

Generating Change: Disability, Culture and Art

Colin Barnes

(This is the penultimate draft of an article that appears in: *Behinderung und Dritte Welt (Journal for Disability and International Development)*. 19 Jargang, Ausgabe 1. 4 -13 (2008).

Abstract.

Since the emergence of the international disabled people's movement in the mid twentieth century, disabled people have increasingly begun to explore their experience of oppression in various cultural forms. Disability politics and the disability arts movement are now inextricably linked and a world wide phenomenon. This paper explores the links between disability politics, culture and art, provides a broad overview of the disability arts movement, and critically evaluates the implications of these phenomena for both disabled and non disabled people and the struggle for a more inclusive society.

Introduction

During the latter half of the twentieth century, disabled people across the world began to express themselves in a variety of cultural forms including painting, sculpture, literature, poetry, music, theatre and dance. This is not necessarily a new phenomenon however. People with accredited impairments have been involved in cultural production - the arts and sciences - since the ancient world of Greece and Rome. Indeed, for centuries impairment and suffering have been seen as an almost necessary prerequisite for creativity and artistic endeavour. What is significant about recent developments

within the context of disability art is that since the emergence of the international disabled people's movement in the 1960s, disability art has become inextricably linked to a radical new disability politics and culture; its aim is to bring about a more equitable and inclusive future. In this article I will begin by exploring the relationship between culture, politics and art. I will then provide a brief overview of the emergence of the disability arts movement, and finally I will critically evaluate some of the important implications of disability art and a disability culture.

Disability, culture, and art

It is important to note at the outset that culture is a particularly elusive concept that means many things to many people. In the broadest sense, for example, it is inevitably linked, in one way or another, to politics and is often used to refer to an overarching set of values and norms associated with a particular group, community, nation or society. Hence, parliamentary democracy, freedom of choice and the English language are generally associated with western culture (Giddiness 2006).

But, historically, the word culture has also been used with reference to what is considered the best that has been thought and said' in a particular society and age. Here culture encompasses the sum of the 'great ideas' to be found in the classic works of literature, painting, sculpture, music and philosophy. Highly prized and appreciated by often only a relative minority, such works are frequently referred to as 'high culture'. More recently, but within the same train of thought, the term has been used with reference to the more widely distributed artefacts of everyday life. Examples include television programmes, pop music, pulp fiction, art design, fashion, leisure

activities and lifestyle. This is referred to as 'mass' or 'popular culture', High culture versus popular culture was, for many years, the classic way of framing debates about culture, with both terms carrying a value judgement - 'high' culture being good, and popular culture being for 'mass' consumption and thus somehow debased or construed as bad and of less value (Hall 1997).

It is worth mentioning that discussions about the relationship between mainstream or 'hegemonic' culture and minority or 'subcultures' are also significant. Dominant cultures are often perceived as oppressive by some sections of society. In response oppressed groups sometimes develop their own cultural norms and values. These then provide members with an individual and collective defence mechanism against oppression, as well as a form of cultural resistance. Well known examples include Afro Caribbean Rastafarian culture, and Gay and Lesbian cultures. Besides contributing to mainstream pop culture in terms of music and fashion, these subcultures also constitute an alternative lifestyle. In many ways therefore, these and other sub-cultural forms are important mechanisms for generating social change in the sense that they represent a growing and general dissatisfaction with dominant cultural values (Hall and Jefferson 1976).

From this perspective, therefore, subcultures constitute a kind of 'counter hegemony' with the potential for challenging and, in the long term, changing mainstream culture. All of which has relevance to the debates about disability culture and art. Indeed, as many disabled activists and scholars have pointed out western culture is replete with negative images of disabled people. It is therefore a predominantly non-disabled culture - its norms and values are those of non-disabled people (Scott 1969: Rieser and Mason 1990: Morrison and Finkelstein 1992).

Disability culture, on the other hand, is therefore a minority, sub, or subordinate culture. It emerged from within, and is associated with, the international disabled people's movement, and reflects the norms and values of disabled activists, their supporters and allies. Key elements of disability culture are the redefinition of disability by disabled people and their organisations, and the radical socio/political interpretation or social understanding of disability commonly referred to as the social model of disability (Barnes and Mercer 2001; 2003).

