion show that disabled children were often treated as burdens on family, state, and social order. The point is not that impairment automatically caused exclusion. Rather, exclusion followed from the values by which those societies interpreted the body. A body unable to fight, speak publicly, or perform the expected tasks of citizenship became expendable. Such examples expose the ideological nature of "fitness." They show that what counts as a useful, worthy, or complete body is determined by culture.

The social construction of disability becomes even more visible when one notices how standards shift across time and place. Davis (1997) claim that all bodies are disabled in some sense destabilizes the fantasy of a fully normal body. No body perfectly embodies the ideal. The average body is a statistical abstraction, not a living person. Yet social institutions treat that abstraction as real, and then discipline bodies against it. Schools reward certain forms of speech, attention, movement, and cognition; workplaces privilege certain rhythms of productivity; public spaces are built around presumptions of vision, hearing, and mobility; literature and media privilege beauty, autonomy, and coherence. In each case, "normal" operates as a hidden architecture. Disabled people are then asked either to assimilate to this architecture or to accept exclusion from it.

This is why stigma is so central. Stigma transforms social norms into emotional and moral experience. The stigmatized person is not only denied access; they are also made to feel reduced, exposed, and defective. The insight from Goffman (1997) that stigma produces a spoiled identity captures the violence of this process. The stigmatized subject is read before they can speak for themselves. Their body or trait becomes a sign interpreted by others. Coleman's argument that stigma reflects dominant value judgments is therefore crucial because it reveals that shame and inferiority are politically produced rather than naturally deserved (Coleman, 1997). A person may internalize stigma, but the origin of that stigma lies in social structures of value.

The politics of normalcy also depends on the conflation of physical difference with moral or intellectual lack. The uploaded paper highlights how Greek attitudes toward deafness equated lack of speech with lack of thought. This is a powerful example because it shows how quickly a functional difference can be transformed into a totalizing judgment about personhood. Similar patterns recur elsewhere. Physical disability is often linked to helplessness, mental disability to permanent infantilization, poverty to laziness, and racialized difference to primitivism. The body becomes a surface onto which society projects wider anxieties and hierarchies. In each case, the social order benefits from this projection because it justifies exclusion as if exclusion were simply a response to natural deficiency.

At this point the discussion of disability merges with the wider politics of culture. Culture supplies the language, images, narratives, and institutions through which hierarchy becomes common sense. Liberal humanist accounts of culture often concealed this function beneath the rhetoric of universality. Arnold's definition of culture as the best that has been thought and said appears uplifting, but its political effect

is selective (Arnold, 1998). It implies that some people are closer to culture than others, and that the authority to determine the “best” belongs to an educated minority. Bertens rightly notes that such a definition can be read as a struggle for the power to define culture itself (Bertens, 2001). Once culture is defined from above, the majority may be included only as recipients of refinement, not as producers of value. The division between the cultured and the uncultured mirrors the division between the normal and the abnormal.

Leavisite criticism intensifies this exclusion by defending minority culture against mass civilization. Commercial media, popular entertainment, and working-class taste are treated as threats to cultural authority. The political logic of this framework is clear: culture becomes a fence around privilege. It is not simply a matter of aesthetic preference. It is a means of securing class distinction by elevating the habits of a minority into standards of judgment. The uncultured are then represented as chaotic, passive, or vulgar, just as disabled people have often been represented as deficient, dependent, or tragic. In both cases, hierarchy is reproduced through representation. A minority defines the standard and the majority is measured against it.

Williams’s intervention is therefore transformative. By redefining culture as a whole way of life, he resists the reduction of culture to elite texts and institutions (Williams, 1998). This move democratizes the field and allows analysts to examine the politics of everyday norms. Once culture includes work, leisure, speech, family, media, education, and ordinary rituals, one can ask how those practices produce categories such as normal, able, civilized, respectable, masculine, feminine, and national. Disability is no longer outside culture; it is one of culture’s constitutive tests. How a society builds schools, designs transportation, writes laws, organizes labor, and imagines beauty all reveal what kinds of bodies it expects and values.

Marxist cultural studies sharpen the political dimension of this analysis. Culture is not only a set of meanings but also a site where social divisions are reproduced and contested. Lauter’s attention to education as a means of channeling acceptable thought and behavior underscores how institutions normalize dominant interests while appearing neutral (Lauter, 2001a). Educational access, literacy, curricular design, and aesthetic judgment all affect who is recognized as capable, cultured, or worthy. If schools are built for hearing, sighted, physically mobile, and linguistically dominant bodies, then disability is reproduced through institutional design long before it appears as a personal problem. Similarly, if curricula elevate elite and Western cultural forms while dismissing popular, local, female, or colonized expressions, then culture reproduces class and power.

