International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

Reframing Moral Philosophy through Disabled Ethics: Autonomy, Personhood, and the Politics of Care

Awadhesh Patel

Assistant Professor, Lady Shri Ram College for Women, University of Delhi, India

Author Email: awadheshpatel@lsr.du.ac.in

Abstract—This paper critically explores how disabled ethics reshapes traditional moral philosophy by challenging dominant notions of autonomy, personhood, and justice. Positioned against the ableist foundations of Western moral thought, disabled ethics emphasizes inclusion, interdependence, and the lived experiences of disabled individuals. Tracing its intellectual lineage from classical and religious texts to contemporary disability rights movements, the paper contrasts the medical model of disability with the social and relational models. Drawing on key theorists like Eva Feder Kittay, Lennard Davis, Anita Silvers, and others, it argues for an ethics rooted in care, vulnerability, and mutual dependency rather than abstract rationality or independence. The discussion incorporates intersectional and non-Western perspectives—highlighting the cultural, spiritual, and social meanings attached to disability across African, South Asian, East Asian, and Islamic traditions. The study concludes by examining the policy implications of disabled ethics in healthcare, education, and law, advocating for proactive inclusion and participatory justice. Ultimately, the paper redefines the moral landscape to affirm that justice and dignity must account for the full spectrum of human embodiment and interdependence.

Keywords: Disabled Ethics, Personhood and Autonomy, Politics of Care, Ableism and Justice, Intersectional Disability Studies

I. INTRODUCTION

Moral philosophy across much of intellectual history has been grounded in ideals of rational self-sufficiency, bodily autonomy, and independence as defining markers of moral worth, from Plato's Republic and Aristotle's Politics, which implicitly assumed the able-bodied citizen as the norm, to Enlightenment thinkers such as Locke and Kant who equated moral agency with reason and independent action; these traditions shaped modern liberal democracies, where autonomy, framed in individualistic and ableist terms, marginalizes disabled persons within what Lennard J. Davis (1995) terms the "hegemony of normalcy"; in India, this legacy intersects with religious, cultural, and colonial histories, as seen in the Manusmriti's karmic framing of disability (Olivelle, 2005), Islamic jurisprudence's paternalistic charity (Alnaser, 2024), and colonial medicalized charity models reinforcing dependency (Miles, 2002), with postcolonial approaches too often continuing welfare-based, assimilationist perspectives that position disabled persons as objects of aid rather than rights-bearing subjects; consequently, even landmark developments like the UNCRPD (2007) and the RPwD Act (2016), while legally significant, have not fundamentally disrupted the entrenched moral assumptions underlying social policy, thereby necessitating a critical re-examination of disability ethics to develop alternative frameworks of care, interdependence, and justice that can more adequately inform policy in the Indian context.

I.II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The central problem this paper addresses is the **disjuncture between formal rights recognition and substantive moral inclusion**. Legal reforms such as the RPwD Act (2016) have expanded the definition of disability from 7 to 21 categories and

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

mandated a 4% reservation in public sector jobs for persons with benchmark disabilities. The **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020** promotes inclusive education, and the **Accessible India Campaign (Sugamya Bharat Abhiyan)** seeks to eliminate physical and digital barriers. However, despite these frameworks, **ableist cultural norms** persist in education, healthcare, and employment sectors, constraining the lived experiences of disabled persons. This disconnect is partly due to the **philosophical underpinnings** of current policy. Most policy frameworks are built upon a liberal conception of autonomy that equates moral agency with independence. This fails to acknowledge what disability scholars such as Eva Feder Kittay (1999) and Anita Silvers (1998) argue: **dependency and vulnerability are not exceptions to human life but its universal conditions**. By centering independence, policies unintentionally marginalize those whose autonomy is necessarily **relational**—dependent on caregivers, assistive technologies, or community networks.

I.III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To reconceptualize autonomy from an individualistic capacity to an interdependent reality that values mutual care.
- To redefine personhood so as to include those whose cognitive, sensory, or physical capacities fall outside ableist norms.
- To reimagine justice in a way that moves beyond non-discrimination toward proactive inclusion and participatory governance.
- To bridge the theoretical–practical divide between moral philosophy and public policy in India by aligning ethical reasoning with the lived realities of disabled persons.

I.IV. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a theoretical–normative methodology supplemented by policy analysis and comparative philosophical review, engaging primary philosophical texts from Western and non-Western traditions such as Kittay's *Love's Labor* (1999), Davis's *Enforcing Normalcy* (1995), and Silvers's essays on justice and disability; disability studies scholarship that critiques the medical model and advances social and relational models of disability (Oliver, 1990; Shakespeare, 2006); Indian policy frameworks including the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), National Education Policy (2020), Accessible India Campaign (2015), Ayushman Bharat – Health and Wellness Centres, and Skill India with Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Grameen Kaushalya Yojana (DDU-GKY); international human rights instruments such as the UNCRPD (2006) and WHO Global Disability Action Plan (2014–2021); and an interdisciplinary approach drawing on philosophy, public policy, legal studies, and sociology to examine how disabled ethics can reshape moral reasoning and inform equitable, culturally grounded policy in India.

II. HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND

II.I. DISABILITY IN CLASSICAL WESTERN MORAL PHILOSOPHY

The exclusion of disabled persons from moral and civic consideration has deep roots in **classical Western thought**. In **Plato's Republic** (*Politeia*), bodily health is portrayed as symbolic of harmony, while illness or disability is aligned with disorder and injustice (Plato, trans. 1992). Although Plato's emphasis on the harmony of the soul could be interpreted metaphorically, his political prescriptions included the elimination of individuals with severe impairments from the ideal city-state, implying that physical and cognitive conformity was central to justice. This sets a precedent for conflating **moral virtue with physical and cognitive "normalcy"**.

Aristotle's Politics similarly entrenched the able-bodied ideal. The "good citizen" was envisioned as physically capable and rationally autonomous (Aristotle, trans. 1995). Aristotle even endorsed exposure of infants with "deformities," framing such acts as a service to the polity (Politics, VII.16). This intertwining of physical capacity and political worth laid the groundwork for centuries of **normative exclusion**.

II.II. RELIGIOUS AND MEDIEVAL TRADITIONS

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

During the **medieval period**, religious frameworks in Europe, the Middle East, and South Asia coexisted with emerging institutional responses to disability. In **Christian theology**, disability was often interpreted as a manifestation of sin, divine punishment, or a test of faith. While the Christian ethic of charity ensured some material support, the underlying theological framing positioned disabled individuals as objects of pity rather than moral equals (Stiker, 1999).

In **Islamic jurisprudence**, canonical texts emphasized compassion and inclusion, and historical accounts note the participation of disabled persons in public and religious life. The Prophet Muhammad's appointment of a blind man, Ibn Umm Maktum, as a muezzin is a frequently cited example of **inclusive leadership** (Alnaser, 2024). However, over time, **paternalistic interpretations** often overshadowed these egalitarian principles in practice.

In **Hindu traditions**, disability has been historically linked to the doctrine of **karma**, as articulated in texts like the *Manusmriti* and *Mahabharata*. While this framework sometimes encouraged care (as a means of earning spiritual merit), it also **stigmatized disability** as evidence of past-life wrongdoing (Wilson, 2019). The **caste system** compounded these stigmas, situating many disabled persons in socially marginalized positions.