This radical socio/political interpretation of disability entered the political arena in 1974 following the groundswell of political activity amongst disabled people across the world during the previous decade. The critique of 'able-bodied' society and orthodox individual medical interpretations of disability was first codified into a radical alternative by Britain's *Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation* (UPIAS). Comprised exclusively of people with physical and sensory impairments, the UPIAS manifesto entitled *The Fundamental Principles of Disability* (1976) contains the profound assertion that it is society that disables people with impairments.

In our view it is society which disables physically impaired people. **Disability** (emphasis added) is something imposed on top of our impairments by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society. Disabled people are therefore an oppressed group in society (UPIAS 1976: 14).

The UPIAS analysis of the disabling society is built on a clear distinction between the biological (impairment) and the social (disability), and is contained in their *Policy Statement* of 1974. Here Impairment denotes 'Lacking

part or all of a limb, or having a defective limb, organ or mechanism of the body' and disability is:

'The disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by a contemporary social organisation which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from participation in the mainstream of social activities' (UPIAS 1976: 3-4) .

Clearly, the medical conceptualisation of physical impairment has been retained, in contrast to the definition of disability in socio-political terms.

Such an approach renders the use of the phrase 'people with disabilities' problematic since it blurs the crucial conceptual and analytical distinction between the biological and the social. This has caused considerable confusion outside the United Kingdom (UK) since many non-English speaking countries have no equivalent, or are unhappy, with the term impairment. The confusion is further compounded by the tendency amongst academics and professionals to ignore the theoretical and investigative implications of the UPIAS construct.

Nonetheless, the UPIAS approach was later adopted and adapted by many organisations controlled and run by disabled people including, in 1981, the *British Council of Organisations of Disabled People*, renamed the *United Kingdom's Disabled People's Council* (UKDCP) in 2006 (BCODP 2008) and *Disabled People's International* (DPI), to encompass all forms of impairment whether physical, sensory or cognitive (Barnes 1991: Driedger 1989). The UKDCP is Britain's national umbrella for organisations controlled and run by disabled people and DPI is the international equivalent for national agencies such as the UKDCP (DPI 2008).

This holistic approach is based on the insight that in a society geared almost exclusively to the needs of a mythical non-disabled ideal, physical, sensory and cognitive impairments are inevitably interrelated. Also impairment specific labels have little meaning beyond the need for appropriate medical treatments and social supports. They are also socially and politically divisive.

Moreover, this re-interpretation of disability has facilitated the construction of a 'social model' (Oliver, 1981) or 'social barriers model' of disability (Finkelstein, 1991). This approach focuses on the various barriers: economic, political and cultural, encountered by people with accredited impairments. Thus 'disability' is not a product of individual failings but is socially created; explanations for its changing character are found in the organization and structures of society. Moreover, although its value is contested by some academics (see for example Shakespeare and Watson 2002; Shakespeare 2006), social model inspired thinking has had a significant impact on the shaping of disability policy, both at the national and international levels. In the UK, the social model forms the basis for the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit's programme for *Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People* (PMSU 2005). It lies at the heart of the *Commission of the European Communities Disability Policy* (CEC 2003) and was instrumental in the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Disability and Rehabilitation Team's *Rethinking Care from the Perspective of Disabled People* initiatives (WHO 2001) and their redefinition of disability as the *International Classification of Disability Functioning and Health* (WHO 2002).

Disability culture may be differentiated from mainstream culture in other ways too. First, interacting with other disabled people is often especially important for people

with accredited impairments, because in the majority of cases disabled people are unable to share the same experiences as non-disabled people or conform to mainstream norms and values. Second, within the context of disability culture there is an acceptance of impairment as a symbol of difference rather than shame, and recognition of the significance and value of a disabled lifestyle. This can mean anything from articulating the experiences of impairment and disability openly and without shame, through to the rejection of prostheses or other artificial aids designed to conceal or minimise the visibility or effects of impairment. Thus the cause of the problem - impairment, is inverted to become a source of individual and collective empowerment and pride. Finally, since the 1970s, disquiet over the prevalence of disablist imagery in popular culture and the arts among the disabled community has prompted the development of a positive alternative, now known as the disability arts movement (Barnes and Mercer 2001; Sutherland 2003).

Consequently, disability politics and disability arts are intimately connected. For the disabled activist and writer Alan Sutherland:

Disability arts would not have been possible without disability politics coming along first. It's what makes a disability artist different from an artist with a *disability*. (emphasis added) (Sutherland 1997: 159)

This is important because the relationship between impairment, culture and art is intertwined and extremely complex.