This point becomes even clearer in the context of globalization and consumer culture. The uploaded paper notes that globalization often advances homogenizing cultural icons—consumer brands, media forms, and Western lifestyles—while threatening local identities and producing new anxieties about belonging. Such homogenization is also a politics of normalcy. It promotes certain lifestyles, bodies, languages, and aspirations as globally desirable while marginalizing others as backward, local, or resistant. The standardized consumer subject is expected to be mobile, visually legible, productive, and aspirational. Bodies or identities that do not fit that model become difficult to represent except as needs, problems, or markets. Thus globalization does not abolish hierarchy; it often repackages hierarchy in transnational form.

Race, gender, and class are deeply implicated in this process. Race has historically functioned as a visual politics of normalcy in which whiteness is treated as unmarked and other racialized bodies are treated as visible departures from the human norm. Gender operates similarly when masculinity is treated as neutral agency and femininity as deviation, supplement, or emotional excess. Class works through cultural capital, education, language, taste, and bodily presentation; middle-class habits become signs of discipline and respectability, while working-class habits are pathologized as vulgar or deficient. Disability intersects with all of these. A poor disabled woman, for instance, does not experience stigma in isolated layers but through a dense interaction of economic exclusion, gender norms, and bodily judgment. The politics of normalcy therefore organizes multiple identities at once.

One of the most important contributions of cultural studies is its insistence that meanings are contested rather than fixed. Hall's concept of articulation suggests that no practice carries one inevitable meaning; meanings are linked to historical contexts and power relations (Storey, 1998). This means that disability, popular culture, race, and gender are not locked into singular interpretive frameworks. The same body or practice may be read as deviant in one discourse and as politically meaningful in another. This theoretical openness is crucial because it makes resistance imaginable. If normalcy is constructed, then alternative constructions are possible. Disability activism, feminist criticism, anti-racist movements, queer theory, and decolonial cultural practice all challenge the authority of dominant norms by showing that those norms are partial rather than universal.

Resistance, however, cannot mean simple inclusion into existing norms. To demand that disabled people be accepted only insofar as they mimic able-bodied standards would leave the politics of normalcy intact. The deeper challenge is to transform the norm itself—to redesign spaces, institutions, and values so that difference is not automatically translated into lack. This is why the uploaded paper's suggestion that disabled communities possess distinct ways of life is politically important. It resists the homogenizing fantasy that justice means total assimilation. The same lesson applies to culture more broadly. Democratic culture does not require one universal standard; it requires the recognition that multiple ways of being human can coexist without being ranked according to a single hierarchy.

In this sense, the politics of normalcy and the politics of culture converge in the question of who gets to define the human. Liberal humanist culture once answered that question through educated minority standards. Traditional stigma answered it through bodily fitness and social conformity. Contemporary capitalist culture often answers it through productivity, consumption, and visual legibility. Against all of these, critical theory insists that the human cannot be reduced to a norm. Human beings differ in body, perception, intelligence, language, sexuality, class position, and cultural practice. Those differences are not obstacles to culture; they are the substance of culture.

The uploaded paper concludes that culture is as powerful in distinguishing man from man as it is in distinguishing human beings from animals. That claim remains deeply relevant. Culture is not only what people share; it is also what they use to divide, classify, and dominate. Yet because culture is made, it can be remade. The politics of normalcy may be historically entrenched, but it is not ontologically fixed. Once we see that norms are constructed through discourse and institutions, we can also see that exclusion is not fate. The challenge for criticism, then, is not merely to expose hierarchy but to imagine a social order in which difference is not punished for failing to resemble the average.

Such an order would require changes at multiple levels. Educational systems would need to abandon the assumption that one mode of learning, speaking, or moving defines competence. Literary and cultural institutions would need to widen their standards of value beyond elite taste and narrow canons. Public architecture would need to recognize accessibility not as charity but as a condition of democratic membership. Media representation would need to move beyond pity, spectacle, and token inclusion. Above all, societies would need to relinquish the fantasy that dignity belongs only to bodies and identities that approximate a dominant norm. Until that happens, the politics of normalcy will continue to reproduce disability, class hierarchy, racial exclusion, and gendered subordination in the name of common sense.