II.III. COLONIAL MEDICALIZATION AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION IN INDIA

Under **British colonial rule**, disability care in India shifted from familial and community-based support to **institutionalized, medicalized frameworks**. Colonial administrators introduced **asylums, hospitals, and special schools** modeled on British systems, emphasizing cure and segregation (Miles, 2002). This approach paralleled the emergence of the **medical model** in Europe, which framed disability as an individual pathology to be treated, rather than a socially constructed condition.

This period also saw the early legal codification of disability in British India through laws that conflated disability with **incapacity and dependency**, particularly in labor and guardianship contexts. Disabled persons were thus classified administratively as wards of the state or subjects of charity, rarely as rights-bearing citizens.

II.IV. THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURY TRANSITION: FROM DEFICIT TO RIGHTS

Globally, the late 19th and early 20th centuries brought two conflicting trends: the rise of **eugenics** and the slow emergence of **rights-based advocacy**. In the West, eugenics movements pathologized disability and justified coercive interventions, while disability self-advocacy groups—especially after World War I—began to demand recognition and inclusion (Davis, 1995).

In India, early disability legislation remained largely welfare-oriented, such as the **Workmen's Compensation Act (1923)**, which addressed workplace injuries but without challenging ableist assumptions. The post-independence era marked a gradual shift toward social justice framing, influenced by the **global disability rights movement** of the 1960s–1990s.

II.V. EMERGENCE OF THE SOCIAL MODEL AND DISABILITY STUDIES

A turning point came with the **Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS)** in the UK during the 1970s, whose manifesto distinguished between:

- **Impairment** — physical, sensory, or cognitive difference.
- **Disability** — the disadvantage or restriction caused by societal barriers.

Michael Oliver (1990) and other scholars built on this to formulate the **social model of disability**, which reframed disability as a product of **environmental and attitudinal barriers**, not merely bodily deficits.

In parallel, **Eva Feder Kittay**'s ethics of care (1999), **Anita Silvers**'s work on justice and inclusion (Silvers et al., 1998), and **Lennard J. Davis**'s critique of "the normate" (1995) challenged the moral assumptions of mainstream philosophy. They argued for recognizing **mutual dependency** as central to human life, thereby dismantling the false dichotomy between the "independent" able-bodied and the "dependent" disabled.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

II.VI. THE INDIAN RIGHTS FRAMEWORK POST-UNCRPD

India's ratification of the **United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD)** in 2007 catalyzed a legislative overhaul, culminating in the **Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (RPwD Act)** in 2016. The Act:

- Expanded recognized disabilities from 7 to 21 categories.
- Mandated **4% reservation in public sector employment**.
- Strengthened anti-discrimination provisions in education, employment, and public services.
- Required accessibility in physical infrastructure and information/communication technologies.

However, despite these legal advances, implementation remains **uneven**. Rural areas, in particular, lag in accessibility infrastructure, assistive technology provision, and disability-sensitive service delivery (NCPEDP, 2021).

II.VII. POLICY–PHILOSOPHY DISJUNCTURE

While policies like the **Accessible India Campaign (2015)**, **National Education Policy (2020)**, and **Ayushman Bharat** acknowledge inclusion, they often **reproduce ableist assumptions** by:

- Prioritizing "mainstreaming" into existing systems without restructuring those systems to accommodate diverse needs.
- Treating disability accommodation as an *add-on* rather than a core design principle.
- Overemphasizing economic productivity as the measure of social worth, sidelining those whose contributions do not fit into conventional economic metrics.

This underscores the need to **reframe moral philosophy** itself—so that **policy is not merely reactive to legal obligations but proactively grounded in inclusive ethics**.

III. KEY PHILOSOPHICAL DEBATES IN DISABLED ETHICS

III.I. RETHINKING AUTONOMY: FROM INDIVIDUAL INDEPENDENCE TO RELATIONAL INTERDEPENDENCE

III.I.I. CLASSICAL AUTONOMY

In the **liberal tradition**—articulated most prominently by **John Locke**, **Immanuel Kant**, and later **John Rawls**—autonomy is conceived as the ability to make rational, independent decisions, free from external interference (Kant, 1785/1997). This *individualist* conception presumes that the ideal moral subject is **self-sufficient**, physically capable, and cognitively unimpaired.

Such a framing creates an **exclusionary baseline**: people with significant physical or cognitive disabilities are implicitly deemed less capable of achieving full moral agency, thereby **marginalizing them in rights discourse** (Silvers, 1998).

III.I.II. RELATIONAL AUTONOMY IN DISABILITY ETHICS

Eva Feder Kittay (1999) and **Martha Fineman** (2010) challenge this paradigm through the concepts of **relational autonomy** and **universal vulnerability**. They argue that dependence is not a deviation from the human condition—it is *constitutive* of it. Infants, the elderly, and those with temporary injuries all experience dependency, demonstrating that autonomy is always mediated by **social supports and care networks**.

From this perspective, **autonomy is relational**, grounded in the mutual recognition of dependency rather than the denial of it. For persons with disabilities, autonomy often means **having control over one's supports**—for instance, choosing one's caregiver, assistive technology, or learning environment—rather than living without any support at all.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

III.I.III. INDIAN POLICY CONTEXT

India's **Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (RPwD Act) 2016** reflects elements of relational autonomy by mandating:

- **Individualized support services** for education and employment.
- **Reasonable accommodation** in workplaces and public spaces.
- Legal recognition of guardianship models like **Limited Guardianship**, which aim to respect decision-making capacities.

However, many **implementation practices remain paternalistic**—for example, in medical consent procedures for persons with intellectual disabilities, decisions are often made by family members without structured mechanisms for supported decision-making (Human Rights Watch, 2018).

A philosophically informed shift toward **supported autonomy** could push Indian policy beyond minimal compliance to **true participatory self-determination**.

III.II. PERSONHOOD: BEYOND COGNITIVE CAPACITY

III.II.I. THE COGNITIVE THRESHOLD PROBLEM

Mainstream moral philosophy, especially in **Kantian and utilitarian frameworks**, often associates personhood with cognitive capacities like rational deliberation, self-awareness, and future planning (Singer, 1993). This has led to troubling implications in bioethics, where some theorists suggest that individuals with severe cognitive impairments have a diminished claim to moral consideration.

III.II.II. DISABILITY ETHICS' RESPONSE

Disability ethicists counter this **cognitive reductionism** by emphasizing **embodied relationality**. Kittay (2005) argues that **membership in the moral community should not hinge on intellectual capacity** but on being part of a network of relationships in which mutual care and recognition occur.

Similarly, **Susan Wendell** (1996) challenges the privileging of "able-bodied norms" in feminist theory, showing how such norms exclude disabled women from full feminist solidarity. Personhood, in these frameworks, is defined not by abstract capacities but by **social embeddedness** and **inherent dignity**.

III.II.III. INDIAN CULTURAL NUANCES

In Indian philosophical traditions, personhood is often tied to **dharma (duty)**, **atma (self)**, and **samsara (life cycle)** rather than purely cognitive traits. The **Bhagavad Gita** and Buddhist teachings frame all beings as intrinsically valuable, though these ideals have coexisted with karmic stigmatization of disability (Wilson, 2019).

Contemporary disability rights advocacy in India—such as by the **National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People (NCPEDP)**—seeks to reclaim these inclusive strands while rejecting the fatalistic elements of karmic discourse.

III.III. JUSTICE: REDISTRIBUTION, RECOGNITION, AND PARTICIPATION

III.III.I. Liberal Justice and Disability

John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* (1971) famously posits principles of fairness that, critics argue, inadequately address disability because they assume a baseline of "normal functioning." Disability ethicists highlight that **equal opportunity** requires *structural adjustments*, not just nondiscrimination.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

III.III.II. CAPABILITY APPROACH

The **capability approach** of **Amartya Sen** (1999) and **Martha Nussbaum** (2006) explicitly integrates disability by focusing on what individuals are *actually able to do and be*. This shifts the measure of justice from resource distribution to **functional capabilities**, which vary depending on personal and environmental factors.