Indeed, throughout recorded history impairment and 'suffering' have been viewed as an almost necessary prerequisite of creativity and artistic endeavour (Sontag 1982). There are many examples of famous writers, poets,

artists and musicians with long term illnesses or accredited impairments. For instance, although his existence is open to conjecture, Homer, the Greek philosopher and poet, is but one important example. Other well known examples include Ludwig van Beethoven (1770 - 1827), Lord Byron (1788-1824), Vincent Van Gogh (1853-90) and Henri de Toulouse Lautrec (1864-1901). The stereotype of the flawed artist remains as strong as ever within western culture. Post-punk singer Ian Curtis, of the cult rock band *Joy Division*, for example, owed some of his reputation for tragic extremism to his epilepsy. But while impairment may on occasion be said to add to the appeal or the insight of a particular artistic figure, it is important to remember that many artists with accredited impairments have denied or ignored this aspect of their lives. Others have reacted in a personal rather than a political way. Contemporary examples include musicians Ray Charles, Jacqueline du Pré, Evelyn Glennie, Stevie Wonder, Hank Williams and Ian Dury (Barnes and Mercer 2001; Kingsley 2006).

However, the connection between biology and art represents a complete contrast with art as therapy. Traditional responses to the issue of disabled people and the arts have been based on paternalism. Those disabled people viewed as inadequate and incapable have been given art as therapy in the context of segregated special schools, day centres, and residential institutions. Such initiatives have not just individualised and depoliticised creativity, but also in some cases exploited it for commercial purposes without the artists' knowledge or consent. Whilst there is arguably a place for art therapy, disabled people do not deserve this presumption of perpetual infantilisation, and increasingly, have refused to put up with it. For Allan Sutherland:

The term 'art therapy' is one of those phrases, like 'military intelligence', that contains an internal contradiction. Art therapy uses the forms of art for entirely unartistic ends. In particular it leaves out communication; for it assumes we (disabled people) have nothing to communicate. (Sutherland 1997: 159)

By way of contrast disability arts is all about communication. In particular, it stresses the role of the arts in developing cultural (and by inference political) identity:

Disability arts... provides a context in which disabled people can get together, enjoy themselves and think in some way about issues of common concern. But it goes deeper than that, as disability culture really does offer people a key to the basic process of identifying as a disabled person, because culture and identity are closely linked concepts. (Vasey 1992: 11)

Disability art is, therefore, about exposing the disabling imagery and processes of society. There is also a role to play alongside conventional political activities:

Arts practice should also be viewed as much as a tool for change as attending meetings about orange badge provision ... Only by ensuring an integrated role for disability arts and culture in the struggle can we develop the vision to challenge narrow thinking, elitism and dependency on others for our emancipation. To encourage the growth of a disability culture is no less than to begin the radical task of transforming ourselves from passive and dependent beings into active and creative agents for social change. (Morrison and Finkelstein 1992: 11-12)

Therefore disability art is potentially educative, transformative, expressive, emotionally exploratory, participative, and involving. It is a conception of cultural action that owes much to playwrights such as Berthold Brecht and educationalists like Paulo Freire, because it is radical, challenging and progressive at an individual and social level. Brecht was a well-known German Marxist dramatist whose plays and songs focus on oppression and injustice, and Freire, a Brazilian teacher and writer, perceived education as an important means of transforming people's political consciousness.

It is a sign of the maturity and confidence of the disabled people's movement that disabled people are able to celebrate difference, and work together to create and discuss images of their own choosing. Mainstream arts have not confronted disability as a socio-political issue. Moreover, disabled people are often dis-empowered, if not excluded, by arts training. Therefore, developing their own art, in environments controlled by them, is seen as critical if disabled people are to develop as creative producers, and compete with artists in the mainstream.

It is for this reason that the disabled people's movement has supported and nurtured its own artists and sought to provide for them opportunities to experiment and develop the necessary experience and confidence (Cribb 1993). Hitherto, the difficulty has been to avoid imposing a non-disabled view of quality. It is vital to recognise the process on which people are engaged, the struggle against barriers involved in getting there, and the context in which work is presented (Pick 1992).

There is little doubt that there has been a lack of a positive cultural identity for disabled people to draw upon, and in the face of extensive cultural oppression disability culture and art has had to be created almost from scratch.

