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Abstract

This article aims to navigate the nuanced realm of cripped (non)pedagogies and their potential to reconceptualize/de-conceptualize traditional educational concepts, as well as ethics, politics, and knowledge. By engaging with the tensions and the contextual rebellions of anti-oppressive pedagogies – contrasted against the more radical backdrop of crip theory qua anti-normativity (an immanence of immanence) – cripped (non)pedagogies not only disrupt conventional educational paradigms but also animate mutable, multiplicitous, and nonsensical conceptions/non-conceptions of thought/dis-thought and existence/dis-existence that continuously transgress normative educational boundaries. Throughout the article, I will assert that cripped (non)pedagogies embody a refusal to adhere to pedagogical norms, offering a space/un-space/non-space where educations/miseducations/anti-educations are not confined by normative regimes but are fluid, multivalent, imaginative/de-imaginative/re-imaginative, and aberrant/cripped. The final part of this exploration draws from seminal works in critical pedagogy to enhance our understanding/dis-understanding of how crpped (non)pedagogies align with, yet diverge from, conventional critical teaching methods.
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Introductory Movements

The conventional image of the teacher or educator is continually evolving. However, when educators challenge these norms within the realms of education, politics, society, or knowledge construction, they place themselves and their well-being in jeopardy. Take, for example, anti-oppressive and anti-racist educators who more actively acknowledge their students’ rights to choose what and how they learn (Rodríguez, 2019). By engaging with prohibited literature (Zinga & Styres, 2019), pushing the boundaries of normative discourse frameworks (Kumashiro, 2000), or delving into more radical political and social ideologies like anarchy, decolonialism, and anti-imperialism (Callaghan et al., 2023), these educators find themselves in precarious legal, social, and political positions, jeopardizing their livelihoods, reputations, and relationships (Zavala, 2016). Within normative educational contexts (the inscription of education as a necessarily normative project), teachers and educators are conditioned to conform to norms, and those who challenge the reductive and often oppressive educational possibilities, epistemologies, and ontologies are met with various forms of punishment/discipline – be it social, material, or internalized. For instance, by invoking anti-racist pedagogies and by playing with fleeting issuances of anti-normativity, Matthew Hawn was fired from his job as a teacher in Sullivan County, Tennessee (Natanson, 2021).

Our educational systems rely on normative determinations of being/nonbeing, human/inhuman, and rational/irrational to perpetuate the status quo and stifle transformative potential within education/(non)education (Wynters, 2003). Thus, I will suggest crippledness and crip theory as a productive and anti-productive gesticulation toward more anti-normative possibilities and impossibilities within/of education: miseducation, anti-education, and (non)education.

In this article, I will challenge conventional pedagogies and established educational paradigms, grappling with more anti-normative pedagogies/(non)pedagogies and disrupting the precepts of educational regimes as commonly understandable (such that we, as researchers and practitioners, maintain the normativity of education to sustain its productivity qua sensemaking (Deleuze, 1993). Moreover, rather than suggesting crippled (non)pedagogies as necessarily just or equitable pedagogical interventions, I want to argue that crippled (non)pedagogies more continuously upset normative arrangements and enliven a kind of aberrant locution/il-locution that progressively expands the possibilities/impossibilities of educations/miseducations/anti-educations. To construct this argument, I will utilize crip theory as a framework, delving into the realm of crippledness to more viscerally reject and
defy the construction and maintenance of norms within the classroom and educational systems. My work will question educational practices that uphold and perpetuate social, political, and intellectual norms, thereby limiting the capacity for embracing alternative/aberrant perspectives and acknowledging more anti-normative experiences of crippled/aberrant folks. In other words, my work will suggest invocations/evocations of crippled (non)pedagogies that continuously press against normative and/or normativizing educational regimes, thereby grappling with crip theory as an evocative/deformational impulse, anti-oppressive pedagogies as poignant exemplifications, and more praxical enfleshments/embodiments of crippled (non)pedagogies. Thus, I will use the embodied refusal of normativity via crippledness to maintain crippled (non)pedagogies' refusal of normativity and crip theory's anti-normative impulse that moves beyond the fleeting transgressions of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies.1

Moreover, while I will argue that anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies re-normativize educational possibilities under various regimes, I will maintain crippled (non)pedagogies as more anti-normative invocations given the embodied dissension/il-locution of the crippled: the nonverbal autistic, the schizo hallucinatory terrain, and the anarchism of ODD (Oppositional Defiant Disorder). I will argue that these crippled experiences encompass multiplicitousness, nonsense, continual/mutational transgression, and otheredness such that crippled (non)pedagogies shatter and maintain the deconstruction of normative educational possibilities (though never necessarily arguing for what could be considered more just educations given justice's normative categorizations). While I will initially contextualize my introductory discussions, highlighting how anti-oppressive pedagogies encourage teachers and educators to challenge prevailing/contemporary social, legal, and discursive norms (qua embedded paradigms of white supremacy, heteronormativity, and patriarchy), I will subsequently scrutinize the emergence of new norms that anti-oppressive educational practices necessarily foster as anti-oppressive via particular politics, ethics, and knowledge(s). This interrogation, moreover, will allow my arguments to delve deeper into the embodiments and viscera of crippled (non)pedagogies that

---

1 Again, rather than suggesting that crippled (non)pedagogies are more humane, less oppressive, or less violent than other pedagogical impulses, I will argue that crippled (non) pedagogies upend our determinations of education qua normativity and enliven othereding spaces wherein education/miseducation/anti-education may become possible to imagine/enliven as aberrant and crippled.
maintain their gyroscopic and mutational anti-normativities rather than the re-normativizing impulses of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies that maintain education as educative, thereby playing at more critical pedagogical impulses distending from Biesta and Boler, for instance (Biesta, 2013; Boler, 2002).

