

**DAN
GOODLEY**

2ND EDITION

DISABILITY STUDIES

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY INTRODUCTION

 **SAGE**

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B 1/1 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Editor: Natalie Aguilera
Editorial Assistant: Delayna Spencer
Production editor: Katherine Haw
Copyeditor: Neil Dowden
Indexer: Judith Lavender
Marketing manager: Sally Ransom
Cover design: Shaun Mercier
Typeset by: C&M Digital (P) Ltd, Chennai, India
Printed in India at Replika Press Pvt Ltd

© Dan Goodley 2017
Chapter 8 © Dan Goodley, Rebecca Lawthom,
Kirsty Liddiard and Katherine Runswick-Cole

First edition published 2011
Second edition published 2017

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016933342

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from
the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4462-8067-6
ISBN 978-1-4462-8068-3 (pbk)

At SAGE we take sustainability seriously. Most of our products are printed in the UK using FSC papers and boards. When we print overseas we ensure sustainable papers are used as measured by the PREPS grading system. We undertake an annual audit to monitor our sustainability.

FUTURES

FOUR APPROACHES AND THREE KEY THEMES OF CRITICAL DISABILITY STUDIES

We have been on quite a journey. The end of our travels culminates in our reaching a transdisciplinary destination unpacked in this chapter: namely *critical disability studies*. This is a location populated by people who advocate building upon the foundational perspectives of disability studies while integrating new and transformative agendas associated with postcolonial, queer and feminist theories. I will unpack what I mean by critical disability studies, outline four emerging approaches of this field (crip studies, critical studies of ableism, Global South disability studies and dis/ability studies) and then consider three themes that might be taken up in future research and scholarship. The chapter ends with a reminder of why disability studies are needed now more than ever.

WHAT IS CRITICAL DISABILITY STUDIES?

This book has connected disability studies with the politics of class, gender, sexuality, race and ethnicity. Such intersections are key to *critical disability studies*. While critical disability studies might start with disability it never ends with it, remaining ever vigilant of political, ontological and theoretical complexity. Reflecting upon recent related writings¹ my own understanding is that critical disability studies:

- acknowledges the importance of analysing disability through materialism and is respectful to the building blocks of disability studies, especially the social model of disability;
- recognises that our contemporary times are complex, as they are marked by austerity, a widening gap between rich and poor, and globalisation of the guiding principles of late capitalism, and therefore we require sophisticated social theories that can make sense and contest these processes;

- remains mindful of global, national and local economic contexts and their impact on disabled people;
- adopts a position of cultural relativism while seeking to say some things about the global nature of disability;
- recognises the importance of the constitution of the self in relation to others (and is therefore always attuned to the relational qualities of disability);
- brings together disability alongside other identities as a moment of reflection that Lennard Davis² terms dismodernism;
- adopts the practice of criticality in order to be critical of all kinds of disability studies (including critical disability studies);
- keeps in mind the view that any analysis of disability should not preclude consideration of other forms of political activism.

Critical disability studies is not:

- a futile exercise that simply adds the word ‘critical’ to disability studies to suggest that all previous examples of disability studies have not been critical;
- just another approach to sit alongside traditional approaches like materialist social model perspectives;
- the insertion of a discursive preoccupation with culture that ignores the material realities of disability;
- simply the study of disability (or ability for that matter);
- an academic exercise without political commitment, only constructed to keep academics in their jobs;
- incapable of having values and ambitions that it wants to share with the world.

We have entered a period of scholarship and activism that we can – *and should* – define as critical disability studies. I will unpack some critical disability studies perspectives and consider four analytical themes that might shape the future of theory and research.

FOUR EMERGING CRITICAL DISABILITY STUDIES APPROACHES

Critical disability studies is testimony to the intellectual saturation of the field and its transdisciplinary reach. For our purposes we shall seek to pull out four emerging, promising areas of activism and scholarship.

CRIP STUDIES AND CRITICAL STUDIES OF ABLEISM

The first foray into the field reveals two powerful theoretical vistas that have started to populate the terrain of critical disability studies (summarised in Figure 10.1).

	Crip studies (USA, Canada and Europe)	Critical studies of ableism (Australia and USA)
Meaning	<i>Disability is (a) a negated identity as a consequence of an emphasis on compulsory able-bodiedness and simultaneously (b) a subversive position that disruptively crips normative standards in society.</i>	<i>Disability is produced by wider standards of society, culture and economics that emphasise and idealise an ableist normativity.</i>
Moral implications	Cultural re/production constitutes disabled people as both carriers of hegemonic values associated with able-bodiedness and active producers of counter-hegemonic crip culture.	Disabled people are excluded from communities, services and professional practices because they fail to meet the standards of ableist society.
Sample idea	Deconstruction and ideology critique of film, novel and media. Reconstructing disability histories, identifying disability fantasies and offering 'crip' alternatives.	Deconstruction and ideology critique of film, novel and media. Unearthing links between able-bodiedness, whiteness, coloniality and the capitalist imperatives of labour and consumption.
Origins	2000s onwards, emerging out of cultural models of disability and queer/disability activism. Key writers include Robert McRuer, Kristina Kolárová, Julie Passanante Elman.	2000s onwards, growing out of crip, cultural and social approaches to disability. Key writers include Gregor Wolbring, Fiona Kumari Campbell.
Goals of intervention	Destabilise cultural performances of dis/ability and ab/normality; promote disability arts and subculture; subvert liberal arts agenda which often excludes disabled people. Disability is renamed as a site of resistance that critiques 'the normate' and 'the abled'.	Contest the inherent ableism of political, policy, legal, economic, educational and social systems; challenge normative understandings of the body and mind; intervene in transhumanist movements and advances associated with human-technological hybrids.
Benefits of model	Crip activism connects with other disruptive positions including queer, anti-capitalist, union activists; affirmative identity of overrides traditionally more negative connotations associated with disability.	Anti-ableist activism connects with other movements associated with anti-neoliberal capitalism; broadens scope from specifics of disability to wider considerations of Others to the ableist same (associated with class, race, sexuality, global location).
Negative effects	Over-emphasis on the subversive qualities of crip which may underplay wider effects of disablism; cultural studies underpinnings accused of ignoring 'real' material conditions of disablism.	Loss of focus on disability politics as a consequence of more generalised activism around ableism; danger of viewing anything normative as ableist, e.g. progressive education.