The origins of disability culture and art

There is little doubt that disability culture and art as defined above is a product of the late twentieth century, and that the process of exclusion has played a significant role in its development. It is highly likely however that disabled people throughout recorded history - in various circumstances and to varying degrees - have developed alternative value systems based around their own values and unmet needs rather than those of the dominant majority.

Certainly, ever since the ancient world of Greece and Rome disparate sections of the disabled population have found themselves thrown together whether through choice or otherwise. Indeed, in eighteenth century Europe the practice of segregating the most severely impaired members of the community into institutions of various kinds was gradually extended to include other sections of the population. In the UK it was a practice that continued well into the 1960s and 70s (Scull 1984; Stiker 2001). Given the tendency among all other marginalised or outsider groups to develop alternate value systems, it is almost inconceivable that those excluded on the basis of perceived impairment would not have done the same. This process of exclusion generates a shared experience for inmates. Examples include the experience of separate schooling, segregated transport, dealing with professionals, welfare services, rehabilitation agencies and charities. Many people born with congenital impairments will experience the same institutionalised educational experiences, just as people who acquire impairments will often share the same medical experiences.

To this extent it is possible to talk of a shared culture, albeit one based on the experience of oppressive institutional settings. Certainly the seeds of a proactive disability culture are clearly visible in the early writings of Paul Hunt, himself an inmate of various residential institutions for most of his adult life:

I would suggest that our role in society can be likened to that of the satirist in some respects. Maybe we have to remind people of a side of life they would sooner forget. We do this primarily by what we are. But we can intensify it and make it more productive if we are fully conscious of the tragedy of our situation, yet show by our lives that we believe this is not the final tragedy. (Hunt 1966: 156)

The process of exclusion was fundamental to the development of Deaf culture. For the American writer Lennard Davis, Deaf culture has its roots in the eighteenth century, with the discovery of 'deafness' and the development of schools for deaf children. Of course many authors had written about deafness before then. But for Davis the emergence of these schools signals a major qualitative shift in deaf people's individual and collective experiences. Hitherto, they had had no shared experience. On the whole they remained isolated from each other and were therefore, without a shared, complex, language (Davis 1995; Padden and Humphries 2006).

However, in understanding the cultural experience of deafness, it is important to distinguish between sign language users and non signers. Many people with hearing impairments acquire their condition during the life course. As a consequence although they may be described as deaf or hard of hearing, signing may not be their first language. People born with hearing impairment are likely to have grown up in an environment in which

signing is the primary method of communication. Hence they may refer to themselves as a Deaf person; the use of the capital D denoting membership a cultural or linguistic minority. This is analogous to other minority ethnic groups who are similarly likely to be excluded from mainstream culture as English is not their first language. At the same time, they resist identification as disabled people or people with impairments. This political approach has sometimes proved a stumbling block to relations between Deaf people and the disabled people's movement as a whole (Corker 1998). It is notable however that the British Deaf Association (BDA), a national organisation controlled and run by Deaf people formed in 1890 was a member of the BCODP from the outset and some of its members were active in the campaign for Anti Discrimination Legislation for disabled people during the 1990s (Barnes 1991).

A further element in the development of disability culture and the arts that should not be over-looked is the relationship between disabled people and the 'entertainment' industry. Historically, people with perceived impairments or 'abnormalities' have provided an important source of entertainment for the non-disabled majority. The ancient Egyptians, for example, used blind people as musicians, artists and masseuses. Deformed slaves were highly prized among the Greeks and Romans. The custom of keeping these people as enslaved entertainers became popular during the Hellenistic era. People of short stature or 'dwarfs' were particularly popular in Athens and Imperial Rome (Garland 1995: Edwards 1998).

Throughout the medieval period, society's apparent fascination with perceived abnormalities persisted. Many royal courts in Europe between 1600 and 1800 retained people of short stature as court jesters or kept a compliment of 'fools' (these were people with learning difficulties or others who feigned idiocy for amusement).

During the Middle Ages and thereafter, people with accredited deformities and intellectual impairments were often displayed for money at village fairs and on market days, festivals and holidays. Such practices became institutionalised in the nineteenth century with the development of the 'freak show', a phrase used to refer to 'the formally organised exhibition of people with alleged physical, mental or behavioural difference at circuses, fairs carnivals or other amusement venues' (Bogdan 1996: 25). Freak shows flourished throughout Britain and North America in the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century. Although these exhibitions were undoubtedly frequently the site for the uncontrolled exploitation and degradation of people with impairments, for some they provided a welcome refuge from the pathologising gaze and controlling influence of the newly ascendant medical profession. Many viewed themselves as professional performers and an essential part of show business (Gerber 1996). This is clearly reflected in Todd Browning's classic 1932 film 'Freaks' (Hawkins 1996; Browning 2001).