In this article, I will present my arguments in three main sections. (1) First, I’ll provide a concise background of crip theory (McRuer, 2006; Yergeau, 2018; Thorneycroft, 2020). This will serve as a foundation for exploring cripped (non)pedagogies, juxtaposing the anti-normative impulse of the crpped with the normative inscriptions of pedagogy and education. Within this exploration, I’ll emphasize the crpped (non)pedagogue’s embodied defiance of norms, enfleshing a fluidity of educational outcomes or in-determinations and fleetingly engaging in anti-theoretical and/or nonsensical inquiries qua crppedness as my specific invocation (Schiro, 2012). (2) Following, I will introduce some specific examples of anti-oppressive educational possibilities and pedagogies. For instance, I will focus on recent educational inquiries (Rosales & Garcia, 2023) and legislative actions (Schwartz, 2023) that pull on anti-oppressive pedagogies. I will provide a contextual analysis of anti-oppressive pedagogies as fleetingly anti-normative and fleetingly suggestive of crpped (non)pedagogies that embrace more anti-normative invocations. Within the same section, I will also anchor my discussion of anti-oppressive pedagogies by challenging the re-normativizations of educational and socio-institutional paradigms within/of such frames. My arguments will highlight the transitory challenges of anti-oppressive pedagogies and their reconstructive impulses qua normativity. Thus, by pulling on crip theory and some of Deleuze and Guattari’s invocations qua immanence and deterritorialization (refusing the economic processes of reterritorialization via the immanence of immanence) (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983; Deleuze & Guattari, 1996; Günzel, 1998), my explorations with anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies will inform and deform understandings of what crpped (non)pedagogies might feel like within/of their embodied refusal of normativity and their continual deterritorializations of normativizations (even as such challenges upend inscriptions of education qua normativity or education qua social justice) (Valcarlos et al., 2020; Deleuze & Guattari, 1996) (3) Finally, in the last substantial section of the piece, I will draw upon some more praxical (non)pedagogies to exemplify moments of crppedness. Thus, I will fleetingly play with crpped (non)educative practices, including teaching badly, refusing to teach, and teaching in contradiction to established curricula, societal norms, and legislative mandates to gesture toward more anti-normative possibilities.
that remain mutational and aleatory (even within my own gesticulations)\(^2\) (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983 and 1996).

Ultimately, while my arguments play with the possibilities of crippled (non)pedagogies, I neither suggest that such pedagogical/non-pedagogical invocations are necessarily just/humanizing nor do I presuppose the formations of such crippled (non)pedagogies as determinative. For instance, while I use certain aleatory formations of crippled (non)pedagogies within my final section as praxical examples, I refuse to pre-suppose any formation/deformation of crippled (non)pedagogies. Rather, crippled (non)pedagogies are multiplicitous and nonsensical – simultaneously gesturing toward multiplicative onto-epistemes and toward embodied/visceral incoherence qua the crippled/nonverbal/aberrant mindbody. By the “end” of the article, I will present/refuse to present crippled (non)pedagogies as more anti-normative issuances of educational possibilities/impossibilities (more radical terrains for imagining/de-imagining education/miseducation aberrantly).

Crip Theory and a Framework

Crip theory, as a theoretical framework, has been explored as immanent (Gutteridge, 2019), transgressive (McRuer, 2006), and self(s)-rhetorical (Yergeau, 2018). Since the beginning of the 20th century, it has evolved from its early role as a reformulation of queer theory’s interrogation of heteronormativity (McRuer, 2006; Rich, 1983) to becoming a provocatively theoretical force in its own right. Crip theory, akin to mad studies and the like, is a critique of rationalistic, humanistic, and normative modes/means of constructing/maintaining being, thought, and reality (Wynters, 2003; Thorneycroft, 2020). It has continuously challenged the notions of compulsory able-bodiedness and normativity – perpetually disrupting the determinative constructions of the human mindbody. For instance, McRuer (2006), a central figure in crip theory, has continuously upset the bounds of rationality, the human, and the being as normative and insidiously powerful constructions of compulsory able-bodiedness. Even more so, by engaging with cripnessness and radical alterity/aberrance, the framework/anti-framework of crip theory has

\(^2\) While I gesture toward nonsense and multiplicitousness within the piece, I do not want to engage in re-normativizing examples of crippled (non)pedagogies or anti-oppressive impulses. Rather, such exemplifications or gesticulations remain multiplicitously evocative – producing a multiply locutale space of possibilities as immanent and as a nonsensical crip pedagogical embodiment that actively refuses normative attenuation of itself (Bierdz, 2023; Thorneycroft, 2020; Deleuze and Guattari, 1996).
repetitively rejected re-constructing a normative notion of existence. For instance, rather than redefining a normative model of politics, being, and/or thought along the grains of a particular crippedness, crip theory has continued to upend normativizations as inherently limiting and violent – playing at more anti-normative lines of flight (Bierdz, 2023).

While crip studies shares roots with queer studies and continues to explore similar themes, such as envisioning alternative embodiments and desires alongside crippedness and disability (McRuer, 2006, p. 32), it also seeks to disrupt normativity beyond the immediate purview of queerness and/or identity. Crip theory intends to challenge, for instance, the continual violations of cripped bodyminds, knowledges/dis-knowledges,3 and realities/non-realities in educational settings via the segregation of cripped folks, their continued ostracization, and massively increased rates of institutional punishment/discipline (Lau, 2022). Crip theory, therefore, endeavors to contemplate and engage with normativity as a made-fundamental aspect of thought, being, and reality as indicative within/of educational contexts: “Resisting normativity, here through the activity of crippling, always comes from somewhere” (Karlsson & Rydström, 2023, p. 401; Thorneycroft, 2020). Thus, as I complement crip studies in this article, I will maintain and shift between three primary considerations of crip theory in contrast to the re-normativizing work of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies (Joseph-Salisbury & Connelly, 2021). (1) First, I will argue that crip studies and crip theory are mutable signifiers – ever-evolving and fleeting assemblages of mutational anti-normativity – a theoretical/anti-theoretical trajectory that perpetually reshapes itself both sensically and nonsensically. Crip studies embodies/enfleshes an ongoing process of becoming and an act of rebellion against normative theoretical frameworks as immanently constructible/deconstructible (Thorneycroft, 2020). For example, Sandahl argues,

Moreover, the term cripple, like queer, is fluid and ever-changing, claimed by those whom it did not originally define. As a pejorative, the term queer was originally targeted at gays and lesbians, yet its rearticulation as a term of pride is currently claimed by those who may not consider themselves homosexual, such as the transgendered, transsexuals, heterosexual sex radicals, and others. 