Figure 10.1 Critical disability studies: crip theory and critical studies of ableism

Sources: adapted from McRuer (2003, 2006a, 2006b), Guter and Killacky (2004), Campbell (2008a, 2008b, 2009), Wolbring (2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2009, 2012), Shildrick (2009), Kolárová (2012, 2013), Passanante-Elman (2012), Goodley (2014)

Crip studies and critical studies of ableism share the common goal of disturbing those normative homelands that *all of us* are forced to populate. The arrival of crip theory into the disability studies domain, some ten years ago, substantively shifted the ways in which we thought of disability. Crip studies celebrated the anarchic potential of disability to destabilise the normative centres of society and culture. Disability's disruptive character was recast as a radical, contrary Other. I have previously cited the work of Jim Overboe and Amy Vidali as perfect examples of crip studies.³ Overboe portrays his own disabled body as a crip body that sits in direct opposition to those normative bodies so cherished by capitalist societies. He rejects the hackneyed view of the disabled body as deficient, refiguring it as a place of becoming, reflection and production. Overboe writes of his bodily spasms (normatively and medically understood as a sign of the negative affliction of his cerebral palsy) as productive aspects of crip embodiment. These kinds of embodiment, I suggest here, might be queerly understood as productive, creative and physical attributes. This is a leitmotif of crip theory: reclaiming the disabled body as a celebratory moment of body politics. We find a similarly affirmative account being from Amy Vidali⁴ in her reappropriation of the term spastic colon (as an alternative to the contemporary term irritable bowel syndrome). In writing of her body as one that promotes crip encounters (as deficient, ill or dirty) she asks us rather than to rethink reasonable, appropriate, acceptable and contained bodies of contemporary cultural life. Vidali invites us to enter a very specific embodied arena associated with *odour poetics*: the rhetorics of bodily control associated with the politics of shit. She considers those mundane moments, say, around dinnertime and eating, when her spastic colon disrupts these practices (such as having to leave the table to visit the wash-room). At times this can be rather helpful (e.g. asking to be excused to eat certain food items when actually she would never have desired those foods in the first place). Her disruptive spastic colon demands others to think again about the kinds of constraints and expectations ableism places on its reasonable bodies. Overboe and Vidali articulate how it feels to embody the counter-hegemonic position associated with living crip lives and crippling life.

Crip studies has not simply settled on the body as *the* site of theorisation and activism. Indeed, Robert McRuer's recent work centres on analysis of crip activism in a time of austerity, revealing a number of resistant possibilities.⁵ Disabled people are always amongst the first to experience damaging impacts of economic downturns and austerity measures that diminish welfare state provision. As I have recently written elsewhere, crip politics, according to McRuer,⁶ refer to those moments across the globe where anti-capitalist politics coalesce around the moment of disability, including Arnieville camp protests in California, hunger strikes in Chile and protests by healthcare professionals in Spain and Greece. This leads McRuer to suggest that, rather than positing that 'one day we will all be disabled', he recommends: 'One day all politics will be crip.'⁷

Crip theory's influence upon disability studies has been nothing short of paradigm-shifting. Ideas such as the crip art of failure – a riff upon the queer art of failure⁸ – pitches disability politics at the forefront of post-social activist work.⁹ According to Liora Elias, crip studies feed a political manifesto on failure that illuminates the capacity of 'those of us who fail, lose, get lost, forget, get angry, become unruly, disrupt the normative order of things, and exist and behave in the world in ways that are considered antinormative, anticapitalist, and antidisiplinary'.¹⁰ These failings – now read as opportunities – are calling for what Elias terms 'a politics of solidarity, of refusal, of unbecoming and unknowing, of the absurd that all come back to failing differently, failing better, and failing collectively'.¹¹ Take, for example, the concept of crip time (a notion developed beautifully by the Canadian sociologist Rod Michalko¹²). Crip time might slow down, halt and find time to think again about how we live our lives. Such moments contrast with the speed, haste and mobility of lives that work to succeed in a capitalist society. We rethink temporality through disability. We rethink how we might live our lives: to stop and regroup. Habits such as labour and consumption – validated by late capitalist societies – are now problematised by the presence of crip practices that in actuality might fail to work and shop.

The extent to which crip studies has really unsettled these practices of normalcy is questioned by Michalko.¹³ He has argued that the normal world is never really disrupted, disturbed nor decentred by the presence of disability (or crip for that matter). Think of a school setting, a building, public transport, popular media representations or everyday communities, and one could conclude that they remain designed for and by members that are anything but the disruptive potential of disability. As Goodley et al. (in press) argue in a recent piece, influenced by Michalko, 'Normative practices – especially of neoliberal advanced capitalist societies – are incredibly good at maintaining their modes of production, their character and their everyday practices'.¹⁴ A key normative practice relates to the constitution of the human subject as *the hub* around which all civilising practices are maintained: law, education, health and citizenship. The human subject is, as Nicolas Rose has put it, the politics of life itself.¹⁵ And this human category is a classic humanistic one: a self-governing, autonomous and self-sufficient subject, working and shopping enough.¹⁶ This legacy of the normative human category is something I will return to in a discussion of dis/ability studies later in this chapter.

The second approach – critical studies of ableism – sits with crip theory's critique of the normative (the normal, the usual, the neoliberal, the humanist). Associate scholars contest the under-girding philosophy of contemporary society that unflinchingly idealises a specific kind of citizen: one that embodies all elements of ableist normativity. Fiona Kumari Campbell's work turns the gaze back onto non-disabled people and those of other persuasions including white, economically privileged, minority world citizens and purveyors of their cognitive superiority.¹⁷ Her work asserts that disability studies becomes ability studies

because in that leap of faith we find the true origins of oppression. These sources of discrimination are found in the foundations of modern societies: the humanistic subject, a subject so perfect that no one comes near to mimicking it but a subject, nonetheless, that remains the pinnacle of human achievement. This is the self-sufficient, contained man that we have encountered in this book.

In the mould of critical ableist studies, Licia Carlson's¹⁸ analysis of cognitive ableism shines light on a commonly held attitude of bias in favour of those who possess certain cognitive abilities (or the *potential* for them) against those who are believed not to possess them. This prejudice underpins the very workings of mass education. Some students are included within educational practices while others are not. In Britain, we are witnessing some profound changes to the educational assessment of children aged 14 to 16. The British educational GCSE system (hitherto known as O Levels) previously combined coursework and exam assessment. Under new guidance young people will be assessed primarily through exams. This is a form of cognitive ableism that assumes that the child being assessed is ready, willing and able to work under exam conditions and thus it excludes many children who struggle with exams. Not only is assessment narrowly couched, so too are those cognitive abilities being assessed (that is, how well one performs under exam conditions). This is a deeply flawed individualistic form of assessment. Critical studies of ableism in education seek to trouble the assumed learner at the epicentre of many Global North educators' thinking.