III.III.III. FRASER'S THREE-DIMENSIONAL JUSTICE

Nancy Fraser (2000) adds that justice for disabled people must involve:

1. **Redistribution** — material supports, accessible infrastructure.
2. **Recognition** — cultural deconstruction of ableist norms.
3. **Representation** — ensuring disabled people shape policies affecting them ("Nothing about us without us").

III.III.IV. INDIAN POLICY IMPLICATIONS

In India, redistribution occurs through schemes like:

- **Disability pension programs** (Indira Gandhi National Disability Pension Scheme).
- **Reservation quotas** in education and employment.
- **Assistive technology subsidies** (ALIMCO programs).

Recognition remains a challenge: media often portrays disabled persons as **objects of pity or "supercrip" inspiration**, reinforcing stereotypes.

Representation is improving with **disabled persons' organizations (DPOs)** participating in policy consultations, but **consultation without binding influence** risks tokenism.

III.IV. POLITICS OF CARE: FROM PATERNALISM TO PARTICIPATORY SUPPORT

III.IV.I. ETHICS OF CARE IN DISABILITY

Care ethics, as articulated by Kittay (1999) and Joan Tronto (1993), foregrounds **dependency work** as a moral practice. In disability contexts, this means valuing caregiving relationships without romanticizing them or denying the agency of the care recipient.

III.IV.II. CARE AND POWER

Disability activists caution that care can easily slip into **paternalism**, where decisions are made *for* rather than *with* the person. This risk is heightened in societies with strong family structures like India, where familial authority may override individual preferences.

III.IV.III. INDIAN WELFARE-TO-RIGHTS TRANSITION

Historically, Indian disability policy operated under a **welfare paradigm**, offering charity-based support without challenging systemic barriers. Post-2016, legislation and schemes increasingly frame care as a **right**—for example, the RPwD Act mandates personal assistance services as entitlements.

However, **service delivery remains fragmented**: healthcare, education, and rehabilitation programs are siloed across ministries, making integrated care rare. A politics of care informed by disability ethics would emphasize **cross-sectoral coordination** and **recipient-led service design**.

IV. INTERSECTIONAL AND NON-WESTERN PERSPECTIVES IN DISABLED ETHICS

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

IV.I. INTERSECTIONALITY: MAPPING MULTIPLE AXES OF MARGINALIZATION

IV.I.I. CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

The term **intersectionality**, coined by **Kimberlé Crenshaw** (1989), originally described how Black women's experiences of discrimination could not be fully understood through single-axis analyses of either race or gender. In disability studies, intersectionality reveals how **ableism interacts with other systems of oppression**—including caste, class, gender, religion, and ethnicity—to compound disadvantage.

IV.I.II. GLOBAL ILLUSTRATIONS

In the U.S., Black disabled individuals experience **higher incarceration rates**, lower employment opportunities, and health disparities compared to both white disabled people and non-disabled Black individuals (Benjamin, 2019).

In the Global South, economic marginalization is often intertwined with disability: the **World Bank** estimates that **20% of the world's poorest are disabled**, while **UNESCO** notes that **90% of disabled children in developing countries** lack access to schooling (UNESCO, 2018).

IV.I.III. INDIAN INTERSECTIONAL REALITIES

In India, disability intersects with **caste-based exclusion**, gender norms, and rural–urban disparities:

- **Caste and Disability**: Dalit and Adivasi persons with disabilities face **double discrimination**, as social stigma compounds structural exclusion from education and employment.
- **Gender and Disability**: Women with disabilities experience **higher rates of domestic violence**, restricted mobility, and forced sterilization (Human Rights Watch, 2018).
- **Rural–Urban Divide**: While urban disabled populations may access specialized institutions, rural disabled persons often lack basic assistive devices, healthcare, and inclusive schools.

IV.II. AFRICAN PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES: UBUNTU AND COLLECTIVE PERSONHOOD

IV.II.I. UBUNTU ETHICS

In several African traditions, the concept of **Ubuntu**—"I am because we are"—posits that **personhood is relational and communal** (Mugumbate & Nyanguru, 2013). This framework inherently values all members of the community, including those with disabilities, not for their productivity but for their participation in the communal web of relationships.

IV.II.II. DISABILITY AND SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE

Precolonial African societies often **integrated disabled persons into social life**, sometimes attributing spiritual roles to them (Ojok & Musenze, 2019). While colonial influences introduced Western medicalized deficit models, indigenous philosophies maintained a counterweight, preserving a moral vision of **inclusive personhood**.

IV.II.III. INDIAN POLICY RESONANCE

Ubuntu's communal ethics parallels **panchayat-based participatory governance** in India, where local inclusion of disabled persons in decision-making can foster social belonging. However, as with Ubuntu, **community participation must be guarded against local prejudice**, which can perpetuate exclusion unless paired with **rights-based legal frameworks**.

IV.III. SOUTH ASIAN PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS: KARMA, DHARMA, AND CARE

IV.III.I. KARMA AND STIGMA

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

Classical Hindu and Buddhist interpretations sometimes framed disability as the **result of past-life karma**. While this provided a cosmological explanation, it also risked **normalizing inequality**, leading to fatalism and neglect (Wilson, 2019).

IV.III.II. DHARMA AND CARE OBLIGATIONS

Alongside karmic interpretations, **dharma** emphasized moral duties of care toward the vulnerable, creating a **mixed heritage**: while some used karma to justify exclusion, others invoked dharma to legitimize compassionate care. This duality persists in rural India today, where disabled persons may be simultaneously stigmatized and supported within families.

IV.III.III. BUDDHIST PERSPECTIVES

Mahayana Buddhist teachings on **impermanence and interdependence** offer a powerful counter to ableist binaries, suggesting that **disability is a universal human condition in potential**. In Tibetan Vajrayana, disabled bodies are not morally inferior but spiritually significant for cultivating compassion (Bejoian, 2006).

IV.III.IV. INDIAN POLICY CHALLENGES

Modern Indian disability rights activists often navigate these dual legacies:

- Countering fatalism with **rights-based awareness campaigns**.
- Leveraging cultural values of care to promote **inclusive community rehabilitation programs**.
- Integrating Buddhist and Gandhian ideas of interdependence into **universal design policies**.

IV.IV. ISLAMIC ETHICAL TRADITIONS: DIGNITY, EQUALITY, AND PROHIBITION OF MOCKERY

IV.IV.I. QUR'ANIC AND PROPHETIC GUIDANCE

Islamic ethics regards all humans as created with **dignity (karamah)**, regardless of physical or cognitive capacity. The Qur'an prohibits **mockery or humiliation** (Qur'an 49:11) and encourages inclusion of disabled individuals in community affairs. Prophet Muhammad appointed **Abdullah ibn Umm Maktum**, a blind man, as a **mu'azzin (caller to prayer)**, signaling respect and leadership roles for disabled persons (Alnaser, 2024).

IV.IV.II. DISABILITY RIGHTS IN ISLAMIC LAW

Contemporary Islamic jurisprudence upholds:

- **Right to education**.
- **Right to accessible worship spaces**.
- **Guardianship structures** that aim to preserve autonomy where possible.