2003, p. 27

---

3 By playing with the dis- of disability, I want to gesture toward more anti-normative notions/non-notions of knowledge and the like throughout the piece: spacetimes and possibilities/impossibilities of education, knowledge, thought, etc. that may be more possible given a more anti-normative approach to education/schooling/dis-schooling.
Crip studies defies the categorizational determinations of identity-based politics and refuses theoretical work as normatively defining (Canagarajah, 2019). For instance, in *Crip Negativity*, Smilges argues for a plastic ontology that mirrors the mutability of thecripped: “That is, a plasticizing ontology captures how [a plastic] ontological category, such as “disabled,” might initiate or sustain a person’s plasticization” (Smilges, 2023, p. 30).

Furthermore, my (2) second consideration of crip theory will argue that crip studies does not seek to establish or uphold normative interpretations – processes that create and maintain standardized boundaries of understanding as a way to preserve one's existence, reality, or being. Instead, crip studies embraces its anti-normative impulse within/of theoretical/anti-theoretical work and crippe...
locution/dis-locution that eschews fixed self-other dichotomies that are inhered by normative theoretical frameworks and determinable pedagogical methodologies. Informed by the crippled works of Yergeau (2018), Piepzn-Samarasinha (2022), and Deleuze and Guattari (1983 and 1987), I resist the tendency to other or externalize meaning from the self(s) as a propagation of normative identity-formation or knowledge-production. Stemming from a transdisciplinary approach of crip theory, critical theory, and postfoundational theory (McRuer, 2006; Joseph, 1998; Schalk, 2013), my work posits the self(s) not as a definitive identity/category but as a constellation of becomings, continuously in flux and resistant to normative delineations qua Deleuze and Guattari’s becomings as immanent and mutational (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983 and 1996). Moreover, as I gesture toward possibilities ofcripped (non) pedagogies in my last constitutive section, I want to argue that the cripped self(s) refuses to externalize its gesticulations beyond the immanence of the self(s) and summarily challenges normative theoretical work that attempts to define forms of knowledge or determinable pedagogical models outside of its very immanence. Thus, as I invoke the cripped self(s) as mutationally immanent, I want to grapple with a self(s)-reflexive lens via my gesticulations toward cripped (non) pedagogies that refrains from imposing determinative/ reterritorializing pedagogical models.

Therefore, my work champions a self(s) locus/non-locus/dis-locus that does not seek to establish coherence through oppositional constructs, such as human/nonhuman or animal/human, but rather celebrates an immanent spectrum of embodied sensibilities/dis-sensibilities that are not only constantly mutating but also non-determinable as significatory, pedagogical, or discursive assemblages. While this suggestion/invocation of the mutational self(s) via cripped (non) pedagogies may challenge the individual teacher/educator to grapple with constant curricular mutations and potential illegitimations, such accesses to cripped (non)pedagogies maintain immanence and reject externalizations/normativizations. This theoretical/anti-theoretical shift moves away from the constraints of conventional theory and pedagogy, proposing a self(s)-ing that retains the transgressive spirit of crip studies and continuously rejects any stable/static formation/determination of pedagogical/non-pedagogical/anti-pedagogical construction. The cripped self(s) qua cripped (non) pedagogies honors the multiplicitousness, contradictoriness, and rebellious/aleatory experiences of embodied crippledness/aberrance, fostering an understanding/dis-understanding of the self(s) and cripped (non) pedagogy that is perpetually in motion and unconfined/in-determined (Yergeau, 2018; Mills & Sanchez, 2023): “We meander. We (as cripped folks) are
like streams or rivers that wend our way along a course and go our own way doing it” (Piepzna-Samarasinha, 2022, p. 214)

Ultimately, how can education be fleetingly and improvisationally crippled – continuously mutating and nonsensical? What avenues exist to re-imagine/de-imagine pedagogy, a typically normative educational component, as a vehicle for anti-normativity or more anti-normative impulses? In other words, it is not my intention in this work to prescribe/proscribe a crippled pedagogy or to establish determinative methods for facilitating education in more liberating or non-violent manners (as such work has already been undertaken, including the realms of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies) (Kumashiro, 2002; Crass, 2013). Rather, my focus in this piece is to engage with the concept/non-concept of crippled (non)pedagogies: (non)pedagogies that defy conventional definitions and (non)pedagogies that undermine insidious re-normativizations within/of educational contexts. While my arguments will consider anti-oppressive pedagogies as a particular means by which we may be able to imagine a less violent/oppressive educational possibility (a contextually derived more anti-normative insinuation/intimation), I want to play with crippled (non)pedagogies as more aleatory and anti-normative approaches to education, gesturing toward the multipliciousness of the crippled (McRuer, 2006), the mutations of the crippled (Mitchell, Snyder, & Ware, 2014), and the nonsense/dis-locutions of the crippled qua echolalia or the autistic grunt (Deleuze, 1993; Mills & Sanchez, 2023). In particular, rather than eschewing the echolalic or the dyslexic as necessarily abnormal to determinable notions of rationality/sensicality, I want to continue to present crippled (non)pedagogies that immanently play with knowings/dis-knowings that are livable via the materiality and viscerality of crippledness.

Therefore, as we move forward within this exploration, I will argue the following points alongside my invocations of crippled theory: (1) Crippped (non)pedagogies are inherently fleeting, characterized by their transgressive and immanent nature (Mitchell, Snyder, & Ware, 2014; Deleuze and Guattari, 1983). They enable “anomalous embodiment” within and beyond the educational moment and space while retaining the potential for livable experiences via such immanence (Canagarjah, 2023, p. 19). (2) Crippped (non)pedagogies are mutationally transgressive and, at times, nonsensical, thereby challenging and disrupting sensical frameworks typically associated with education and learning (embodving the nonverbal autistic, the schizo-hallucinatory terrain, and the Tourette’s harangue (Mills & Sanchez, 2023)). Crippped (non)pedagogies embrace nonsensicality and indeterminacy – non-deterministically, for example, grappling with interdependent subjectifications and non-discrete knowledges/knowings (Mitchell, Snyder, & Ware, 2014; Kafer, 2013; Hanebutt
& Mueller, 2021). Though refusing prescription/proscription, cripped (non) pedagogies may mirror the echolalia of absurdist theater or the nonsense of the making-dyslexic literacy methods/non-methods. (3) Finally, it is also necessary to explore cripped (non)pedagogies within/of the self(s). The cripped self(s) as an evocation of cripped (non)pedagogies therefore engages ephemerality/mutation and disrupts the normative and sensical apparatuses/constructions that are made-inherent within pedagogy and pedagogical research. This transgression of dialogical methods and our embrace of the cripped self(s)/(non)pedagogies as mutational and non-significatory (crippedness) challenges how pedagogies/educative apparatuses seek to construct and maintain knowledge systems that are necessarily normative and violent (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983).