Jan Masschelein and Maarten Simons¹⁹ further a critical ableist agenda. They suggest that inclusive education is destined to fail because education is predicated on the notion that students are entrepreneurial: ready to self-start and take on the challenges of education when given the right kind of support by educators. Two assumptions are at play here: (1) that students are self-contained entities ready and able to play the education game; and (2) that schools do not have to radically shift their approach to teaching and learning – pedagogy remains unchanged and unaltered. Such assumptions are, clearly, fundamentally ableist in-character. Students are assumed to be able (albeit requiring support) and schools are considered to be able to sustain such students (without requiring a culture shift). The entrepreneurial student and schools of enterprise read as well-crafted agents of a neoliberal-able education system. Nothing has drastically changed in terms of educational philosophy. The ableist imaginary remains intact. Instead, Masschelein and Simons suggest that what is required is an axiomatic shift in thinking about the meaning and aims of education. Such a shift requires an approach that troubles ableist assumptions within education.

Simo Vehmas and Nick Watson²⁰ suggest that those who embrace critical studies of ableism are in danger of assuming that everything associated with being able is necessarily oppressive. Marking everything a sign of ableism, they argue, is in danger of dismissing any intervention that might be associated with the promotion of good health, the development of progressive forms of education or

ideas associated with a good/better life. In a recent paper,²¹ Katherine Runswick-Cole and I acknowledge that equating all things associated with the ability to achieve and enact specific ambitions and aims as always ableist (and therefore wrong) is problematic. Moreover, we have found in our work with the politics of self-advocacy of people with intellectual disabilities an appeal to normative idea(l)s including a right to work, education, a healthy love life, a welcoming family, marriage and parenting (as explored in this book in relation to community). A critical ableist approach need not inevitably lead us down an ignorant path where we refuse to acknowledge the importance of normative, perhaps even ableist, ideals (including humanism, health and labour). But disability always shakes up and interrogates the normative position associated with ableism as a marker of humanity. Disability disorients normativity.

GLOBAL SOUTH DISABILITY STUDIES AND DIS/ABILITY STUDIES

The third and fourth examples of critical disability studies reflect the importance of *place* and *ambiguity*. Global South disability studies have proliferated outside of the Global North. The open access journal *Disability and the Global South* is just one example of placing disability studies in locations usually conceptualised as lower-income nations that make up the majority of the world. As we know from the 2011 *World Report on Disability*, there are more disabled people in the majority than in the minority world. Capitalising the *Global South* and lowering the (letter) case of the *global north* is a political strategy that foregrounds a Global South perspective. The second approach – dis/ability studies – seeks to work the hyphen between dis (a position reminiscent of crip disruption described by crip studies) and ability (a position aligned with some of the more normative ableist desires that critical ableist studies have rejected). This working of the split term dis/ability is a process that has already been explored to some extent in the chapter on community and is the focus of my recent book.²² Dis/ability captures the ways in which the politics of disability simultaneously disrupts *and* desires the norm. This ambiguity recognises the crip potential of disability to challenge disablism while also acknowledging the inevitable presence of ability and ableism.

One response of Global South disability studies has been reclaiming knowledge. Tsitsi Chataika's work on disability and education in Zimbabwe makes a case for Ubuntu, an indigenous form of community organising that has historically responded to the individual through the collective.²³ This desire for the collective has, Chataika notes, always been part of the African psyche. This traditional knowledge risks extinction through the colonising forces of Global North knowledge production which maintains the centrality of individualistic European enlightenment. Global South studies decentre Western European and North American dominance and seek to insert knowledge production that is always locally and historically situated. Such a turn is not to ignore the impact

	Global South disability studies	Dis/ability studies
Meaning	<i>The production of disability is related to historical patterns of imperialism and coloniality with a number of effects including: (i) incidences of impairment are higher in the Global South; (ii) localised responses to disablism are ignored in favour of interventions devised in Global North nations; and (iii) forms of indigenous knowledges and practices are silenced.</i>	<i>'Dis/ability' acknowledges the ways in which disability and disablism (and disability and ability) can only ever be understood simultaneously in relation to one another. The slashed and split term denotes the complex ways in which opposites bleed into one another.</i>
Moral implications	Disabled people living in low-income nations, often in the Global South, are excluded from global discourses and discussions about disability.	Dis/abled people are excluded from an ableist culture, society and economy which also promotes ideals and ambitions that non-disabled people fail to meet.
Sample idea	Supranational discourses such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities are on occasion contested for upholding notions of rights and personhood that fit with WENA conceptualisations of the human.	The politics of self-advocacy/People First emphasises one side of the binary (dis/ability), while recognising new forms of disability activism, interdependent living and distributed competence emboldens the others side (dis/ability).
Origins	2000s onwards, emerging out of critical development, critical disability studies and other disciplines. Key writers include M.Miles, Anita Ghai, Shaun Grech, Tsitsi Chataika, Helen Meekosha, China Mills, Karen Soldatic.	Origins in critical ableist, crip and critical disability studies literature of the late twentieth century. Emerging writers include Jenny Slater, Anat Greenstein, Katherine Runswick-Cole, Kirsty Liddiard, Rebecca Lawthom and the author.
Goals of intervention	Contest Eurocentric and Americanised models of inclusion and disability access and replace them with modes of production that emphasise the complex meldings of local/global; North/South; Westernised/indigenous knowledges.	Destabilise cultural performances of dis/ability and ab/normality; promote disability arts and subculture; subvert liberal arts agenda which often excludes disabled people. Work engages with offerings of each side of binary including dis/ability, dis/humanism, dis/autonomy.
Benefits of approach	Recuperation of indigenous and local knowledge as key factors in addressing disablism. Nuanced recognition of non-Western notions of identity, community and activism. Promotion of critical analyses of the neoliberal-able tendencies underpinning practices including inclusive education, widening participation and the opening up of opportunities for labour.	Sense of belonging and involvement in a disability community; disability pride. Promotion of empowering professionals and self-advocacy informed services. Broadening of political activism to include others engaged in critiquing ableism, normativity and the status quo.
Potential negative effects	Danger of localising analyses of disability and a rejectionist attitude towards some disability studies written in rich income nations.	Danger of recuperating the power of the norm, ability and autonomy if the crip potential of disability is not applied to these phenomena.