The struggle against such politics is therefore simultaneously a struggle over representation, institutions, and imagination. To challenge stigma is to challenge the standards that make stigma possible. To democratize culture is to question who has been authorized to name the best, the proper, the refined, and the normal. The value of disability studies and cultural studies lies precisely here: both expose how power hides within everyday categories. Once that hiding place is disturbed, critique becomes possible, and with critique comes the possibility of a more inclusive culture grounded not in sameness but in the recognition of complex human plurality.

5. Conclusion and Implications

The politics of normalcy is one of the most enduring mechanisms through which societies create hierarchy while pretending merely to describe reality. By naming certain bodies, behaviors, tastes, identities, and forms of life as normal; dominant groups also create the abnormal, the deficient, the uncultured, and the unworthy. Disability studies reveal this process with particular clarity. Disabled people have historically been marginalized not because bodily difference inherently means inferiority, but because cultures have interpreted difference through norms of fitness, speech, productivity, reason, and usefulness (Davis, 1997a; Edwards, 1997). Once those norms are institutionalized, exclusion can appear natural. Stigma then translates social judgment into lived shame and diminished status (Goffman, 1997; Coleman, 1997).

At the same time, the paper has shown that disability is not an isolated topic. It belongs to a larger politics of culture in which class, race, gender, education, and power are constantly negotiated. Liberal humanist notions of culture, especially in Arnold and Leavis, often elevated minority standards into universal ideals while relegating popular, working-class, female, colonized, and disabled lives to positions of lesser value (Arnold, 1998; Bertens, 2001). By contrast, cultural studies, Marxist criticism, and poststructuralist thought expanded the field of analysis to include everyday life, ideology, and hegemony, making it possible to see culture as a terrain of struggle rather than a neutral storehouse of excellence (Williams, 1998; Lauter, 2001a; Storey, 1998). Within that terrain, the politics of normalcy can be understood as one among several interconnected strategies through which dominance secures consent and organizes difference.

The deeper implication of this argument is that normalcy contains no inherent moral truth. It is a contingent effect of discourse, institutions, and historical interests. What is called natural is often only familiar; what is called universal is often only dominant. Because norms are made, they can be unmade. This does not require denying difference. On the contrary, it requires taking difference seriously enough to refuse its automatic translation into hierarchy. Disabled people, poor people, racialized communities, women, and other marginalized groups do not need value conferred upon them by proximity to a dominant standard. Their value precedes the standard. What must change is the cultural and political order that treats the standard as the measure of humanity.

A more democratic politics of culture would therefore reject the equation of difference with deficiency. It would recognize that cultures are plural, identities are relational, and bodies are diverse. It would redesign institutions so that access, dignity, and representation do not depend on conformity to a narrow norm. It would also challenge elite claims to define what counts as refinement, intelligence, and legitimacy. In such a framework, culture would no longer function primarily as a technology of exclusion but as a field of shared yet contested human meaning. The task of criticism is to help make that transformation possible by exposing how power operates through ordinary categories. To critique normalcy is not to abolish standards altogether; it is to insist that standards must remain answerable to justice, plurality, and human dignity. Only then can culture cease to be a means of differing man from man in hierarchical terms and become instead a space for recognizing difference without domination.

References

Arnold, M. (1998). Culture and anarchy. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (pp. 7–12). Pearson.

Bertens, H. (2001). *Literary theory: The basics*. Routledge.

Coleman, L. M. (1997). Stigma: An enigma demystified. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 216–231). Routledge.

Davis, L. J. (1997a). Constructing normalcy. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 9–28). Routledge.

Davis, L. J. (Ed.). (1997b). *The disability studies reader*. Routledge.

Edwards, M. L. (1997). Deaf and dumb in ancient Greece. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 29–52). Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1997). Selections from *Stigma*. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 203–215). Routledge.

Lauter, P. (2001a). American studies, American politics, and the reinvention of class. In *From Walden Pond to Jurassic Park* (pp. 34–63). Duke University Press.

Lauter, P. (2001b). Culture and conformity in wartime America: My junior high school song book. In *From Walden Pond to Jurassic Park* (pp. 82–98). Duke University Press.

Lauter, P. (2001c). *From Walden Pond to Jurassic Park*. Duke University Press.

Roy, A. (2002). *The god of small things*. Penguin Books.

Storey, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader*. Pearson.

Williams, R. (1998). The analysis of culture. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (pp. 48–56). Pearson.

Winzer, M. A. (1997). Disability and society before the eighteenth century. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 75–110). Routledge.