**Anti-Oppressive Pedagogies, Renormativizations, and Intimations of Crippling**

Following, I will delve more deeply into the fleeting and contextual anti-normative aspects of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies, grappling with how they attempt to limit violence in educational systems while at the same time challenging particular norms and summarily reconstructing other norms. In other words, I will argue that anti-oppressive pedagogies construct a fleeting connection to anti-normativity that is perpetually ephemeral and necessarily intended to construct/maintain other norms within/of such educational spaces. In particular, I want to bring out this fleeting anti-normativity of anti-oppressive pedagogies given our contemporary context in education to gesticulate toward and begin to play with more anti-normative intimations of cripped (non)pedagogies – pedagogical/non-pedagogical issuances that refuse the re-normative/reterritorializing impulses of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies given their intimations of determinative/delineatory politics and ethics to sustain more a perpetual and radical immanence of immanence (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996; Günzel, 1998).

In recent years, there has been a surge in new legislation, a flood of news stories, numerous investigations involving teachers and schools, and a continued prevalence of neoliberal and necropolitical policies and discourses surrounding education and teachers (Mbembe, 2019). Given CRT’s central position in these discussions, theorists such as Delgado and Stefancic (2012) and Crenshaw (1991) grapple with the complexities of these educational challenges and advocate for how educators construct anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies in response. For instance, these socio-political
developments have sought to curtail educators’ capacity to embrace and enact anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies in their classrooms and educational institutions – attempting to mitigate and illegalize how teachers and educators can challenge normative positions of white supremacy, heteronormativity, and the like within/of schooling, learning, and teaching (Schwartz, 2023; Rosales & Garcia, 2023; and Kumashiro, 2000). In many ways, our present legislative and educational contexts have criminalized anti-oppressive pedagogies, effectively rendering illegal the efforts of educators and teachers to challenge oppressive norms, implement anti-oppressive curricula, and/or support other educators engaged in anti-oppressive practices. Consequently, as various theorists advocate for forms of anti-oppressive pedagogies in our contemporary moment (coming from CRT, black studies, queer studies, critical pedagogy studies, etc.) (Kumashiro, 2002; Crass, 2013), educators who support such praxis must clandestinely maintain subversive pedagogies (a semblance of anti-normativity) to address issues related to racial hegemony, gender identity, and students’ rights to self-governance and autonomy (Kumashiro, 2002; Crass, 2013; Joseph-Salisbury & Connelly, 2020). Thus, while acknowledging the foundational critiques of normativity qua white supremacy and heteronormativity by CRT scholars like Ladson-Billings (1998) and queer studies scholars like Kumashiro (2002), I want to suggest that crip (non) pedagogies perpetually and consistently extend this critique of normativity to the realm of the mindbody, rationality/irrationality, and knowledge production/maintenance. Thus, as I bring anti-oppressive pedagogies to the fore, I want to use such critical engagements to position anti-oppressive pedagogies as contextually anti-normative within our current educational and legal moment and as substantively re-normative as well, gesturing toward anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies as intimate accesses to what crip (non)pedagogies may think/dis-think and feel/dis-feel like.

In this section, I will pull on and interrogate two contextually driven realities that substantiate anti-oppressive pedagogies as fleeting anti-normative: (1) the prohibition of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in certain states (Schwartz, 2023) and (2) the investigation of a public-school teacher in Florida (Rosales & Garcia, 2023). By exploring the context of our contemporary educational discourse, I will play with the fleeting and ephemeral opportunities for more anti-normative education(s) that anti-oppressive pedagogies make possible, thereby intonating and gesturing toward fleeting connections to what could be imagined as crip (non)pedagogies. For instance, even as anti-oppressive pedagogies challenge heteronormativity, white supremacy, and other hegemonic regimes within our educational realms and classrooms (Crenshaw, 1991; Delgado & Stefancic, 2012), I also want to argue that they also instantiate
and conform other normative boundaries of anti-racism, queerness, and anti-oppressiveness within/of their educative practices and curricula. While such norms may be more liberating given our current context (even more humanizing), I want to play with and gesture toward crippled (non)pedagogies as more crippled/cripping and as more anti-normative, thereby refusing any re-normativizations that attempt to define politics, knowledge, being, and/or reality in any determinative or delineatory way.

In recent years, over twenty states have either passed or have continued to write legislation banning the use/discussion of critical race theory in public schools (Schwartz, 2023). For example, in Tennessee in 2021, Governor Bill Lee signed a bill limiting how and why teachers can actively discuss racism and sexism in the classroom.

Republicans in the House made the legislation a last-minute priority, introducing provisions that ban schools from instructing students that one race bears responsibility for the past actions against another, that the United States is fundamentally racist, or that a person is inherently privileged or oppressive due to their race (Allison, 2021).

In other words, the legislation and prohibition of specific topics, discussions, and inquiries within the classroom serve to establish and reinforce the illegality of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies (their contextual anti-normativity). This legislation silences crucial CRT-informed dialogue and anti-racist pedagogical invocations (Bell, 1993) and embodies the type of normative constraint that crippled (non)pedagogies disrupt continuously, mutationally, and nonsensically. Therefore, anti-oppressive educators in states and municipalities with such restrictions must engage in anti-racist work that actively challenges social and discursive regulations related to racialization and oppressive systems. However, while states like New Hampshire, Texas, Florida, Virginia, Idaho, and many others have implemented various measures to criminalize and ban Critical Race Theory (CRT) in public schools, the link between anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies qua illegality and anti-normativity is contextual, spatial, and temporal, rather than foundational (Kumashiro, 2002; Beckett, 2015).