Figure 10.2 Critical disability studies: Global South disability and dis/ability studies approaches

Sources: adapted from Ghai (2002, 2006, 2014), Grech (2009a, 2009b, 2015), Meekosha (2011), Goodley (2014), Grech and Soldatic (2014), Soldatic and Grech (2015a, 2015b). See also the open access Journal *Disability and the Global South*: <http://www.dgsjournal.org/>

of globalisation. Indeed, China Mills's²⁴ work on the pan-national reach of psychiatry shows how disability is constituted in the Global South as a global concern. She teases out the ways in which the global language of psychiatric distress is being played out in poor countries. Depression and associated psychopharmacological treatments (read, antidepressant drugs) occupy the rural heartlands of India. Distress caused to Indian farmers by industrial farming (funded by multinational companies and supported by the Indian government) has been understood not as socio-economic distress but as individual mental illness. The response to the socio-political cause of mental ill health has been led by supranational drug companies that circle overhead in search of sufferers requiring drug rehabilitation. Big farms and Big Pharma merge together as local community forms of organisation are disbanded, swallowed up by the neoliberal tendencies of supranational economic growth and gain. Vandana Chaudhry's²⁵ work similarly captures the ways in which the Indian government's funding of disability self-help and community groups – in the name of global and local promotions of mental health promoted by the World Health Organization – replaces local community organisation responses. This leads Anita Ghai²⁶ to conclude that any understanding of disability in subaltern spaces such as India has to be sensitive to the postcolonial nature of India touched by processes of globalisation.

Global South disability scholars have displaced theory and practice from its usual foundations in rich-income nations – a sobering reminder to many of us (and I would include myself here) who engage in global north-centric research. One of the dilemmas of Global South approaches is the extent to which local and traditional practices might now, to some extent, have been written over by the processes of globalisation, Americanisation and other kinds of colonisation and empire. As I shall explore later, one wonders if the notion of the Global South (fundamentally a political category recognising the oppression of poor people in poor nations by rich countries) is in danger of cultural erasure, as the invisible hands of globalisation envelope the world. One also wonders if a focus on the local place of disability is in danger of romanticising the subaltern voices without due consideration being given to the impacts of globalisation. Furthermore, questions have been raised in the Global South literature about whose voices are still dominating debate and leading developments.²⁷ In contrast to Shaun Grech's²⁸ argument that we need a distinct Global South critical disability studies (so as to ensure that Global South priorities are foregrounded), I think that we should keep Global South approaches as a key leading strand of a more generic conception of critical disability studies. This positioning invites an overlapping of concerns across Northern and Southern politics, urging us to develop global and pan-national disability politics, as well as prioritising pressing concerns of the Global South.

Our final critical disability studies approach – dis/ability studies – is an emerging paradigm of work. In my own recent text,²⁹ I seek to reveal the ways in which disability and ability (and for that matter, disablism and ableism) are reproduced as

distinct phenomena that are, nevertheless, dependent upon each other for reproduction. More than that, ability might well be desired as an interlocking, contradictory and desirable entity at the very same time that disability is coveted as a productive identity. In a position of disablist marginalisation one might yearn to be considered as normal as anyone else. Dis/ability is a bifurcated and paradoxical object of politicisation. This ambiguity is elaborated upon in the work of Sheffield Hallam University's Jenny Slater³⁰ and her narrative work on disability and youth. In her text she elucidates upon the very normative desires of disabled young people while also documenting their *crip* potential. She stories her conversations with disabled young women activists in Iceland. These co-researchers, she notes, make a very clear case for disabled young women wanting to adorn clothes and make-up that might be considered gendered, populist and sexualised cultural artefacts. Their rationale is clear: we dress as young women normally dress in the friendship groups that we inhabit. Slater reminds us that these are just some of those physical markers typically associated with being young women. Here we find young women emboldening one side of the *dis/ability* complex. What positions our Icelandic activists outside of this normative order is their working of the other side of *dis/ability*. They refuse to be left in the cul-de-sac of normalcy. Instead, their disability politics draws upon a network of support to enable their encounters with make-up and dress while also locating them in *crip*, queer and feminist politics in Iceland. They rock up as beautifully fragmented postmodern subjects: recognisable in style and polemical as social actors.

The activist-researcher Anat Greenstein³¹ similarly conjoins a valuing *and* repulsion of the traditional, modernist, self-serving human subject. Her work documents time with disabled young people in segregated contexts of school settings. She writes of the desires that young people have to be known as people in their own right (as valued students and learners). But, she also notes, these young people cannot stop their presence from disrupting educational spaces in ways that open up new forms of teaching and learning (practices that are often defined as pedagogy). Greenstein barely conceals her contempt of the able, willing and capable subject that lies at the heart of much socially just and critical pedagogy. And in so doing she reveals the Eurocentric, modernist, humanistic learner at the epicentre of the majority of radical, democratic and critical forms of education. Her disabled learners and co-researchers require more expansive forms of connection and alliance with others (including students and teachers). This might mean dropping the usual demands of national curricula and generating new content, priorities and practices of education. Ironically, these new forms of pedagogy may well invite learners as subjects to be recognised as autonomous in their own right (in fitting with the *dis/ability* side of the complex), albeit with a shift in the perspective and culture of schooling (*dis/abling* normative culture). Our third exemplar of *dis/ability* studies can be found in the groundbreaking work of Kirsty Liddiard.³² Her work originated in Britain and was developed further through her relationships with activists and researchers in Canada. Liddiard revisits sexual desire in the company of disability. While many of

the disabled people she interviewed spoke of their desires for sex and companionship in ways that could easily be typified as illustrative of a normal sexually functioning human subject (*disability* if you like), these same informants brought a complexity to an analysis of sexuality (a *disability* perspective). For example, the input of prosthetics alongside the support of personal assistants, as well as the opening up of the body as a site of desire, reorient how we might normally think of (and do) sex and desire. These three examples showcase the potential of a *disability* studies perspective to disavow the normative humanist human subject while, crucially, offering *crip* alternatives that expand how we might think of the subject. A further example of *disability* studies is offered in this book where we explored the idea of *DisHuman* communities. While there is much potential for the development of *disability* studies I do worry that the disruptive potential of disability (articulated so powerfully by *crip* voices) might be swallowed by the normative desires associated with ableism. Like any position of ambiguity: while sensitive to the contradictions of life it might also promote unhelpful uncertainty.

THREE KEY THEMES FOR CRITICAL DISABILITY STUDIES

With these emerging critical disability studies approaches in mind let us now explore a number of key themes that, I suggest, could occupy contemporary and future research.