Due in part to the economic, political and social changes of the 1940s and beyond, the popularity of the freak show has declined markedly. Moreover, since the politicisation of disability in the 1960s and 70s disabled people's involvement in the performing arts has changed considerably.

The disability arts movement

Clearly then disability arts, recently referred to as the 'last remaining avant-garde movement' by the writer and broadcaster Lord Melvin Bragg (Bragg 2007: 1), is not simply about disabled people obtaining access to the mainstream of artistic consumption and production. Nor is it about simply expressing the individual experiences of

living with or coming to terms with an accredited impairment. Disability art is the development of shared cultural meanings and collective expression of the experience of disability and struggle. It entails using art to expose the discrimination and prejudice disabled people face, and to generate group consciousness and solidarity. For a growing number of people around the world, the main forum for positive cultural representations of the disability experience is only located within the context of disability arts.

Early initiatives in the disability arts movement include the production of *Link*, a television programme specifically for disabled people, by a British independent production company; and the production of newsletters and magazines by the disabled people's movement. Examples include *The Disability Rag*, the unofficial newspaper of the American Independent Living Movement started in 1980; *In From the Cold*, the magazine produced by Britain's Liberation Network of People with Disabilities, established in 1981 - the last edition appeared in 1987; *Coalition*, the magazine of the Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People (GMCDP) - it first appeared in 1986 and is still going strong, and the *DAIL* (Disability Arts in London) Magazine. Whilst all these periodicals include articles, features, reviews, and commentary on disability issues, culture and art, the latter, as its name implies is devoted exclusively to arts practice. *DAIL* began operations in 1987. In 1999 it had a national circulation of 3000, and an estimated 8000 readers (DAIL 1999). It is now available under a new name Arts Disability Culture as a reflection of its national audience (LDAF. 2008).

Further illustrations of this trend include the setting up of *London Disability Arts Forum* in 1986, and a general upsurge in conferences, exhibitions, workshops, cabaret and performance throughout Britain. All of which has

generated a wealth of artefacts including paintings, sculpture, novels, poetry, plays, music and performance art both in Britain and the rest of the world. Indeed, recent research by the newly formed Edward Lear Foundation shows that in 2003 there were more than 50 organisations and agencies involved in the development of disability art in the UK alone. Moreover, a chronology of the development of disability culture and art in the UK has been produced by the disabled writer, comedian and activist Allan Sutherland (Sutherland 2003).

Also, there is an increasingly politically aware disability voice reflected on film and in other media produced by disabled people. It represents a growing body of work that takes:

Legitimate and conscious account of the film maker or artist's encounter with and progress through the experience of disability (Pointon 1997: 237).

Well known early examples include Steve Dworskin's *Trying to Kiss the Moon* (UK) and Billy Golfus's *When Billy Broke his Head and Other Tales of Wonder* (USA) (for a comparative review see Darke 1995).

Moreover an American organisation *Culture! Disability! Talent!* based in Berkeley, California staged its 27th International Disability Film festival in June 2007. Thirteen films were shown from six countries featuring a diverse array of disability stories. Audio description and American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters were provided. Braille and large print screening schedules were available and the venue was wheelchair accessible (Culture! Disability! Talent! 2008). The Moscow International Disability Film Festival *Breaking Down Barriers* of 2004 included entries from film makers all over the world including Georgia, Germany, France Russia and Spain. A similar event

entitled *The Other Film Festival*, is planned for 2008 (Breaking Down Barriers 2004). In the UK the *London Disability Arts Forum*, supported by the *British Film Institute* is to stage its 8th Disability Film Festival at the National Film Theatre from the 14th to the 19th February 2008. Established in 1999 the Festival has grown in size, quality and impact every year. In 2005 for instance, it included 47 events spread over five days with audiences of more than 2600. It returns in 2008 with a host of new ideas and contributions. It has served as a model for other disability film festivals in Canada, Finland, Greece, and Turkey. The organizers insistence on accessible premises, facilities and programming has resulted in it becoming a beacon of best practice (X08, 2008). It is notable that despite this apparent success the future of the *London Disability Arts Forum* is unclear due to recent cuts in funding by the Government sponsored Arts Council (Masefield 2008).