Although pedagogies like CRT, anti-oppressive pedagogies, and anti-racist pedagogies offer crucial anti-normative critiques of specific realms of embodiments/enfleshments (Christie & Lingard, 2020), crippled (non) pedagogies extend this challenge multiplicatively and mutationally – refusing any stability that necessarily intends to define knowledge or being. As Mitchell,
Snyder, and Ware (2016) argue, for instance, “Curricular cripistemologies, in contrast, openly advocate for the productive potential of failing normalization practices because such goals entail erasing the alternative values, practices, and flexible living arrangements that attend the negotiation of interdependent disabled lives” (p. 41). In other words, anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies embrace a form of momentary and context-dependent anti-normativity, yet they also inhere their own normative invocations of ethics, being, and reality alongside queerness and anti-racism: “that teacher education must be a place where students (re)imagine school subjectivities, who we are all ‘supposed to be’ in the space of the school, and how this is intimately connected to possibilities for socially just practices” (Gebhard, 2020, p. 15). Anti-oppressive educators inevitably create normative ethics, knowledge(s), and theoretical frameworks related to anti-oppression as part of their pedagogical approach (Au, 2009; Diem & Welton, 2020), and although such intimations may get us closer to a more anti-normative educations/miseducations/anti-educations, I want to continue to suggest that crippled (non)pedagogies are a more radical and in-stable possibility/impossibility that would allow us to unbind particular aspects of education as educative, determinative, productive, or the like.

Within the practices of anti-oppressive education, certain norms are necessarily established. These norms primarily revolve around fostering inclusive, equitable, and respectful learning environments. Educators emphasize the value of diversity, empathy, and open dialogue, encouraging students to critically engage with various perspectives: “this approach aims not merely to increase the students’ knowledge but to develop the students’ empathy for the Other” (Kumashiro, 2000, p. 31). Additionally, anti-oppressive education often instills a strong sense of social responsibility and a commitment to challenging systemic inequalities (Callaghan et al., 2023). This approach mirrors the foundational aspects of CRT, which also prioritizes dismantling systemic inequalities and champions a pedagogy responsive to students’ cultural experiences (Bell, 1993; Ladson-Billings, 1995). While these norms are vital for cultivating inclusive educational spaces – foundational to anti-oppressive pedagogical work – they also suggest a differentiation and contradistinction of how I argue crip (non)pedagogies enliven/enflesh a more transgressive and in-determinative anti-normative approach. As suggested by crippling and crip theory (McRuer, 2006; Yergeau, 2018; Thorneycroft, 2020), crippled (non)pedagogies consistently, multiplicously, and mutationally embody anti-normative impulses – consistently and perpetually challenging normative boundaries (and boundary-productions) of thought, reality, and education. Such crippled (non)pedagogies perpetually disrupt the normative boundaries of what education should look and feel like, as well as how teachers...
conceive/reconceive teaching. Thus, as I grapple with this connection to anti-oppressive pedagogies, I want to demonstrate a fleeting impulse of anti-normativity within our contemporary moment and further elicit imaginations/in-determinations of what crippled (non)pedagogies may think/dis-think, look/dis-look, and feel/dis-feel like as more mutationally and perpetually anti-normative – an unstable pedagogical non-pedagogy. Moreover, while anti-oppressive educational norms are crucial within our current hegemonic context, it is also imperative to recognize that they, too, can benefit from the disruptive insights offered by crip theory andcripping, which can serve to continuously transform/unbound our understandings/dis-understandings of education/schooling from incessant/interminable re-normativizations/reterritorializations (Shakespeare, 2010: Deleuze & Guattari, 1983).

Continuing, I want to provide another example of how anti-oppressive pedagogies can inadvertently intersect with criminality and contextually-bound anti-normative actions. I will interrogate a recent incident in Florida that involved a teacher being suspended for inadvertently upsetting normative boundaries of sexual and gender identity in their classroom. In early 2023, a teacher in Hernando County, Florida, named Barbee, came under investigation by their school board for showing a Disney movie featuring a gay character. This investigation was prompted by Florida’s new legislation requiring parental consent and school administration approval to show movies in class. Barbee, the teacher under investigation, intended to give her students a break after a series of standardized tests, and she selected a movie called “Strange World” due to its relevance to the curriculum’s standards on ecosystems and the environment (Rosales & Garcia, 2023). However, shortly after the movie screening, her local school board notified her that she had violated recent legislation regarding curricular content and that she was being put under investigation.

Barbee’s experiences and their situation highlight the anti-normative impulses (the illegal intensities) within/of anti-oppressive pedagogical practices, even as she implied that her actions were inadvertent. Her choice of movie, for instance, aimed to align her students’ classroom experiences with Florida’s science education curriculum standards, yet it led to her being incriminated and her teaching practices being investigated as illegitimate/illegal by the state. Moreover, even though Barbee denied that she intended to show the movie as part of an anti-oppressive pedagogical movement (as a means of inculcating her students within a queer/non-conforming timespace), her actions and the actions of the school board demonstrate the ways in which such seemingly anti-oppressive pedagogical intimations challenge normative determinations of heteronormativity and white supremacy and are thereby
incriminated within our current socio-political context. In other words, the incident created educative contexts within the classroom space that briefly challenged regimes of normativity and engaged in temporaneous and context-dependent anti-normative work. Even more so, while Barbee's actions temporarily challenged a normative boundary within her school district and introduced an anti-normative dimension related to queerness, their actions also underscored the temporal and context-dependent nature of anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogical engagements with anti-normativity and crippedness (Rosales & Garcia, 2023). As such, I want my argument qua crippedness to compel us to continuously reevaluate and recalibrate our understandings of education(s), knowledge(s), ethics, reality(s), and being(s), keeping them open to the spontaneous, the aberrant, and the subversive – where teaching/dis-teaching is not a normative/renormative project but an ever-evolving act/enfleshment of becoming, and education/miseducation/anti-education itself becomes a site of endless becoming, ever responsive to the ebb and flow of normativities in contention and subversion.