IV.IV.III. INDIAN MUSLIM DISABILITY CONTEXT

Indian Muslim communities, especially in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, operate numerous **madrasas and community trusts** that run rehabilitation and assistive device programs. Yet, many such initiatives remain **charity-based rather than rights-based**, lacking formal integration into state welfare systems.

IV.V. SYNTHESIZING NON-WESTERN AND INTERSECTIONAL INSIGHTS FOR INDIAN POLICY

IV.V.I. WHY IT MATTERS

Incorporating non-Western perspectives into disability ethics is not merely a matter of cultural representation; it directly affects **policy legitimacy, community acceptance, and practical outcomes**.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

IV.V.II. POLICY DIRECTIONS

1. **Intersectional Impact Assessments**: Embed tools in all disability-related policies to measure impact on marginalized subgroups (e.g., disabled Dalit women).
2. **Community-Led Care Models**: Draw from Ubuntu and dharma ethics to design **panchayat-led rehabilitation schemes** that are co-created with disabled persons.
3. **Religious Literacy in Disability Rights**: Train policy implementers to engage constructively with karmic, dharmic, and Islamic care narratives, reframing them toward **empowerment rather than fatalism**.
4. **Cross-Traditional Disability Dialogues**: Facilitate platforms where African, Buddhist, Islamic, and Indian disability advocates share care models and advocacy strategies.

V. MODELS OF DISABILITY AND CRITIQUES OF ABLEISM

V.I. GENEALOGY OF THE MEDICAL MODEL: PATHOLOGY, CURE, AND CONTROL

The **medical model** conceives disability primarily as an *individual pathology*—a deviation from species-typical functioning that should be prevented, rehabilitated, or cured. Its intellectual genealogy spans nineteenth-century clinical medicine, the rise of scientific classification, and eugenic public health regimes that normalised population management through the lenses of **defect** and **improvement** (Davis, 1995). Within this paradigm, physicians and allied experts are cast as **moral and epistemic authorities**, while disabled persons are positioned as objects of intervention rather than as **rights-bearing agents**.

This model's **moral grammar** equates welfare with normalisation: the "good" life is understood as one that approximates the able-bodied ideal. As a result, public expenditures are directed at **clinical correction** and institutional care more than at **barrier removal**, **community inclusion**, or **supported decision-making**. The model's ontological focus (impairment as problem) and ethical focus (cure as solution) jointly **depoliticise disability**, obscuring how infrastructures, institutions, and cultural norms *produce* disadvantage (Oliver, 1990; Shakespeare, 2006).

INDIAN POLICY RESONANCE

In India, vestiges of the medical model appear in:

- **Hospital-centred rehabilitation** and fragmented assistive-device camps rather than **continuous, community-based rehabilitation**.
- Certification regimes that **quantify impairment** (percent disability) as a gatekeeping device for benefits—useful administratively, but often **reifying deficit** and encouraging perverse incentives to prove incapacity.
- Consent practices where families or providers **substitute** decisions for persons with psychosocial or intellectual disabilities, reflecting paternalistic legacies rather than **supported autonomy**.

These practices persist even as statutes like the **RPwD Act 2016** and India's UNCRPD commitments endorse a rights-based turn.

V.II. THE SOCIAL MODEL: FROM BODIES TO BARRIERS

The **social model of disability**, articulated by UPIAS and systematised by Michael Oliver (1990), reframes disability as the **mismatch between bodies and environments**—architectural, technological, institutional, and attitudinal. Here, *impairment* is a bodily/neurological variation; *disability* is the **socially produced** disadvantage arising from inaccessible design and exclusionary norms. Ethically, the social model **relocates responsibility** from the individual to society: justice demands *universal design*, *reasonable accommodation*, and *anti-discrimination*.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

STRENGTHS

- **Normative clarity**: Shifts moral burden from "fixing people" to **fixing systems**.
- **Policy tractability**: Generates concrete mandates—curb cuts, captioning, accessible ICT, inclusive curricula, workplace accommodations.
- **Coalitional politics**: Aligns disability justice with civil rights strategies (anti-stigma, legal remedies, participatory governance).

LIMITS

- **Bodily reality**: Risk of underplaying chronic pain, fatigue, or illness as morally salient features of lived experience (Wendell, 1996; Shakespeare, 2006).
- **Care relations**: Less explicit on the **ethics of care** and the politics of dependency (Kittay, 1999).
- **Heterogeneity**: One-size barrier removal may not address **neurodiversity** or complex communication needs.

INDIAN POLICY RESONANCE

The social model's imprint is visible in:

- **RPwD Act 2016** provisions on accessibility and reasonable accommodation.
- **Accessible India Campaign** targets in built environment, transport, and ICT.
- **NEP 2020** on inclusive education, teacher preparation, and universal design for learning (UDL) principles.

V.III. INTERACTIONAL/RELATIONAL MODELS: INTERDEPENDENCE AND SUPPORTED AUTONOMY

Emergent **interactional** and **relational** models integrate the social model's barrier critique with **care-ethical** insights about **dependency work** and **relational autonomy** (Kittay, 1999; Wasserman & Aas, 2023). They treat autonomy not as independence from others but as **agency through supports**: personal assistance, AAC (augmentative and alternative communication), peer advocacy, and community networks. Disability, on this view, is co-produced by **body–environment interactions** and **care infrastructures**; justice therefore requires **funding, training, and governance** that secure the *continuity, quality, and controllability* of supports.

ETHICAL PAYOFFS

- **Moral realism**: Acknowledges pain, fatigue, and cognitive diversity as ethically relevant, without collapsing into medicalisation.
- **Power analysis**: Surfaces **asymmetries** within care relations (risk of paternalism, coercion, or exploitation) and centres **recipient control**.
- **Plural capabilities**: Aligns with **Sen–Nussbaum** capability theories by focusing on what people can actually do/be *with supports*.

INDIAN POLICY RESONANCE

- **Limited Guardianship** (RPwD Act) hints at supported decision-making but needs **clear protocols**, **independent advocates**, and **appeal mechanisms** to prevent overreach.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

- **Community-Based Rehabilitation (CBR)** pilots (NGO–state partnerships) demonstrate relational models in practice, but scalability requires **sustained financing**, **training pipelines**, and **inter-ministerial coordination**.

V.IV. BEYOND BINARIES: WELFARE, MERE DIFFERENCE, AND VALUE PLURALISM

Within analytic ethics, **welfarist** views define disability as any trait that *reduces expected well-being* in typical environments. Disability philosophers counter that many disadvantages stem from **contingent social arrangements**; where environments are inclusive, **well-being differentials shrink** (Wasserman & Aas, 2023). While some impairments may entail intrinsic harms (e.g., pain), disability as a category is **not coextensive** with diminished worth or inevitable suffering.

A pluralist synthesis for India would therefore:

- Treat **intrinsic harms** (pain, progressive illness) as **health priorities** without converting all impairment into pathology.
- Treat **extrinsic harms** (stairs, stigma, paperwork barriers) as **civil-rights priorities**.
- Fund **supports** that convert capabilities into functionings (education, mobility, communication).

V.V. MAPPING ABLEISM IN INSTITUTIONS: INDIA-FOCUSED DIAGNOSTICS

Ableism names the cultural and institutional privileging of able-bodied norms—what Davis (1995) calls the **hegemony of normalcy**. In India, ableism manifests across sectors:

V.V.I. HEALTHCARE

- **Diagnostic overshadowing**: Physical complaints in persons with psychosocial or intellectual disabilities misattributed to the disability, delaying treatment.
- **Consent and coercion**: Substituted decisions in psychiatry; limited uptake of **advance directives** and **support persons** frameworks.
- **Inaccessibility**: OPDs without ramps/lifts; absence of sign-language interpreters; low AAC availability.