It is important to remember too that the disabled people's movement is truly international. There are organisations controlled and run by disabled people throughout the developing nations of the majority world engaged in the struggle for a more equitable and just society (Albert 2007: Barnes and Mercer 2005). An example of how politics and art are linked is evident in Rebecca Yeo and Andrew Bolton's (2008) study *I don't have a problem, the problem is theirs*. The report documents the lives and aspirations of disabled people in Bolivia in both words and pictures. It includes;

the raw voices of disabled people. Not leaders or the conventionally articulate, but in the voices of ordinary disabled people talking about their lives. And...., through the creation of public murals.., painted their lives and aspirations (Yeo and Bolton 2004: 1)

The report contains twenty colour photographs of these images.

Clearly then the emergence of the disability arts movement tends to contradict the Canadian writer Susan Wendell's (1996: 273) assertion that:

It would be hard to claim that disabled people as a whole have an alternative culture or even the seeds of one.

Furthermore, in recent years film makers in Hollywood and elsewhere have produced a panoply of films that arguably reflect different aspects of the 'disability' experience. There are also more 'disabled' characters (although not all are played by actors with impairments) in British soaps and dramas (Pointon and Davies 1997). Whilst these developments might not go far enough for some disabled activists, there can be little doubt that there is a much greater range of mainstream material dealing with disability issues available.

It may also be argued that the impact of disability culture and art is having quite tangible effects within the context of mainstream culture. In the USA for example, *The Americans with Disabilities Act* (ADA) forced suppliers of television sets to build in a decoder chip so Deaf people could receive 'closed caption' (a type of subtitling system for viewers with hearing impairments). In the UK, £50,000 of National Lottery funding has awarded to Derby's *Royal School for the Deaf*, to help build Europe's sign language video library. This is the first phase of the establishment of a £1 million National Sign Language Video Centre. There has also been a consistent growth in the number of signed theatre performances for deaf people (Pointon 1997). There has also been a general expansion in the number of 'positive' images of disabled people. Indeed, in the mid

1980s Paul Longmore (1987) commented on these developments in American advertising with disabled characters appearing in advertisements for Levi Jeans, McDonalds Hamburgers, and Kodak films - a trend which has yet to cross the Atlantic.

Discussion

The emergence of disability culture and its relative success raise a number of important issues that are not easily resolved. Notions such as 'disability pride' and the 'celebration of difference' are for many people quite problematic. This is particularly the case with reference to those whose impairments are debilitating, painful, or likely to result in premature death. Whilst other oppressed groups may proclaim that 'black is beautiful' or pronounce themselves 'glad to be gay', it is harder for many disabled people to make similar claims. While agreeing that the main determinants of disabled people's quality of life are social, not medical, many would contest the optimism of Jenny Morris' suggestion that:

We can celebrate, and take pride in, our physical and intellectual differences, asserting the value of our lives. (Morris, 1991: 189)

It may be necessary to develop an attitude of ambivalence towards impairment: on the one hand, asserting the value of people with perceived impairment/s, and on the other hand, refusing to glorify incapacity. Central to this process is the distinction between impairment and disability. It is possible to celebrate the resistance and strength that the collective movements of disabled people have demonstrated throughout the world in the last few decades, and to take pride in the survival and self-organisation of disabled people and their organisations.

Moreover, the development and very existence of disability culture and art may itself be exclusionary, and in turn, compound the difficulties experienced by disabled people as it can very easily alienate potential non-disabled allies. By definition disability culture and art are the outcome of a 'minority group' consciousness. As a consequence, their potential for initiating meaningful and radical political and social change may be limited. In addition, the overwhelming majority of people with impairments have acquired conditions and have been socialised into a mainstream cultural environment that remains wedded almost exclusively to a non-disabled ideal. As a result they are often reluctant to accept a disabled identity and align themselves with the disabled people's movement. Additionally the disability arts movement has yet to make a significant impact on other sub-cultural groupings. Furthermore, as various aspects of disability culture and art are assimilated into mainstream culture their political significance may be effectively neutralised.

Final word

Despite these concerns there is clear evidence that the last few decades have witnessed the emergence of a burgeoning disability culture and arts movement. Undoubtedly a new phenomenon, disability culture can be likened to other sub-cultural forms. Its roots are long and varied and lie in the complex relationship between perceived impairment and the creative arts. Whilst there is little doubt that the disability arts movement poses a significant challenge to conventional assumptions about impairment and disability, its very existence and relative success raise a number of important questions that have yet to be fully resolved. But how and in what ways these

questions are to be addressed can only be decided by disabled people themselves.