Ultimately, while anti-oppressive pedagogical efforts gesture towards liberation in various registers, they simultaneously risk re-normalizing/reterritorializing educational trajectories along politically and ethically determinable lines, inadvertently reinstating controls on what can be signified as being and knowing:

> It follows that anti-oppressive pedagogies share a common interest in just education and society by first critiquing the cultural imperialism of Western intellectual tradition and neoliberalism, and second, teaching in ways that work against inequitable forces of exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, and violence in education and society.

*Valcarlos et al., 2020, p. 347*

Cripped (non)pedagogies, however, call into question the entire architectures of normative pedagogical constructs (the maintenance of education qua educating – the production of particular knowledge(s)/ethics) and the insidious ways in which they perpetuate certain forms of violence/limitation qua the intonations of particular activist politics and determinative reorganizations of socio-institutional frameworks. Thus, I want to suggest that cripped (non)pedagogies, guided by the spirit of crip theory and cripping, cling to a consistent anti-normative impulse that revels in mutation, contradictoriness, and nonsense (an immanence of immanence) (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996) – thereby enlivening/enfleshing more transgressive possibilities for education, miseducation, and anti-education (dis-politics, anarchisms, aberrations, and
dis-beings) (Illich, 1971; Bey, 1991). Crippped (non)pedagogies, in particular, intend to deterritorialize without reterritorialization/renormativization (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983 and 1996). This commitment to anti-normativity, moreover, echoes Shakespeare’s (2010) contention for more transformative/radical pedagogical/anti-pedagogical practices that refuse to be confined to normative/renormative impulses of politics, knowledge, and teaching/learning, perpetually moving beyond the renormativizing impulses of anti-oppressive pedagogies as they intend to delineate knowledge, politics, and ethics qua anti-oppressive regimes.

Multivalent Directions of Crippped (non)Pedagogies

As I transition to the final substantive section of my exploration, I will play with some of the multidirectional and multiplicitous practices of crippped (non)pedagogies. Moreover, while I will grapple with some of the fleeting intonations of crippped (non)pedagogies, I also feel it pertinent to repeatedly argue that these exemplifications of crippped (non)pedagogies are neither directive nor totalizing; they continuously and mutationally “interrupt normative cultural practices” (Mitchell, Snyder, & Ware, 2016, p. 37). They are immanent intimations that remain deterritorializing even in their own fleeting instantiations. In a crippped way, I refuse proscription/prescription (McRuer, 2006; Johnson, 2014; Collins, Jones, & Rice, 2023); within this section, I will play with crippped practices/non-practices that reject traditional teaching methods, such as refusing to teach or embracing methods that are considered bad or ineffective by conventional standards. I want to destabilize and continuously reimagine/de-imagine not only the pedagogical and non-pedagogical timespaces of the classroom but also educations/miseducations/non-educations/anti-educations.

Moreover, I will discuss the challenges that crippped (non)pedagogies face and how they can more profoundly embody a more anti-normative ethos, even as they consistently flail at the edges of anti-normativity and immanence. First, I will interrogate what might be called teaching badly, a strategy/anti-strategy that involves subverting traditional roles and expectations to create spaces/nonspaces for emergence and immanence. Second, I will consider the possibilities/impossibilities of refusing to teach as a crippped (non)pedagogical invocation of deterritorialization. Third, I will explore the possibilities/impossibilities of negating/eschewing social, educational, and legal boundaries as a deliberate pursuit of anti-normativity – embracing illegal forms of activism and the like. Finally, I will also spend some time interrogating the
limitations of crippled (non)pedagogies, gesturing toward deterritorializations and immanences of immanence as continual projects of cripping (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996; Bierdz, 2023).

The concept of teaching badly conventionally emerges from a critical pedagogical theory (Biesta, 2013; Kumashiro, 2002; Illich, 1971); however, I will reposition such frames qua crip studies and interrogate how crippled (non) pedagogies may engage in teaching badly to subvert more normative educational contexts (a more explicit challenge to the regimentations of normativity). Moreover, I argue that teaching badly is an advocacy for ineffective or unproductive teaching and a more radical pedagogical stance that may intentionally engage in more deviant notions of cognition, learning, and knowledge. This crippled approach of teaching badly, therefore, aligns and enlivens the foundations of crip theory via anti-normativity, irrationality, and aberrance. Thus, as I intimate teaching badly, I am gesturing toward direct and sustained delimitations of normative standards/enactments, actively seeking to dismantle the structures/regimes that define and confine conventional educational experiences (Loutzenheiser & Erevelles, 2019).

Teaching badly, qua cripping and the criped, are (non)pedagogical praxes that celebrate variance and operate via cripped/broken pedagogies – an embodied and active refusal of the educative process as a method of co-opting living experience and/or reifying knowledge(s)/beings. Teaching badly via crippedness manifests deterritorializingly – immanently immanent of all possibilities simultaneously without mandating particular practices. Thus, I want to refuse/crip the economic processes of Deleuze and Guattari qua deterritorialization/reterritorialization and maintain the immanence of the criped – the autistic groan or echolalia as an immanence of immanence that refuses any determinative lines of renormativization/reterritorialization (Mills & Sanchez, 2023). Teaching badly, therefore, might manifest as an educator resisting the urge to correct mistakes as potential sites of learning or mislearning – allowing students to engage in work and construct their own knowledges whether they are rational/irrational, factual/counter-factual, or determinable/in-determinable. Even so, teaching badly could also involve allowing classes/courses to be entirely student-led, with the teacher absent in defining/determining learning objectives or teaching methodologies. In such possibilities, the criped learning process is in-deterministically chaotic, multiplicitous, mutational, and more anti-normative since the students’ knowledges/knowings remain aleatory without determination or correction. Moreover, although anti-oppressive pedagogies play with the possibilities of teaching badly (Kumashiro, 2002; Boler & Zembylas, 2002), there remains an underlying impulse to sustain (though mutate) certain educational/political
standards and outcomes as suggested in the previous section: “an embrace of the politics of abolition” (Stovall, 2018, p. 56). Crippled (non)pedagogies, on the other hand, propose/de-compose a learning/mis-learning/de-learning/anti-learning environment where we can re-imagine/de-imagine the possibilities/impossibilities of education qua miseducation and/or (non)educations.