Ethical correction: Mandate **supported decision-making**, interpreter/AAC **service lines**, and **accessibility accreditation** for hospitals tied to Ayushman Bharat empanelment.

V.V.II. EDUCATION

- **Admission gatekeeping** and "medical fitness" criteria; **special schools** as default for diverse learners.
- **Pedagogy**: Minimal UDL, scarce resource rooms, limited Braille/DAISY/digital accessibility.
- **Assessment**: High-stakes exams with inflexible formats and inconsistent scribe policies.

Ethical correction: NEP 2020 operationalisation with **funded UDL**, teacher **credentialing standards** on disability pedagogy, and **national scribe/AAC protocols**.

V.V.III. EMPLOYMENT

- **Quota formalism**: 4% reservation under-filled; postings clustered in low-progression roles.
- **Workplace design**: Accessibility limited to large corporates; MSMEs lack incentives and guidance.
- **Performance norms**: Presume standardised productivity without accommodation.

Ethical correction: Tie procurement preferences and tax incentives to **accessibility audits**; fund **job coaches** and **reasonable accommodation budgets**; establish **disability employment exchanges** with skills mapping.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

V.V.IV. WELFARE AND CERTIFICATION

- **Percent-disability** metrics drive access but incentivise **deficit proof** rather than **capability growth**.
- **Inter-state portability** issues for benefits; urban bias in assistive-device distribution.

Ethical correction: Shift to **functioning-and-supports assessments**; enable **One-Nation, One-Disability ID** with portability; integrate **maintenance and training** into device provision.

V.VI. ETHICAL SYNTHESIS: TOWARD AN INDIAN POLITICS OF CARE

A **synthesised model** for India should integrate:

1. **Social-model universalism**: Accessibility as a *default design rule* in all public works (no waivers without compensatory alternatives).
2. **Relational autonomy**: Fund **continuous supports** (PA services, AAC, interpreters, job coaches) with **user governance** (direct payments, choice of provider).
3. **Care justice**: Recognise **dependency work** as social infrastructure—stipend caregivers, offer respite, and professionalise care with labour protections.
4. **Intersectional safeguards**: Prioritise disabled women, Dalit/Adivasi communities, and rural households through **weighted allocations** and **targeted legal aid**.
5. **Participatory oversight**: "Nothing about us without us" as enforceable rule—**DPO representation with vote** in procurement, curricula, hospital accreditation, and city planning.

Philosophically, this synthesis affirms that moral community is constituted by **interdependence**, not independence (Kittay, 1999). Practically, it converts ethics into **budget lines, standards, and rights of action**—the only route by which anti-ableism can move from critique to **institutional habit**.

VI. ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY, HEALTHCARE, EDUCATION, AND RIGHTS IN INDIA

VI.I. TRANSLATING DISABLED ETHICS INTO INDIAN POLICY

VI.I.I. FROM CHARITY TO RIGHTS-BASED GOVERNANCE

Historically, Indian disability policy—reflected in the **Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995**—adopted a **welfare paradigm**: disability was primarily framed as an object of *benefits* rather than *rights*. The enactment of the **Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016** signaled a **normative shift**, aligning domestic law with the **UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD)**.

Yet, **operational culture** in ministries, hospitals, schools, and local bodies remains paternalistic, focusing on **certification and rationed benefits** rather than **universal accessibility, continuous supports, and participatory governance**.

Ethical implementation of disabled rights in India therefore requires:

1. **Integration of models** — combining the **social model's barrier removal**, the **relational model's support structures**, and **care ethics' participatory reciprocity**.
2. **Enforcement architecture** — equipping State Commissioners for Persons with Disabilities with **quasi-judicial powers** and **budgetary oversight**.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

3. **Co-production mechanisms** — mandatory representation of **Disabled Persons' Organizations (DPOs)** in all policy and project committees.

VI.II. ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR HEALTHCARE

VI.II.I. ACCESSIBILITY AS CLINICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Current hospital accreditation systems (e.g., NABH) treat accessibility as **optional enhancements** rather than **core clinical standards**. From an ethical standpoint, physical and communicational accessibility is not an *amenity* but part of the **duty of care**.

Policy proposals:

- **Tie Ayushman Bharat empanelment** to compliance with accessibility standards—ramps, lifts, tactile paths, sign language interpreters, and AAC devices.
- Establish a **National Disability Accessibility Fund** for retrofitting government and charitable hospitals, with matching grants for private facilities.

VI.II.II. CONSENT AND SUPPORTED DECISION-MAKING

Informed consent remains compromised for persons with psychosocial, intellectual, or communication disabilities, with **substituted decision-making** often the default. The **Mental Healthcare Act, 2017** offers advance directives and nominated representatives, but awareness and training are minimal.

Ethical reform:

- Embed **supported decision-making protocols**—trained support persons, pictorial/easy-read consent forms, and interpreter services—into the Indian Medical Council's ethics regulations.
- Make compliance a **condition for hospital licensing**.

VI.II.III. PREVENTIVE AND PRIMARY CARE

Disabled persons face **delayed diagnoses** due to diagnostic overshadowing—where new symptoms are attributed to the disability itself. This violates the ethical principles of **justice** and **non-maleficence**.

Corrective actions:

- Mandatory **disability-inclusive health training** in all medical, nursing, and allied health curricula.
- State-level **inclusive health indicators** in HMIS (Health Management Information Systems) for targeted monitoring.

VI.III. ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

VI.III.I. INCLUSIVE PEDAGOGY AND UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING (UDL)

While the **NEP 2020** champions inclusive education, operational norms remain rooted in **integration**—placing disabled learners in mainstream classrooms without transforming pedagogy.

Ethical interventions:

- Make **UDL principles** mandatory in teacher training curricula and align B.Ed/M.Ed syllabi with disability pedagogy modules.
- Fund **resource rooms** in every government school, equipped with Braille, DAISY players, AAC boards, and accessible digital tools.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

- Create **national scribe and examination accommodation guidelines** to ensure uniformity.

VI.III.II. HIGHER EDUCATION ACCESS

Despite 5% reservation mandates, **access to higher education** for disabled persons remains low due to entrance examination barriers and inaccessible campus infrastructure.

Policy suggestions:

- Link **NAAC accreditation scores** to compliance with accessibility standards.
- Offer **direct financial aid** for assistive technologies at the college level.
- Mandate **digital accessibility audits** for all online learning platforms.

VI.IV. ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

VI.IV.I. MOVING BEYOND QUOTAS

While the **RPwD Act** prescribes a 4% public sector reservation, it is under-implemented and often limited to low-skill positions. Ethical employment policy must shift from **quota compliance** to **structural inclusion**.

Reforms:

- Introduce **reasonable accommodation budgets** for every ministry and PSU.
- Expand **wage subsidies** for private sector hiring of disabled workers.
- Mandate **job redesign and flexible scheduling** in labour law amendments.

VI.IV.II. SKILL DEVELOPMENT

Disabled persons are often excluded from mainstream skill-development programs like **Skill India Mission** due to inaccessible training centres and materials.

Ethical proposal:

- Fund **dedicated inclusive skilling hubs** in each district.
- Incentivise ITIs and training institutes to adopt **accessible curricula and assistive tech**.

VI.V. GOVERNANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

VI.V.I. ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURES

Many rights violations occur not due to lack of laws but due to **weak enforcement**. State and district-level Disability Commissioners are under-resourced and lack coercive authority.