1 THE QUESTION OF THE HUMAN

The historical markings and makings of the modern human; the confused blurring of a viable human with ableist idea(l)s around competence and capacity; the extension of the typical human through technology and prosthetics – these are just some of the many different human questions that are posed by the presence of disability. For Tanya Titchkosky, whenever we encounter disability-in-the-world, this is always a very human moment.³³

Global South disability studies and *disability* studies share a viewpoint that human practices which might be deemed as deeply normative (working, earning money, shopping, marriage) remain desirable for many people (disabled or not disabled). Being poor and wanting more money might smack of a neoliberal-ableist subjectivity to those of a *crip* persuasion. To others it is a matter of life and death. *Crip* studies urges us to think again about how we might understand the human. ‘The disruptive child’, ‘the wheelchair-bound’ and ‘the intellectually disabled’ are turned on their heads to become ‘the productive child’, ‘the human-machine hybrid’ and ‘the distribution of intelligence’ that is required of sustainable communities. These are not only reconfigurations of how we understand human

beings now but also have a futuristic desire to them. Concepts such as *hybrids* (taken from postcolonial writing) and *cyborgs* (coming from posthuman and feminist writing) give us the conceptual language for thinking about the potential of human beings in an increasingly technological and postmodern landscape.

The cyborg is associated with the work of Donna Haraway.³⁴ She argued that by the late twentieth century we were already ‘chimeras, theorised and fabricated hybrids of machine and organism’.³⁵ The cyborg is, as Erica Burman describes, a figurative view of the human being that is less caught up in the trappings of tradition and modernity.³⁶ The cyborg is a metaphorical, actual or literal concept that relates to the enmeshing of technology and human subjectivity, the blurring of organic and artificial forms of intelligence, the blending of national and global contexts and the mixing of human and machine.³⁷ The cyborg denotes the ways in which ‘corporeal identities carry the marks of technological change’.³⁸ Cyborgs are ‘spunky, irreverent and sexy: they accept with glee the ability to transgress old boundaries between machine and animal ... male and female, and mind and body’.³⁹

For Rosi Braidotti technology informs a colossal hybridisation of human and machine.⁴⁰ Critical disability studies attends to the impact of machines, not least because the history of disability technology is one of normalisation, cure and rehabilitation.⁴¹ Nevertheless, in the twenty-first century, the postmodernisation of life itself⁴² has created new relationships between science and humanity. The JusticeforLB campaign is an interlinked, cross-border, timeless entity of a Twitter campaign that has democratised debate about disability and human worth. While not forgetting that some important people are missing from social media⁴³ we should not downplay the revolutionary impact of JusticeforLB. Many allies, parents, friends, loved ones, professionals and advocates have got behind the JusticeforLB campaign. And more and more people outside of disability politics are aware of the disability discrimination because of JusticeforLB. We should not be seduced by science nor forget that disabled people’s humanity has historically always been extended through their relationships with prosthetics such as walking sticks and wheelchairs. Disabled humanities are often interfaced with other humans and non-humans in what Deb Marks describes as ‘infinite, polymorphous ways’.⁴⁴ The disabled body is *already cyborg* because it pushes at the margins of the idea of the embodied self,⁴⁵ opening up this very human thing to other humans and non-humans:

- assistive technologies that provide non-speakers with the opportunity to communicate through the use of tablet computers;
- differing levels of personal assistance required and managed by disabled people as part of their personal budget;
- the complex blending of animals and humans to be found in the relationships between blind people and guide dogs;
- the use of personal assistance to enable disabled people’s sex and sexuality.⁴⁶

The cyborg is very much a figure of dis/ability studies because of the ways in which it extends both the *disabilities* of a human being while also foregrounding *disability as the* community to think critically about human–non-human relationships. Cyborgian and disabled humanities are aware of their needs, respectful of their histories and anticipating the future. The cyborg raises important questions about human rights (individual or collective), independence (or interdependence) and co-dependence. These questions are very much at ease with the workings of the dis/ability complex, the potentiality of crip studies while troubling the individualism at the heart of ableism. Both disability and the cyborg urge a moment of human reflection – how do we interconnect with one another (with human or non-human)? The cyborg captures the material interconnectedness of (disabled) bodies and social and technological worlds. Used carefully, the cyborg envisages a future transcending the limits of normalcy.⁴⁷

This mixing of the given and the new resonates with the postcolonial concept of *hybridisation*. Homi Bhabha's work on hybrids emerged out of writing in and about postcolonial contexts.⁴⁸ He suggests that it is best to understand the postcolonial subject as a subject who fuses pre/present/postcolonial practices through 'mimicry, hybridity and sly civility'.⁴⁹ The Indianised gospel music, a British-born Pakistani identity and the glocalisation of a South-East Asian youth exemplify the appropriation and imitation of colonial *and* traditional cultural practices.⁵⁰ The postcolonial subject is always hybridised. We can state similar things about disability. The temporarily able-bodied is a hybrid: an able body that will *become* disabled. And of course the focus of Global South disabilities is always a hybridised figure. For the Australian US-based writer Mark Sherry,⁵¹ Bhabha's⁵² model of hybridisation 'stresses those in-between moments that initiate new sites of identity, new collaborations and new conflicts of one's identity'. The hybrid draws attention to the experimental nature of human subjectivity. This experimentation is reminiscent of the working of the dis/ability complex by Liddiard, Greenstein and Slater outlined above. As Bernadette Baker⁵³ has argued, disabled people are subjectively colonised by a concern to be able to prove one's autonomy. They are, simultaneously, considered as non-normative and therefore perverse in the light of the normative.⁵⁴ Indeed, in some of my own work⁵⁵ I have tried to make sense of the contradictory accounts of parents of their disabled babies and young children. Many parents spoke with uncertainty about their children and disability.⁵⁶ Take the account from a mother, Rebecca:

I'm not saying I'm embarrassed because I'm not ... perhaps it's because I've not accepted it myself yet, I don't know, I don't quite know what it is but ... some people aren't bothered about disability but I am, sometimes.⁵⁷

One interpretation of Rebecca's account is that she is struggling to talk about her child because there are normative (accepting) and disabling (anxious) ways

of being a parent. Splitting parenting into two distinct ways of being would place Rebecca on the bad parent side: a parent in denial. This interpretation is, following Deleuze and Guattari,⁵⁸ a mistake of modernist thinking which insists on the segmentation of the human subject along binary lines (e.g. anxious bad parent or accepting good parent), centralised in linear ways by available discourses (e.g. medical or social models).⁵⁹ The question they encourage us to ask is: not which subject one should be (a bad or good parent) but rather how we work with these binaries in the process of becoming (becoming-parent).