Second, the act of refusing to teach comes from multiple locations within educational thought: Freire (2000), Rodríguez (2019), bell hooks (1994), Tuck and Yang (2014), and others. However, by bringing such refusals to the forefront of our conversation, I want to crip such practices. Thus, by refusing to teach, the teacher embraces chaotic moments/non-moments extended over the spacetime of their refusal. By criping their refusal to teach, they conjure more immanent and aleatory forms of educations/dis-educations. Pulling on a particularly decolonial vein, “One way to deny the power of the colonizer is to refuse to engage with the world on colonial terms and by refuting colonial taxonomies that shunt people and ideas into binary, oppositional, and fixed categories” (Romero, 2022, p. 133; Rodríguez, 2019): however still, by criping such refusal, such (non)pedagogies also refuse to reconstruct determinative engagements with reality(s), knowledge(s), and beings. An active, criped refusal to teach repudiates any normative approaches to teaching/learning, cognition, and/or thought – an active deterritorialization that refuses to reterritorialize (or begin again to teach) (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996; Canagarajah, 2023); such criped refusal, therefore, maintains more anti-normative approaches to educative/dis-educative timespaces, continuing to expand/distend the realms of educations/mis-educations/anti-educations, notions of being/nonbeing/becomings, and possibilities/impossibilities of politics/dis-politics.

Crip theory and an active engagement with the politics/dis-politics of refusal resists the imposition of singular ways/means of learning and/or being (Loutzenheiser & Erevelles, 2019). The more anti-normative impulse within the criping/criped notions of refusing to teach can foreground the lived experiences of criped/aberrant individuals, thus reframing refusal a necessity for survival and resistance against ableist and compulsory able-bodyminded educational practices and spacetimes (McRuer, 2006; Yergeau, 2018). By intertwining/mediating (immanently) crip theory with the practices of refusing to teach, educators can create and/or engender spacetimes that are not just decolonial but are also more fluid, immanent, multiplicitous, and mutational. Thus, refusing to teach within/of cripedness becomes an active, consistent, and mutational refusal akin to refusing diagnosis and/or definition (Bierdz, 2023), thereby consistently challenging what is considered normal
and/or standard, opening up spaces for radically re-imaging/de-imagining the possibilities/impossibilities of education(s).

Third, the final direction within/of crpped non(pedagogies) that I will preliminarily grapple with is the invocation/evocation of teaching illegally. For instance, teaching illegally challenges curricular/educational constraints by introducing students to banned books/censored content or by promoting civil disobedience or other forms of activism that are often deemed illegal. Teaching illegally via crppedness is a broad concept/non-concept (an assemblage that refuses reterritorialization) that covers immanent and aleatory pedagogies/non-pedagogies that continually and mutationally transgress the normative bounds of legislative systems, educational practices, and judicial constraints. Furthermore, while teaching illegally suggests connections to abolitionist teaching (Gillespie and Naidoo, 2021), fugitive pedagogies (Joseph, 1988; Givens, 2021), and/or decolonial pedagogies (Rodríguez, 2010; Romero, 2022), crpping such (non)pedagogical invocations would continue to deterterritorialize and remain immanent, refusing to determine/delineate any stable ethical, political, or educational formations/possibilities.

Teaching illegally is an intentional act (a mutational and continual embodiment) that fosters critical interrogations of the underlying power structures that perpetually shape/re-shape societal norms, censorship, and the very constructions of knowledge(s). This pedagogical/(non)pedagogical stance qua crpped disruption and immanence not only involves students in critical reflections against societal inequities, such as political activism and demonstrations, but also continues to actively deterterritorialize political, ethical, and educational territories (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983 and 1996). While incorporating elements of abolitionist pedagogies (Gillespie & Naidoo, 2021; Dunn et al., 2021), for instance, crpped anti-normative lines of flight via teaching illegally continue to disrupt the limitations of identity politics and extend the scopes of activism(s)/inactivism(s)/refusals, the possibilities/impossibilities of knowing(s)/knowledge(s), and the imaginings/de-imaginings of educations/miseducations/anti-educations. Teaching illegally within/of crpping/crppedness is an ongoing challenge (a continual deterterritorialization) to normative political, educational, and social constructions. Instead, crpped teaching illegally champions a radical mutability that persistently questions and reshapes our understandings/dis-understandings of being, thought, and reality. Thus, rooted in the ethos of crip theory, teaching illegally is not a mere deviation from the norm but a committed, strategic practice/unpractice aimed at a continuous and contradictory dismantling of normative educational paradigms.
Ultimately, while engaging with their multidirectional and multiplicitous embodiments/engagements, it is paramount to assert that these criped practices are not mere contrarian stances but are rooted in a profound critique of pedagogical normativities/normativizations: “crip desire and crip wisdom ... deterritorializes” (Collins, Jones, & Rice, 2023, p. 24). These criped invocations/evocations represent an embodied and active refusal of the traditional educative processes (McRuer, 2006; Thorneycroft, 2020), thereby challenging the very methods through which education conventionally/determinedly (normatively) co-opt living experience and reifies knowledge(s) and beings. These pedagogical refusals are deterritorializing, resisting any static reification even as it manifests in transient forms (Mitchell, Snyder, & Ware, 2014). Such criped praxes starkly contrast more prescriptive/proscriptive pedagogies/non-pedagogies, even those that embrace more radical trajectories such as abolitionist teaching, fugitive pedagogies, or decolonial pedagogies (Rodríguez, 2010; Stovall, 2018; Givens, 2021; Romero, 2022). By committing to a mutational and continual deterritorialization, these criped (non)pedagogies unsettle the notions of educational spaces as fixed/determinative sites of knowledge transmission/production (Loutzenheiser & Erevelles, 2019). Moreover, while teaching badly and other criped, immanently deconstructible practices are intimated by critical pedagogies, they more non-deterministically and mutationally refuse to define/delineate ethical, political, and education possibilities/impossibilities. These immanent and criping/cripped practices celebrate variance, challenge co-optation, and operate via a (non)pedagogy that is inherently broken – indeed criped: criped mindbodies "are moment and sites of possibilities when and where the assemblage and its striations might be disrupted or deterritorialized" (Youdell & Armstrong, 2011, p. 145). Finally, though I simultaneously reject criped (non)pedagogies as “solutions” to educational, ethical, or political dilemmas, I argue that they offer us something much more valuable via cripness (Hendricks, 2021). Rather than fixing educational inequities and various inhered forms of violence and oppression, I want to position criped (non)pedagogies as more imaginative/de-imaginative/re-imaginative deterritorializations that un-determine possibilities/impossibilities of education(s), ethics, politics, knowledge(s), realities, and beings.