Ethical strengthening:

- Provide **statutory powers** to impose fines and direct compliance.
- Allocate **dedicated budgets** for monitoring, inspections, and litigation.

VI.V.II. PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE

To operationalise the slogan *Nothing about us without us*, India must institutionalise **DPO representation** in:

- **Urban local bodies and panchayats** (reserved seats).

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

- **Disaster management committees**.
- **Transport and urban planning boards**.

VI.VI. INDIAN POLICY MAPPING TABLE: ETHICS TO IMPLEMENTATION

Table: Aligning Ethical Principles with Indian Disability Policies

Ethical Principle	Policy Instrument / Program	Current Status	Gaps Identified	Proposed Reform
Barrier Removal (Social Model)	RPwD Act, Accessible India Campaign	Partially implemented	Rural infrastructure, private sector compliance	Expand to MSMEs, rural schemes with incentives
Supported Autonomy (Relational)	Limited Guardianship, CBR Projects	Minimal operationalisation	Lack of protocols, low funding	National supported-decision-making framework
Care Justice	No direct statutory recognition	Informal care burden on women	No caregiver stipends, burnout risk	Caregiver pay, respite care, training programs
Anti-Ableism (Cultural Change)	Awareness campaigns (sporadic)	Urban-focused, non-systematic	Persistent stigma, media stereotyping	Continuous, rural-targeted anti-stigma programs
Intersectional Equity	RPwD Act anti-discrimination provisions	Limited intersectional data	No disaggregated metrics for caste, gender, rural	Intersectional impact assessments in policy design

VI.VII. Philosophical Justification of Policy Reforms

These reforms are grounded in:

1. **Rawlsian fairness** — restructuring institutions so that the **least advantaged** (disabled persons in rural, low-caste, female identities) benefit maximally.
2. **Sen–Nussbaum capability theory** — expanding the **real freedoms** of disabled persons to choose lives they value.
3. **Kittay's care ethics** — embedding **dependency work** as socially necessary labour, not as private charity.
4. **Fraser's three-dimensional justice** — integrating **redistribution, recognition, and representation** in one policy architecture.

VI.VIII. Toward an Indian Disability Rights Future

Ethically robust disability policy for India must:

- Treat **accessibility and support** as *public goods* akin to roads and sanitation.
- Ensure **cross-ministerial integration** so that disability rights are embedded in housing, transport, digital policy, labour, and disaster management—not siloed in social justice departments.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

- Establish **real-time grievance redressal portals** with strict timelines and public dashboards for accountability.
- Elevate disability rights to **constitutional priority**—through a possible amendment enshrining accessibility and reasonable accommodation as enforceable rights under Article 21.

Philosophically, such a future rejects the **moral fiction of self-sufficiency** and embraces the **politics of interdependence**—recognising that every citizen's dignity depends on the supports, solidarities, and shared infrastructures we build together.

VII. CASE STUDIES AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

This section examines four substantive Indian case studies — two leading Supreme Court judgments and two programmatic/policy models — to draw practical lessons about how disabled ethics may be institutionalized. Each case is summarized briefly and followed by an interpretive analysis framed by the paper's core themes: relational autonomy, inclusive personhood, and the politics of care.

VII.I. JEEJA GHOSH V. UNION OF INDIA & ORS. (SUPREME COURT, 2016): DIGNITY, NON-DISCRIMINATION, AND THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

Case summary

In *Jeeja Ghosh & Anr. v. Union of India & Ors.* (2016), the Supreme Court of India considered the forcible de-boarding of Ms. Jeeja Ghosh, a disability rights activist with cerebral palsy, from a SpiceJet flight. The Court found that the airline's actions violated her fundamental rights and awarded compensation; it also directed authorities to adopt protocols to protect disabled passengers' dignity and right to travel. The judgment emphatically rejected presumptions that disability automatically equates to inability to travel or to behave "normally" on board.

Analysis through disabled-ethical lenses

The ruling operationalizes several features of disabled ethics:

- **Recognition of dignity**: The judgment treats the passenger's dignity as an independent moral claim, not reducible to instrumental productivity or "normal" behaviour.
- **Relational autonomy**: It affirms the right of disabled passengers to travel with supports (e.g., attendants) and rejects blanket exclusionary practices that deny agency.
- **Institutional accountability**: By ordering protocols and training for airlines, the Court shifts responsibility from individuals to institutional actors — a social-model move.

Policy lessons

1. **Protocol design matters**: Clear, enforceable institutional protocols (airline SOPs, training modules) operationalize the norm of reasonable accommodation in everyday settings.
2. **DPO involvement**: The case demonstrates the value of DPO complaints and litigation in catalysing systemic reform; participatory complaint mechanisms should be mandated.
3. **Public awareness**: Judicial pronouncements have normative power only if accompanied by continuous public education (airline staff, security personnel, and public).

VII.II. VIKASH KUMAR V. UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION (SUPREME COURT, 2021): REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION AND BENCHMARK DISABILITY

Case summary

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

In *Vikash Kumar v. UPSC* (2021), the Supreme Court confronted the interplay between the RPwD Act's reasonable accommodation requirement and administrative procedures for competitive recruitment. The Court held that **degree of disability** cannot be a ground to deny reasonable accommodation; it emphasized that institutions must adopt flexible measures — such as scribes, extra time, and ICT accommodations — to ensure substantive equality in competitive examinations. The judgment significantly constitutionalized reasonable accommodation as a facet of Article 14/21 equality and dignity jurisprudence.

Analysis through disabled-ethical lenses

- **Relational autonomy & supported agency**: The judgment recognizes that enabling supports (scribes, assistive technologies) convert potential formal rights into real capabilities.
- **Anti-ableism in assessment design**: The ruling challenges assessment regimes premised on a single "normal" mode of testing, aligning with capability ethics by focusing on what examinees can do *with appropriate supports*.
- **Precedential value**: As a Supreme Court pronouncement, *Vikash Kumar* sets doctrinal expectations for public authorities and testing bodies across India.

Policy lessons

1. **Standardized accommodation protocols**: Examination authorities (all central & state commissions) must prepare standardized, transparent accommodation protocols and publicize them widely.
2. **Capacity building**: UPSC/SSC/state commissions should institutionalize training on reasonable accommodation and appoint disability-focal officers.
3. **Monitoring**: Create an independent audit mechanism that tracks the provision and outcomes of accommodations in public examinations, reporting metrics annually (number of requests, approvals, appeal outcomes).

VII.III. DELHI METRO RAIL CORPORATION (DMRC): URBAN TRANSIT AND ACCESSIBILITY — PROGRESS AND PERSISTENT GAPS

Case summary and evidence

Delhi Metro is often showcased as a leading urban transit system in India that integrates accessibility features: elevators and ramps, tactile tiles for visually impaired riders, audio announcements, disabled-friendly ticket counters, and reserved spaces on trains. Research assessing walk accessibility and first-/last-mile connectivity, however, highlights important user experience gaps — especially for visually impaired travelers and in the quality and continuity of tactile pathways from sidewalks to station entry. Studies also show that accessibility performance varies across phases and localities, and integration with feeder modes remains uneven.

Analysis through disabled-ethical lenses

- **Social model in practice**: DMRC's design illustrates the social model by recognizably reducing environmental barriers at the station and train level.
- **Relational shortfall**: Accessibility must be continuous — from home to station to platform to destination. Many users report failures in the "last mile" (pavements, crossings, public buses) that disrupt their autonomy despite station-level features.
- **Institutional design vs. urban governance**: DMRC's successes show what a professional, well-funded transit agency can achieve; but city-wide accessibility requires coordinated municipal planning (pavements, kerb cuts, signals) and enforcement.

