#### Text: The United States federal government should expand disabilities rights claims to incorporate transportation infrastructure.
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Such services treat disabled people as `different' and `special' or even as `burden some'. As Corker (1998, page 82) suggests, the ascription of ``difference'' to disabled people is often used to distinguish them ``as persons who can justifiably be treated unequally''. For Corker (1998, page 82), the unequal treatment of (disabled) people, in relation to ``the distribution of benefits and burdens, and in the absence of any justification, is a paradigm of injustice''. Arguably, these injustices require a politics of mobility in which liberal conceptions of mobility and freedom are reassessed to destabilise the efficacy of `the mobile body'. Given liberalism's abstract universality and individualism, and its preoccupation with the sameness of treatment of subjects, alternative frameworks are required, so some argue, which seek to develop ``a recognition of difference and responsiveness to individuated needs, as well as the protection of the rights of difference'' (Gould, 1996, page 180). A politics of movement and mobility, then, ought to enable us to think about, and respond to ``the diversity of mobility, networks and access required by diverse groups in their daily lives'' (Huxley, 1997, page 2).

These ideas are core to a politics of disability which is premised on the eradication of ascribed needs, or processes whereby policy experts and professionals assess disabled people's needs and ascribe the relevant policy prescriptions (for example, the provision of special transport or equipment to facilitate mobility). For Oliver (1990), ascribed needs reinforce the power of professional experts, such as transportation planners, to determine the quality of disabled people's lives. This, according to Oliver, maintains disabled people's dependence on others and does little to create the conditions for disabled people's self-determination. In contrast, Oliver (1996) notes that a politics of disability ought to work from a position of self-defined needs as a basis for rights claims (also, see Handley, 2000). As Oliver (1996, page 74) suggests, ``it is rights to appropriate their own self defined needs that disabled people are demanding, not to have their needs defined and met by others''.