References

Albert, B. ed. 2007: ***In or out of the mainstream: Lessons from Research on disability and development***, Leeds: the Disability Press.

Barnes, C. 1991: **Disabled People in Britain and Discrimination: A Case for Anti-Discrimination Legislation**, London, C. Hurst and Co Ltd.

Barnes, C. and Mercer, G. eds. 2005: ***The Social Model of Disability: Europe and the Majority World***, Leeds; The Disability Press.

Barnes, C. and Mercer, G. 2003: **Disability**, Cambridge: Polity.

Barnes C. and Mercer, G. 2001: 'Disability Culture: Inclusion or Assimilation'? In G. Albrecht et al., (eds.) **The Disability Studies Handbook**, London: Sage pp. 515 - 535.

BCODP. 2008: British Council of Disabled People, Homepage, <http://www.bcodp.org.uk/> (Accessed 28th January 2008).

Bogdan, R. 1996: The social construction of freaks, in: Thomson, R. G. (ed) **Freakery: Cultural Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body**, New York: Columbia University Press.

Breaking Down Barriers 2004L <http://festival-eng.perspektiva-inva.ru/?7> (Accessed 28th February 2008).

Browning, T. 2001: '**Freaks**', Warner Brothers Home Video inc. (first released in 1932).

Bragg, M. 2007: The last Remaining Avant-garde Movement: Melvin Bragg on the role of disability arts in the nation's cultural life, **Society Guardian**, Tuesday 11th December. 1 - 3
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/dec/11/disability.arts/print> (Accessed 1st February 2008).

CEC. 2003: **Equal Opportunities for People with disabilities: a European Action Plan**, Brussels: 650 Final,
http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/news/2003/oct/en.pdf (accessed on 28th January 2008)

Corker, M. 1998: **Deaf and Disabled, or Deafness Disabled**, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Cribb, S. 1993: Are disabled artists cotton-wooled, **Disability Arts Magazine**, 3/2, Summer: 10-11.

Culture! Disability! Talent! 2008: **CDT News and Information**, <http://www.culturedisabilitytalent.org/> (accessed 1st February 2008).

DAIL 1999: Personal communication, 25 January.

Davis, L. 1995: **Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness and the Body** London: Verso. (especially Parts 6 and 7)

Darke, P. 1995: Autobiographies of discovery, **Disability Arts Magazine**, 5/2, Summer.

DPI Europe 2008: Disabled People's International Europe, http://www.dpi-europe.org/what_is_dpi.html (Accessed 28th January 2008),

Edwards, M. L. 1998: Constructions of physical disability in the Ancient Greek world: the community concept, in: Mitchell, D. and Snyder, S. (eds.) **The Body and Physical Difference**, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Finkelstein, V. 1991: Disability: An administrative challenge (The Health and Welfare Challenge). In M. Oliver (ed.) **Social Work, Disabled People and Disabling Environments**, London: Jessica Kingsley.*

Garland, R. 1995: **The Eye of The Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World**, London: Duckworth.

Gerber, D. 1996: The careers of people exhibited in freak shows: the problem of volition and valorization, in: Thomson, R. G. (ed) **Freakery: Culture Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body**, New York: Columbia University Press.

Giddens, A. 2006: **Sociology**, Cambridge: Polity.

Hall. S. (ed.) 1997: **Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices**, London: Sage in association with the Open University.

Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (eds.) 1976: **Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain**, London: Hutchinson.

Hawkins, J. 1996: 'One of Us': Todd Browning's Freaks, in: Thomson, R. G. (ed) **Freakery: Culture Spectacles of the Extraordinary Body**, New York: Columbia University Press.

Hunt, P. (ed.) 1966: **Stigma: The Experience of Disability** London: Geoffrey Chapman.*

Kingsley, E. 2006: **I Don't Need no Doctor**, BBC Radio 2 programme, 22nd June.

LDAF 2008: **London Disability Arts Forum: Homepage.** <http://www.ldaf.org/pages/dail/dailIntro.htm> (Accessed 21st January).

Longmore, P. K. 1987: Screening stereotypes: images of disabled people in television and motion pictures, in: Gartner, A. and Joe, T. (eds.) **Images of the Disabled: Disabling Images**, New York: Praeger.