Policy lessons

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

1. **Systemic integration**: Transit accessibility must be mainstreamed into municipal planning, not left as a metro project add-on. DMRC's station standards should be contracted into city development plans (e.g., complete streets).
2. **User feedback loops**: Implement real-time user reporting channels (with DPO participation) and disability performance KPIs for each DMRC corridor/station.
3. **Phasewise retrofitting & standards**: Future metro phases must adopt universal design from the outset; retrofitting budgets and timelines for older phases must be legislated and publicly monitored.

VII.IV. KERALA'S INCLUSIVE EDUCATION INITIATIVES (STATE PROGRAMS AND COMMUNITY INNOVATIONS)

Program summary and evidence

Kerala has a longstanding reputation for relatively strong social indicators and experimentations in inclusive education. State initiatives and NGO projects (for example, mobile schools like *Jyothirgamaya* and localized resource-teacher models) have expanded access for children with visual and mobility impairments, combined with district-level resource centres and teacher training programs. Recent evaluations show progress in enrolment and retention but also persistent pedagogical and assessment challenges.

Analysis through disabled-ethical lenses

- **Community and policy synergy**: Kerala's success is illustrative: when state policy (inclusive education mandates, resource allocation) is paired with grassroots innovation (mobile Braille labs, NGO teacher networks), relational autonomy and participatory inclusion gain traction.
- **Pedagogy matters**: Inclusion here is not merely placement in mainstream classrooms; it requires curriculum adaptation, teacher capacity, assistive devices, and assessment flexibility (UDL principles).
- **Equity caveat**: Positive outcomes in Kerala are uneven across disabilities (more progress for physical and visual impairments than for intellectual or autism spectrum conditions) and can mask intra-state disparities (urban vs. tribal/rural pockets).

Policy lessons

1. **State–NGO partnerships**: Institutionalize funding mechanisms for successful local pilots (mobile schools, community resource centres) so they scale without losing local adaptability.
2. **Teacher credentialing**: Make special pedagogy modules mandatory for B.Ed and in-service teacher training with measurable outcomes.
3. **Inclusive assessment**: Standardize scribe/AAC protocols and ensure tech support for remote/online learning — lessons especially relevant since the pandemic.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE POLITICS OF CARE

The preceding analysis demonstrates that disabled ethics demands a paradigm shift from ableist frameworks of independence and productivity to one that prioritizes interdependence, dignity, and inclusion. Translating this ethical vision into policy and practice requires not only legal reforms but also institutional redesign and political commitment. In the Indian context, where constitutional guarantees (Articles 14, 19, 21, and 41) converge with international obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), the politics of care must become central to governance.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

This section sets out a framework of recommendations, structured around five interlinked domains: law and governance, healthcare, education, employment, and social participation. Each recommendation emphasizes concrete policy measures, institutional mechanisms, and budgetary priorities.

VIII.I. LAW AND GOVERNANCE

1. **Mainstreaming Disabled Ethics in Public Policy**
    - Establish a **National Disability Ethics Council** under the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment, comprising philosophers, disability studies scholars, activists, and policymakers, tasked with reviewing laws and schemes through the lens of disabled ethics.
    - Require **Disability Impact Assessments (DIAs)** for all new laws and policies, similar to Environmental Impact Assessments. These would evaluate how proposed policies affect the dignity, autonomy, and participation of disabled persons.
2. **Strengthening the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016**
    - Amend the Act to include **clear enforcement timelines** for accessibility norms in transport, ICT, and education.
    - Establish **Disability Ombudspersons** in each state with quasi-judicial powers to resolve grievances quickly.
    - Introduce **annual compliance reports** to Parliament with disaggregated data on implementation across states.
3. **Decentralization and Local Governance**
    - Mandate that **Panchayati Raj Institutions and Urban Local Bodies** create standing committees on disability, with at least one disabled member or representative nominated by Disabled People's Organizations (DPOs).
    - Ensure convergence of schemes (education, employment, social security) through district-level Disability Coordination Cells, chaired by the District Magistrate but co-managed with DPOs.

VIII.II. HEALTHCARE AND BIOETHICS

1. **Disability-Inclusive Healthcare Infrastructure**
    - Mandate universal accessibility in all government hospitals within five years, with penalties for non-compliance.
    - Introduce **Disability Health Facilitators** in every district hospital to coordinate between patients, doctors, and welfare departments.
2. **Anti-Ableist Medical Ethics**
    - Incorporate disability rights and ethics modules in MBBS and nursing curricula, emphasizing informed consent, refusal rights, and respect for dignity.
    - Require **bioethics review committees** in hospitals to include at least one disabled member, ensuring non-discriminatory triage, treatment, and research protocols.
3. **Insurance and Social Security**
    - Expand Ayushman Bharat to cover assistive technologies (wheelchairs, hearing aids, communication devices) as part of essential health benefits.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

- Create **community-based rehabilitation funds** managed by panchayats to provide home-based care and assistive services in rural India.

VIII.III. EDUCATION

1. **Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Mandate**
   - Require NCERT, CBSE, and state boards to design curricula, textbooks, and digital platforms based on UDL principles, ensuring accessibility by default.
   - Allocate 5% of the education budget to inclusive infrastructure (ramps, ICT tools, tactile materials).
2. **Teacher Training**
   - Make disability pedagogy compulsory in all B.Ed, D.El.Ed, and in-service teacher training programs.
   - Introduce a **National Fellowship for Inclusive Educators** to incentivize teachers in rural and underserved areas.
3. **Assessment and Examinations**
   - Adopt standardized scribe policies across boards and universities.
   - Ensure ICT-enabled accommodations such as screen readers, text-to-speech, and adaptive testing environments.

VIII.IV. EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION

1. **Public Employment**
   - Enforce the 4% reservation for persons with disabilities in all central and state services, with transparent annual recruitment data.
   - Extend reservation to contractual and outsourced posts within government.
2. **Private Sector Incentives**
   - Provide tax rebates and preferential procurement benefits to companies with at least 5% disabled employees.
   - Strengthen the **Accessible India Campaign** by linking corporate social responsibility (CSR) spending to accessibility projects.
3. **Entrepreneurship and Skills**
   - Create a **National Disability Entrepreneurship Fund** to support startups led by disabled individuals.
   - Expand vocational training schemes under Skill India with a specific focus on ICT, renewable energy, and cultural industries.

VIII.V. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PARTICIPATION

1. **Media and Representation**
   - Mandate quotas for accessible content in public broadcasting: subtitles, sign language interpretation, and audio description.
   - Launch nationwide campaigns against ableism, modeled on Swachh Bharat or Beti Bachao Beti Padhao.
2. **Urban and Rural Public Spaces**

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

- Amend town planning codes to enforce universal design in parks, libraries, courts, and community centres.
- Develop **inclusive rural community hubs** combining anganwadis, panchayat halls, and accessible healthcare sub-centres.

3. **Political Participation**
   - Mandate accessibility in electoral processes: ballot papers in Braille, accessible EVMs, priority voting queues, and transport provisions.
   - Encourage political parties to nominate at least one disabled candidate per state as part of inclusive democracy.