Indeed, if we read Rebecca's account carefully it is full of uncertainties and contradictions: a hybridised account that works the edges of dis/ability. When we understand parenting as a process of becoming and hybridisation we are able to capture the subtle ways in which parents of disabled children engage with dis/ablism, dis/ability and crip/normative complexes through understanding their children (and their own parenting) in ways that find moments of breakout: 'To hit a line of flight ... challenging, not totally escaping, disabling strata of society'.⁶⁰

Hybridisation combines seemingly competing ideas. That disabled people have politicised their lives suggests a collective ability to hybridise and *mimic* the conditions of normative culture (to show they 'really are independent', 'disabled but not stupid', 'people first, not intellectually disabled'), while displaying *a sly civility*⁶¹ that recognises the failings of normative culture by crippling common-sense ideas of what it means to be independent ('Who wants to be independent?' 'What's so good about work?', 'We all have some form of intellectual disabilities'). Cyborg and hybrid encapsulate the in-between-ness of life, offering possibilities for what Bhabha⁶² describes as the setting-off of chains of alternative signifiers or a transitional cultural space to play out fantasies, to disrupt categorisation.⁶³ Perhaps at the heart of a critical disability studies is the appropriation of and resistance to various signifiers of ableist society and the making of new signifiers for the understanding and transformation of self, culture and society. And pushing the envelope of such thinking, we will find Global South disability studies scholarship. The task is to attend to cultural particularities without sliding into romanticised ideas about 'the Other'.⁶⁴ Understanding disability in a twenty-first-century village or town in, say, South-East Asia or WENA, requires us to think carefully about the hybridisation of local and global meanings, of tradition, of new forms of welfare, social services, politics, social class and social capital. Hybrids demand analysis of the complex glocal response to dis/ablism.

2 BODIES THAT MATTER

Critical disability studies contests the idea that biology is destiny,⁶⁵ theorising the body's place in society and culture. This assists the queer feminist strategy of pulling the (male) homeless mind back into the body in order to think carefully about the close connection of private/public, individual/social, psyche/society and

embodied/cultural worlds.⁶⁶ This unsettles the Cartesian split of body/mind which originally rejected the body as far too unruly for modernist rational discourse. Theorists no longer suffer somatophobia (fear of the body). Feminist writers such as Judith Butler, Moira Gatens, Donna Haraway and Elizabeth Grosz⁶⁷ have made the natural body an untenable notion by opposing the idea that the (impaired) body is a brute, biological fact.⁶⁸ Instead, the natural body is understood as an artefact of liberal individualistic capitalist society – a phenomenon *materialised* through a host of ableist self-actualising and becoming-fit practices through which we all strive to reach the standards of citizenship.⁶⁹ Crip studies adopts similar understandings and take up the challenge of queer theories to highlight the limits of the straight, non-disabled body⁷⁰ – a key figure of ableism.

For Abby Wilkerson queer/disabled bodies are potential sites of pleasure, interpersonal connection and acceptance.⁷¹ Seemingly hard-wired (but actually heteronormatively constituted) masculine bodies can be queered (rewired) by the experience of disability and impairment. Andy Sparkes and Brett Smith's work on the experiences of young men who have acquired spinal cord injuries (SCI) demonstrates very complex identity work.⁷² On becoming SCI, men spoke of losing old 'boys' friendships and the double bind of fighting to become 'whole' with 'incomplete bodies'. But they also spoke of their surprise at finding disability politics. For some, the solitary masculine relationships that they had prior to SCI had been replaced with more mutually inclusive and interdependent ones. Their new bodies prompted revision. Bodies are conceptualised not as solitary, lacking entities but as interconnected and productive.⁷³ The crip body has a propensity to leak and overflow, blurring distinctions between self and other, with the potential to engulf.⁷⁴ Disabled bodies expand and envelope in exciting ways. Theories of gendered, raced, sexed, classed and disabled bodies offer us critical languages for de-naturalising impairment.⁷⁵ At the same time, an analysis of the body evokes complicated debates about enhancement, improvement and prosthetics. Cochlear implants, facial plastic surgery for children with the label of Down's syndrome, and cures for spinal injuries can be understood as body projects with moral, ethical and political dimensions – viewed either as working the dis/ability complex or as examples of ableist desire. Queer feminists such as Kathy Davis⁷⁶ argue that we need to view surgery as a complex dilemma: problem and solution, a symptom of oppression and act of empowerment, all in one. In this sense, Davis's analysis recalls a dis/ability studies analysis. To recognise this duality ensures that we comprehend choice as always entailing compliance. Indeed, children and their families consciously use new impairments such as ADHD, Asperger's syndrome and ODD. For example, the slogan 'I'm not naughty, I'm autistic' scrawled on the t-shirts of children so-labelled is a beneficial strategy to have in community settings. Conversely, though, labels risk categorising difference *only* through the powerful lens of biopower. Furthermore, as Raewyn Connell⁷⁷ reminds us, most bodies are not white, not well fed and not living in rich countries. To ask what kinds of body

we value has to take into account the majority of the world, thus inviting a Global South perspective.

In *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*, Judith Butler⁷⁸ asks a number of questions which I have rewritten in order to consider dis/ablism:

- 1 How are non-disabled bodies made more viable than disabled bodies?
- 2 How do societal practices uphold the precarious higher status of non-disabled people through the abjection of disabled people?
- 3 In what ways do disabled bodies rearticulate what qualifies as a body that matters?

The first two questions have been addressed sociologically, individually, psychologically, discursively and educationally in this book. The third question poses an exciting challenge for critical disability studies, one that has been taken up in particular by crip theorists.

3 THE GLOBAL BIOPOLITICS OF DIS/ABILITY

In a recent text⁷⁹ I drew upon Rabinow and Rose (2006)'s take on biopower: the making of individuals and the wider population through three interrelated practices. First, the production of one or more truth discourses about the 'vital' character of living human beings, and the investment in an array of authorities considered competent to speak that truth. Think, for example of psychological well-being and its antithesis, psychological breakdown. Think too of psychiatrists, child psychologists and life coaches invited to speak of this (ill) health. Truth discourses allow us to speak of an individual's dis/ability. Second, the state adopts a number of strategies for intervening in the lives of its members in the name of life and health. Hence, school programmes and educational policies are developed to address psychological well-being in schools. Third, the aforementioned discourses and strategies are drawn upon by people in order to govern themselves. So, children come to know and act upon their own psychological well-being (or lack of it). And in so doing they come to understand their selves in the sense of the dis/ability dichotomy.