**Interruptive Remarks for a Continual Crippring**

Throughout this exploration, my inquiries have revolved around the concept/non-concept of what could possibly constitute criped (non)pedagogies as
immanent, multiplicitous, nonsensical, and imaginative/de-imaginative. How can cripped (non)pedagogies challenge and continue to challenge normalcy? How can such (non) pedagogies continuously rebel against pervasive and subversive regulations of normativity within educational systems while at the same time imagining/de-imagining othered/aberrant possibilities/impossibilities for education? How can two seemingly contradictory aspects, crippedness and pedagogy, coexist and simultaneously deconstruct established meanings while refusing any newer, normatively bound significatory regimes qua teaching/learning? I initially grounded this interrogation/exploration in crip studies and crippling; I argued that by invoking crippling I was enfleshing a continual line of flight that deterritorialized continuously without reterritorializing or re-founding normative dimensions (Bierdz, 2023; Thorneycroft, 2020). Following, I then invoked/evoked more contemporary works in pedagogical studies, particularly within more radical movements of critical pedagogy, abolitionist pedagogies, and anti-oppressive pedagogies. These initial forays served as an immanent foundation for our specific inquiry into what it means to “cripple” pedagogy within/of the context of the ongoing struggle against normativity and normative regimentations – challenging the organizations of pedagogy and teaching/learning as foundationally compulsory able-mindbodied (McRuer, 2006; Loutzenheiser & Erevelles, 2019; Thorneycroft, 2020).

Furthermore, as we delved deeper into this piece, I continued to establish a link (a connective tissue – a immanent relation) with anti-oppressive pedagogies in order to illustrate the brief access to anti-normativity that these pedagogical approaches offered as praxical attempts at subverting normative bounds of heteronormativity and white supremacy within the US current context. Thus, within US education, being anti-oppressive necessitates fleeting acts of rebellion; educators must challenge racist norms that underpin our educational systems and disrupt the prevailing oppressive, constrictive, and hegemonic educational discourses that engender racist, sexist, heterosexist, and classist distributions of power and discipline (Kumashiro, 2002; Kinloch & Dixon, 2017). While I initially explored the challenge to normativity that anti-oppressive pedagogies present in our contemporary moment as a hint of what a cripped (non)pedagogy might entail (an embodied refusal of normative foundations), I also problematized the re-normativizations and reterritorializations that anti-oppressive and anti-racist pedagogies invoke/d – thereby determining/inhering particular ethical, political, and rationalistic frameworks qua education. I used the very transience of this act of rebellion/refusal to gesture toward the enduring acts/enactments/embodiments of rebellion and anti-normativity within/of cripped (non)pedagogies (Deleuze...
Thus, by drawing upon crip studies as our theoretical foundation and suggesting a practical and transient connective issuance to/from anti-oppressive pedagogies, I sought to highlight my central challenge: how do cripped (non)pedagogies grapple with the fundamental call for anti-normativity within educational contexts that appear to demand standardized constructs of knowledge and normative judgments of human capabilities and behaviors? By juxtaposing anti-oppressive pedagogies with my exploration of cripped (non)pedagogies, how can cripped (non)pedagogies maintain their commitment to anti-normativity while avoiding re-normalizations/reterritorializations?

Thus, within the final section of the article, I drew on the concepts of anti-normativity (Hanebutt & Mueller, 2021; Loutzenheiser & Erevelles, 2019) via more praxical modelings/anti-modelings of cripped studies/cripping (Mills & Sanchez, 2023; Givens, 2021; Gillespie & Naidoo, 2021; Kumashiro, 2002; Illich, 1971) and immanence/mutation/deterritorializations (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983; Gutteridge, 2019) to more praxically gesture toward immanent possibilities/impossibilities of cripped (non)pedagogies. I explored/intimated the possibilities of teaching badly as a potential manifestation of cripped (non)pedagogies (Kumashiro, 2000; Biesta, 2013). Following that, I hinted at the notions of refusing to teach as potential aspects of cripped (non) pedagogies (Romero, 2022, p. 133; Rodríguez, 2019), and finally, I delved deeper into the opportunities of intentionally and continuously breaking and transgressing laws, policies, and norms as potential expressions of cripped (non)pedagogies (Joseph, 1988; Givens, 2021). Moreover, while all of these pedagogical initiatives can be found outside of cripped thought, particularly within critical pedagogical studies, I continued to use such precipices as means of complementation and mutation. Thus, I continued to pull upon cripped thought and Deleuzo-Guattarian impulses/intensities within/of cripped embodiments/enfleshments to more anti-foundationally challenge educational, schooling, and pedagogical attachments to normative regimes of thought/rationality, being/compulsory able-bodymindedness, and reality. Throughout this exploration, I contemplated the possibilities/impossibilities (the imaginings and de-imagining work) within/of cripped pedagogies by drawing upon anti-oppressive pedagogies, critical pedagogies, and crip theory, thereby mutually positioning and re-positioning/de-positioning cripped (non)pedagogies as mutationally, multiplicotously, and nonsensically anti-normative and transgressive. Ultimately, though I am suggesting more immanent lines of flight and continual deterritorializations qua cripped (non) pedagogies to re-imagine/de-imagine the limits of educational possibilities/impossibilities, I refuse to suggest cripped (non)pedagogies as solutions or
“cures” for educational work/thought. Rather, such invocations/evocations are means by which we may be able to more expansively and non-deterministically grapple with the limits/non-limits of what education could be in-determined as, such as constructing more anti-normative knowledges, ethics, educations, and politics (Loutzenheiser & Erevelles, 2019).
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