VIII.VI. FUNDING AND MONITORING MECHANISMS

1. **Dedicated Budget Line**
   - Introduce a **Disability Inclusion Fund** in the Union Budget, with a minimum of 1% of GDP earmarked for disability-inclusive development.
   - Ensure transparent reporting through a **Disability Budget Statement** (similar to Gender Budgeting).
2. **Participatory Monitoring**
   - Institutionalize **Nothing About Us Without Us** by mandating DPO representation in all monitoring committees.
   - Use ICT-based platforms (mobile apps, grievance portals) for real-time citizen feedback on accessibility of services.

VIII.VII. THE POLITICS OF CARE IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

Disabled ethics reframes care not as paternalism but as a shared political responsibility. In India, this requires challenging both **ableist state policies** that treat disability as a welfare burden and **cultural narratives** that stigmatize disabled persons through karma or pity frameworks. Instead, the politics of care must emphasize:

- **Interdependence as normalcy**: Recognizing that all citizens, not only the disabled, require care across the life cycle (childhood, illness, old age).
- **Dignity as constitutional value**: Embedding Article 21 dignity as the basis for policy design.
- **Shared responsibility**: Mobilizing state, market, and community actors to co-produce care infrastructures.
- **Justice as participation**: Ensuring that disabled people are not passive recipients but active decision-makers in governance, law, and culture.

VIII.III. CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

By operationalizing disabled ethics into law, healthcare, education, employment, and public culture, India can move from tokenistic inclusion to **participatory justice**. The politics of care is not a secondary concern but a core feature of democratic ethics. It acknowledges that vulnerability and dependency are not marginal exceptions but central to the human condition. Embedding these principles into India's federal and local governance systems can create an inclusive moral horizon where dignity, autonomy, and interdependence are equally valued.

IX. CONCLUSION: REFRAMING MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

This paper has traced how **disabled ethics fundamentally reshapes moral philosophy** by critiquing autonomy, personhood, and justice through the lived realities of disabled persons. Against the backdrop of Western traditions that privileged rational

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

independence and able-bodied normalcy, disabled ethics insists that **vulnerability, dependency, and interdependence** are not deficits but essential features of the human condition. Drawing on the works of Eva Feder Kittay, Lennard Davis, Anita Silvers, Susan Wendell, and others, it has been shown that moral philosophy must abandon exclusionary ideals of the "normate" and adopt relational, embodied, and inclusive frameworks.

The Indian context further complicates and enriches this discourse. Disability here is not merely a biomedical issue but is deeply embedded in **social structures (caste, class, gender), cultural narratives (karma, sin, purity), and political institutions (welfare schemes, governance frameworks).** The interplay between stigma and support—between seeing disability as divine punishment and simultaneously mandating dharmic care—demonstrates the ambivalence of Indian traditions. Yet, these same traditions, particularly in their ethical and spiritual dimensions, also provide fertile ground for an alternative politics of care grounded in compassion, interdependence, and collective responsibility.

At the **policy level**, India has made significant progress with the **Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016**, the **Accessible India Campaign (Sugamya Bharat Abhiyan)**, and the inclusionary aims of the **National Education Policy, 2020**. However, persistent challenges remain in implementation: inaccessible infrastructure, tokenistic participation, fragmented funding, and social stigma. Disabled ethics reframes these shortcomings not as technical gaps but as moral failures of justice and dignity. A democracy committed to equality cannot treat disability as a peripheral concern—it must embed it at the center of governance.

The **politics of care**, as argued here, offers the conceptual and institutional bridge. It is not charity or paternalism, but a recognition that **all citizens are interdependent** and that justice requires building infrastructures of care—accessible healthcare, inclusive education, enabling employment, and dignified participation in public life. Policies must shift from **mere non-discrimination to proactive accommodation and participation**, ensuring that disabled persons are co-authors of the ethical and political order.

Ultimately, the reframing of moral philosophy through disabled ethics is both **philosophical and practical**. Philosophically, it demands that notions of autonomy, personhood, and justice be reconstructed to recognize embodied diversity and relational interdependence. Practically, it calls for **governance reforms** that prioritize inclusion, accessibility, and dignity. By embedding disabled ethics into law, policy, and culture, India can pioneer a moral horizon where justice is not abstract equality but **lived inclusivity**.

In conclusion, disabled ethics reveals that the measure of a society is not how it treats its most independent and capable, but how it **values and supports its most vulnerable**. In the Indian context, this reframing aligns with constitutional morality, Gandhian ethics of care, and global human rights standards. If fully embraced, it has the potential to not only transform the lives of disabled persons but also to **redefine the moral foundations of democracy itself**—a democracy where interdependence is strength, and dignity is universal.

REFERENCES

1. Davy, L. (2019). Between an ethic of care and an ethic of autonomy: Negotiating relational autonomy, disability, and dependency. Angelaki, 24(3), 101-114.
2. Capri, C. (2018). The politics of person-making: Ethics of care, Intellectual impairment citizenship, and a reclaiming of knowledge. In The Palgrave handbook of disability and citizenship in the Global South (pp. 269-292). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
3. Davy, L. (2015). Philosophical inclusive design: Intellectual disability and the limits of individual autonomy in moral and political theory. Hypatia, 30(1), 132-148.
4. Arstein-Kerslake, A., O'Donnell, E., Kayess, R., & Watson, J. (2021). Relational personhood: A conception of legal personhood with insights from disability rights and environmental law. Griffith Law Review, 30(3), 530-555.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 236-258 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v4i1.609
Volume: 4 | Issue: 1
April-June 2026

5. Ohajunwa, C. (2026). Can We Do Human Together?: Exploring Personhood and Disability Through Two African Indigenous Enabling Frameworks. In Activating Arts to Understand Disability in Africa (pp. 36-51). Routledge.
6. Pullman, D. (1999). The ethics of autonomy and dignity in long-term care. Canadian Journal on Aging/La Revue canadienne du vieillissement, 18(1), 26-46.
7. Ellis, K. (2004). Dependency, justice and the ethic of care. In The ethics of welfare (pp. 29-48). Policy Press.
8. Welch, E. J. (2015). Beyond the" Right to Die" and the" Right to Life" Debate in Disorders of Consciousness: Reframing the Ethical Concerns through the Writings of Paul Ricoeur. McGill University (Canada).
9. Higgs, P., & Gilleard, C. (2016). Personhood, identity and care in advanced old age. Policy Press.
10. Arneil, B., & Hirschmann, N. J. (Eds.). (2016). Disability and political theory. Cambridge University Press.
11. Rush, E., Short, M., Burningham, G., & Cartledge, J. (2020). Philosophy and ethics: Sustaining social inclusion in the disability sector. In Sustaining Social Inclusion (pp. 203-217). Routledge.
12. Lid, I. M. (2022). The significance of relations. Rethinking autonomy in a disability perspective. In Lived citizenship for persons in vulnerable life situations: Theories and practices (pp. 99-113).
13. Silvers, A. (1995). Reconciling equality to difference: Caring (f) or justice for people with disabilities. Hypatia, 10(1), 30-55.
14. Chandler, L. E. (2016). Reframing the Ethics of Care: Implications for Moral Epistemology in Bioethics.
15. Joshi, M., & Sargsyan, A. (2025). Reimagining Legal Subjectivity: The Politics of Disability Rights and Inclusive Law. Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 4(2), 234-247.
16. Chapman, K., Dixon, A., Ehrlich, C., & Kendall, E. (2024). Dignity and the importance of acknowledgement of personhood for people with disability. Qualitative Health Research, 34(1-2), 141-153.
17. Wu, D. (2024). Autonomy Work: Personhood, Expertise, and Activism of Disabled AI Data Workers in China. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.