Critical disability studies is aware of the global politics of biopower. And the recent text by Mitchell and Snyder⁸⁰ goes a long way in terms of tapping into the co-constitution of disability and ability, disablism and ableism, and illness and health through a host of biopolitical discourses, techniques, professions and institutions. Where there is normality one will, of course, find abnormality. One needs too to be attuned to the differential workings of biopower. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire*⁸¹ merges analyses of globalisation, economic expansion of late capitalism, rapid developments in communication and the impact of biopower on the global citizen. Empire is conceived of as a postcolonial and postmodern process in which knowledge, particularly from the Global North, spreads across the globe in

ways that are, potentially, imposed on, taken up or resisted by citizens in their local contexts. Empire refers to an enveloping global politics of biopower. Through globalisation and the rapid expansion of the capitalist free market, all global citizens are more and more likely to come into contact with biopower. Ideas from psychiatry and psychology, for example, know no fixed boundaries as they are caught up in the plural pan-national exchange of information and communication. Empire also refers to a *globalised biopolitical machine*⁸² through which theories of subjectivity spread, infecting or affecting citizens in every corner of the world. The processes of biopower have in mind a preferred version of the self: healthy, rational, autonomous, educated, economically viable, self-governing and able – a self-contained individual. And if you don't fit, then Empire is ready to fix you. But Hardt and Negri⁸³ also want to document the ways in which global citizens envisage other ways of being – through and against the practices of biopower – that are enabling to them.

Hardt and Negri⁸⁴ consider the ways in which non-government organisations (NGOs) such as Oxfam, Médecins Sans Frontières and Amnesty provide international aid in the development of nation states of the majority world, addressing issues such as poverty, literacy and disability. Check out the websites of Oxfam, Médecins Sans Frontières and Amnesty and you will find that the aims of these organisations reflect the liberal philosophies and values of WENA countries. While we might agree with the promotion of such virtues associated with universal human rights, questions remain about the elision of liberal philosophies with the aims of a free neoliberal market. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child aims to extend children's welfare, cultural and political rights but also instils a culturally specific notion of idealised child subjects and family forms.⁸⁵ The *Indian Human Development Report* smuggled in archetypal medicalised Global North conceptions of impairment that might not fit readily with the Indian context.⁸⁶ Disabled children's inclusion in schools is framed by bilateral and multinational donors from the minority world who fund and monitor the progress of the nations that they patronise.⁸⁷ One of the International Monetary Fund's loan requirements of Argentina has been the reduction to pensions and programmes for elderly people, many of whom are disabled.⁸⁸ The biopolitics of dis/ability can damage local contexts. The productive impacts are to be found when the self-contained individualism of Empire is used politically towards specific ends by people in their countries. The examples of Empire cited above use the language of self-contained individualism: of individual human rights, educational achievement through inclusion, and independence and self-help. Understanding dis/ability requires us to think carefully about the hybrid of local and global meanings, of tradition and Empire, of new forms of welfare, social services, politics, social class and social capital.

Scholars of Global South disability studies Miles⁸⁹ and Grech⁹⁰ enunciate a postcolonial attitude against new disability discourses (developed in the Global North) and the potential dangers of transplanting them (in the Global South).

Their work critiques occidentalism (discourses emanating from the Metropole), which includes aspirations such as ‘rights’, ‘independence’ and ‘individualism’, and they remind us that if disability studies are to develop in ways that do not recreate colonialist pasts then scholars and researchers have to be mindful of the fit of their theories in specific geographical places. Following Hardt and Negri⁹¹ and Jude McKenzie,⁹² effective politics such as those displayed in South Africa combine a call on the truth and rights discourse of Empire (that redress the impacts of colonisation) while also celebrating cultural specifics of distinct national communities (which enlarge notions of community and civic membership).

How we understand complex meetings of global/local, North/South and new/traditional requires theoretical ideas that are in tune with fusion of these binaries. Empire takes as a given that all majority and minority world contexts are mixes of the old and new: postcolonised and independent, occidental and oriental, North and South, global and local. Cities of the Global South are mixed with the consumerism traditionally associated with the Global North,⁹³ and the sweatshops of Paris and New York rival those of Manila and Hong Kong.⁹⁴ Consequently, this raises important questions about *how* we approach the study of global biopolitics of dis/ability but also *who* we are working with in terms of resistance and reappropriation. In bringing together dis/ability and Global South we might address the differential impacts of dis/ability biopolitics.

CONCLUSIONS

Disability is an opportunity to rethink how we organise our lives with one another. Critical disability studies both ensures that disabled people’s discrimination is no longer sidelined and centralises ideas associated with disability (and ability) when developing intellectual, practical and political responses to diversity and inequity. Disability urges a reconsideration of what it means to be human, *the* category through which to investigate the ways in which biopolitics are created and an entry point for contemplations about human nature in globalised times. Critical disability studies takes seriously social theory but does so as it desires social change. At the time of writing, this was an update from the JusticeforLB campaign:

NHS trust ‘failed to properly investigate deaths of more than 1,000 patients’

BBC News, 9th December 2015.⁹⁵

An NHS hospital trust failed to properly investigate the deaths of more than 1,000 patients with learning disabilities or mental health problems over four years, an independent inquiry has found. A leaked copy of the inquiry's report severely criticises a 'failure of leadership' at Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust and accuses senior managers of not looking into and learning from deaths ...

Of the 1,454 unexpected deaths, the trust regarded 272 as critical incidents but classed only 195 of them – or one in seven – as a serious incident that needed to be investigated.

But while it looked into 30% of the deaths among adults with mental health problems, it did so with only 1% of those with learning disabilities and 0.3% of over-65s with mental health problems.

Patients with a learning disability died at an average age of 56, which is seven years earlier than the usual life expectancy ...

NHS England ordered the inquiry after Connor Sparrowhawk, an 18-year-old with learning disabilities, drowned in a bath at the trust's Slade House unit after suffering an epileptic seizure ...

Sara Ryan, Sparrowhawk's mother, told the BBC: 'There is no reason why in 2015 a report like this should come out. It's a total scandal. It just sickens me.'⁹⁶

This report is no compensation for the death of LB. Nor will it feel like true justice for his family. The report is one consequence of a distinct political movement that formed around #JusticeforLB. This was a political pulse informed by the politics of disability and an important message: that people are not prepared to accept discrimination in the lives of disabled people. This message alone reminds us of the importance of disability studies as a field that brings together artists, activists, academics and practitioners to contest oppression and re-site disability as *the* place from which to rethink the social world.

SELF-REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

- Define critical disability studies.
 - How can we develop disability studies theories that are culturally in tune with low-income as well as high-income nations?
 - To what extent does the study of disability also require the study of ability?
-

GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- Summarise the critical disability studies approaches of crip studies, critical studies of ableism, Global South disability studies and dis/ability studies.
- What one message will you share with a friend today that you have learnt from the JusticeforLB campaign?
- To what extent is disability studies always the study of ableism?

Further reading

Erevelles, N. (2012). *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Towards a Transformative Body Politic*. London: Palgrave.

A text that speaks across national borders and disciplinary divides to articulate an approach to disability studies that is informed by materialist politics though mindful of recent developments in crip and ableist studies.

Goodley, D. (2014). *Dis/ability Studies: Theorising Disablism and Ableism*. London: Routledge.