Masefield, P. 2008: Funding cuts 'sounds death knell' for disability arts, **Disability Now**, 67. .

Morris, J. 1991: **Pride Against Prejudice**, London: The Women's Press.

Morrison, K. and Finkelstein, V. 1992: Culture as struggle: access to power, in: Lees, S. (ed.) **Disability Arts and Culture Papers**, London: Shape.*

Oliver, M. 1981: A New Perspective for Social Workers. In J. Campling, (ed.) **The Handicapped Person in the Community**, London: RADAR, 25 -59 *

Padden, C. and Humphries, T. 2006: Deaf People: A different centre. In Davis, L. J. (ed.) **Disability Studies**

Reader, Second Edition, London: Routledge pp. 331-338.

Pick, J. 1992: Why have there been no great disabled artists, **Disability Arts Magazine**, 2/4, Winter: 18-20.

PMSU. 2005: **Improving the Life Chances of Disabled People**, London: HMSO. (Also available at: http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/downloads/work_areas/disability/disability_report/pdf/disability.pdf).

Pointon, A. 1997: Rights of access, in: Pointon, A. with Davies, C. (eds.) **Framed: Interrogating Disability in the Media**, London: British Film Institute.

Pointon, A. with Davies, C. (eds.) 1997: **Framed: Interrogating Disability in the Media**, London: British Film Institute.

Rieser, R. and Mason, M. (eds.) 1990: **Disability Equality in the Classroom: A Human Rights Issue**, London: Inner London Education Authority.

Scott, R. A. 1969: **The Making of Blind Men**, London: Sage.

Scull, A. 1984: **Decarceration (2nd edition)**, London: Polity Press.

Stiker, H. J. 2001: **A History of Disability**, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Shakespeare, T. 2006: **Disability Rights and Wrongs**, London: Routledge.

Shakespeare, T. and Watson, N. 2001: The Social Model of Disability; an outmoded ideology? In S. N. Barnartt and

B.M. Altman (eds.) **Exploring Theories and Expanding Methodologies: Where are we now and where do we need to go? Research in Social Science and Disability**, 2, Amsterdam. JAL. 9 - 28. *

Sontag, S. 1991: **Illness as Metaphor: Aids and its Metaphors**, London: Penguin Books.

Sutherland, A. 1997: Disability arts, disability politics, in: Pointon, A. with Davies, C. (eds) **Framed: Interrogating Disability in the Media**, London: British Film Institute.

Sutherland, A. T. 2003: **Chronology of Disability Art (1977 – March 2003)**. Edward Lear Foundation: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archiveuk/Sutherland/Chronology29.4.05%20Word%20intro%20and%20logo.wpd.pdf> (Accessed 31st January 2008).

UPIAS. 1976: **Fundamental Principles of Disability**. London: Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation.*

Wendell, S. 1996: **The Rejected Body: Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability**, London: Routledge.

Vasey, S. 1992: Disability arts and culture: an introduction to key issues and questions, in: Lees, S. (ed) **Disability Arts and Culture Papers**, London: Shape. *

WHO, 2001: **Rethinking Care from the Perspective of Disabled People**, Geneva: World Health Organisations Disability and Rehabilitation Team <http://www.who.int/inf-pr-2001/en/note2001-16.html> (Accessed 28th January 2008).

WHO, 2002: **Towards a Common Language for Functioning and Health ICD**. Geneva: World Health Organisation
(<http://www3.who.int/icf/icftemplate.cfm?myurl=beginners.html&mytitle=Beginner%27s%20Guide> Accessed 28th January 2008).

X'08. 2008: **London's 8th International Disability Film Festival 14th -18th February 2008**,
<http://www.myfilms.com/film/events.asp?title=X%26%238217%3B08-%26%238211%3B-London%26%238217%3Bs-8th-International-Disability-Film-Festival-2008&id=3005928> (accessed 1st February 2008).

Yeo, R and Bolton B. 2004: 'I don't have a problem the problem is theirs'. ***The lives of Bolivian disabled people in words and pictures***, Leeds: The Disability Press.

* Also available at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archiveuk/index>.

Colin Barnes is a disability activist, writer and Professor of Disability Studies at the Centre for Disability Studies (CDS), School of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Leeds. He is founder and director of CDS, the Disability Press and the Disability Archive UK.

c.barnes@leeds.ac.uk