Apologies for the self-referential nature of this but I add it only for those readers who are interested in exploring the emerging approach of dis/ability studies. This work has, in part, promoted some discussions with colleagues: www.dishuman.com.

Grech, S. and Soldatic, K. (2016). *Disability in the Global South: The Critical Handbook*. New York: Springer.

A timely bringing-together of critical voices from across the globe that sets up a number of key debates and political priorities.

Mazars (2015). Independent review of deaths of people with a learning disability or mental health problem in contact with Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust April 2011 to March 2015. Independent Review: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/south/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2015/12/mazars-rep.pdf> (retrieved 10 January 2016).

A review of all deaths of people in receipt of care from mental health and learning disability services in the Trust between April 2011 and March 2015.

Mills, C. (2014). *Decolonizing Global Mental Health: The Psychiatrization of the Majority World*. London and New York: Routledge.

A cracking book that analyses the ways in which the medicalisation of everyday life has become a global concern, with horrific consequences for those in the majority world countries.

Mitchell, D. and Snyder, S. (2015). *The Biopolitics of Disability: Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Big-name disability theorists still prepared to take risks and rethink theory and politics. Wonderfully researched and incredibly well written.

Shildrick, M. (2012). Critical disability studies: rethinking the conventions for the age of postmodernity. In N. Watson, A. Roulstone and C. Thomas (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Disability Studies* (pp. 30–41). London: Routledge.

A neat postconventionalist account of why we need the critical in disability studies.

Titchkosky, T. (2011). *The Question of Access: Disability, Space, Meaning*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

This phenomenological interpretivist sociological text provides a comprehensible and incredibly authoritative account of the ways in which disability disrupts normative space and meanings.

Notes

- 1 Meekosha and Shuttleworth (2009); Barnes (2012); Goodley (2012); Shildrick (2012); Sheldon (2014); Vehmas and Watson (2013); Mitchell and Snyder (2015).
- 2 Davis (2002, 2006c).
- 3 See Goodley's (2012) discussion of Overboe (2007a) and Vidali (2010).
- 4 Vidali (2010).
- 5 McRuer (2012a, 2012b, 2012c).
- 6 McRuer (2012a).
- 7 Goodley (2014: 169).
- 8 Halberstam (2011).
- 9 Aho (2015).
- 10 Elias (2012: 1962).
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Michalko (2010).
- 13 Michalko (2015).
- 14 Goodley et al. (in press).
- 15 Rose (2001).
- 16 Braidotti (2013).
- 17 Campbell (2009).
- 18 Carlson (2001).
- 19 Masschelein and Simons (2005).
- 20 Vehmas and Watson (2013).
- 21 Goodley and Runswick-Cole (2014).
- 22 Goodley (2014).
- 23 Chataika (2007, 2012).
- 24 Mills (2014).
- 25 Chaudhry (2011).
- 26 Ghai (2006, 2014).

- 27 See Goodley and Swartz (2016).
- 28 Grech (2015b).
- 29 Goodley (2014).
- 30 Slater (2015).
- 31 Greenstein (2016).
- 32 Liddiard (2012, 2013).
- 33 Titchkosky (2011).
- 34 Haraway (1991).
- 35 Ibid. (50).
- 36 Burman (2008).
- 37 Haraway's manifesto (1991: 180–181) is captured in the following section: 'Cyborg imagery can suggest a way out of the maze of dualisms in which we have explained our bodies and our tools to ourselves. This is a dream not of a common language, but of a powerful infidel heteroglossia. It is an imagination of a feminist speaking in tongues to strike fear into the circuits of the supersaves of the new right. It means both building and destroying machines, identities, categories ... I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess.'
- 38 Meekosha (1998: 26).
- 39 Siebers (2006: 178).
- 40 Braidotti (2002).
- 41 See Reeve (2012) brilliant work on iCrip.
- 42 Hardt and Negri (2000).
- 43 Many people with learning disabilities are absent from social media communities for a number of reasons (Holmes and O'Loughlin, 2012).
- 44 Marks (1999b: 14).
- 45 A point made by Margrit Shildrick and Janet Price (2006).
- 46 Take, for example, Liddiard (2012).
- 47 Meekosha (2008); Reeve (2008).
- 48 Bhabha (1985).
- 49 Ibid. (21).
- 50 See also Spivak (1985: 253).
- 51 Sherry (2007: 19).
- 52 Bhabha (1985).
- 53 Baker (2002).
- 54 A point made by Wilkerson (2002).
- 55 Goodley (2007b).
- 56 Reported in McLaughlin et al. (2008).
- 57 Cited in Goodley (2007b: 155).
- 58 Deleuze and Guattari (1987).
- 59 See the following for examples of critical disability studies that use Deleuze and Guattari: Shildrick (2004); Shildrick and Price (2006); Goodley (2007a, 2007b); Roets et al. (2008); *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 3 (3) (2009).
- 60 Goodley (2007b: 154).
- 61 Bhabha (1985).

- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Burman (2008).
- 64 Ibid. (203).
- 65 Linton (1998a: 532).
- 66 Davis (1997a).
- 67 For indicative references see Butler (1990, 1993), Gatens (1999), Haraway (1991) and Grosz (1999).
- 68 It is important to recognise that Butler's influential work has received criticism (e.g. Boucher, 2006).
- 69 Overboe (2007a).
- 70 McRuer (2002: 224).
- 71 Wilkerson (2002: 34).
- 72 Sparkes and Smith (2003, 2004).
- 73 Hickey-Moody (2009: 75).
- 74 Shildrick and Price (1999).
- 75 Donaldson (2002: 112).
- 76 Davis (1997b).
- 77 Connell (2001).
- 78 Butler (1993, see also 1999: 243).
- 79 Goodley (2014).
- 80 Mitchell and Snyder (2015).
- 81 Hardt and Negri (2000).
- 82 Ibid. (40).
- 83 Ibid.
- 84 Ibid.
- 85 Burman (2008: 53).
- 86 Ghai (2006).
- 87 See Gabel and Danforth (2008a).
- 88 McRuer and Wilkerson (2003: 3).
- 89 Miles (2000, 2002, 2006).
- 90 Grech (2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c).
- 91 Hardt and Negri (2000).
- 92 McKenzie (2009).
- 93 Burman (2008: 187).
- 94 An observation proffered by Hardt and Negri (2000).
- 95 <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/dec/09/southern-health-nhs-trust-failed-investigate-patient-deaths-inquiry>.
- 96 See also 'NHS trust "failed to investigate hundreds of deaths"' by Michael Buchanan, Social Affairs Correspondent, BBC News, 10 December 2015: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-35051845>.