# **The history of disablement by Richard Rieser from Ch 7 of Education Equality and Human Rights Ed Mike Cole Routleedge 2023**

The continuing inequality we face will not be rectified by ramps, lifts and accessible communications, or by the outlawing of discriminatory behaviour, welcome as these may be. The wellspring of our oppression comprises deeply held social attitudes that reflect generations of prejudice, fear and discrimination towards disabled people in education, work and social life. The main reasons are negative attitudes and stereotypes, which are based on untrue ideas that have been around for thousands of years, and which are amazingly persistent.

We can, at any time, all become disabled, i.e. develop a physical or mental impairment. Perhaps the need to distance ourselves from this reality makes it convenient to rely on negative attitudes and stereotypes of disability. They are less troubling than accepting the individuality, the joy, the pain, the appearance, the behaviour and the *rights* of disabled people.

Work by anthropologists (Hanks and Hanks, 1948) has established that there is no one way that disabled people are viewed across a wide range of societies. Views ranged from high status to outcast. There appears to be an underlying economic basis, so in societies with more surplus produce, such as agricultural rather than nomadic or hunter-gatherer, there was more acceptance of disabled members of those societies. There was more chance of their being supported as there was surplus food. However, there were exceptions, and some evidence exists that hunter-gatherers have valued disabled members of their societies. A band of Aboriginal people from the Northern Territories in Australia carried a member of their band, who could not walk with them on their wanderings, for 60 years (Davis, 1989). Where an impairment was more commonly occurring, such as blindness in a Mexican village (Gwaltney, 1970), or in Martha’s Vineyard, an island off the New England coast with an unusually high proportion of deaf people (Groce, 1985), the whole culture changed to accommodate guiding and signing, respectively. Although no systematic cross-cultural study of the position of disabled people has yet been carried out, it is clear that the individualized tragic view of disability prevalent in modern Western society is not universal.

## The ancient world

To understand the development of this particular view of disabled people we must go back to ancient Greece, to the beginning of ‘Western civilization’. In Greek mythology Zeus and Hera had a child, Hyphaistos, God of Fire, who was born with a ‘club-foot’. He was thrown off Mount Olympus into the sea, but, being a god, he survived to return and become the butt of jokes of all the other gods (Garland, 1995). He was a forger of metal and as he grew up his sexual relations with women were frequently fraught with difficulty because of the attitudes of the other gods. His wife, according to Homer, was the beautiful Aphrodite, who deceived him by having an affair with Ares. Here, we witness one of the most pernicious myths about disabled adults – that they are incapable of adult sexual relations.

The Greek and Roman attitude was to worship and adore the body beautiful. This is exemplified by the many perfectly proportioned sculptures of the human body, bodies with ‘beautiful’ symmetrical features. In representations on vases, tablets, sculptures and so on, there are very few disabled people. The Olympic ideal was to aspire to be like the gods in physique, intellect and morals. This is still often apparent in the Olympic Games, where the Paralympics and Games for People with Learning Difficulties still segregate disabled athletes, although some physically and sensory-impaired people have recently competed in the main Games.

The cult of the body beautiful was put into practice, particularly among the patrician or ruling classes in ancient Greece and Rome. Aristotle wrote ‘that you should take your child off if they are imperfect and get rid of them’ (Garland, 1995, p. 15). The status of ‘child’ was not conferred until seven days after birth, so there was time to dispose of unwanted babies legally. In militaristic Sparta, children were the property of the state and inspected at birth. ‘If the child be ill-born or ill-formed’, the father was required to expose it at a chasm-like place called Apothetai or the Place of Exposure (ibid., p. 14). In Rome, disabled infants were meant to be drowned in the Tiber and the games at the Coliseum put on to entertain and pacify the ‘mob’ included disabled children being thrown under horses’ hooves, blind gladiators fighting each other and ‘dwarves’ fighting women. The rest of the ancient world was not as proscriptive, but nevertheless, exposure was widespread. Those with less significant impairments who survived generally led a half-life, disdained and ridiculed, often having to rely on begging. There were exceptions. Even in Sparta, King Agesilaos was afflicted with ‘congenital lameness’ but this acted as a spur to his ambition and he desired to be first in all things (ibid., p. 40). Clearly, then, exposure did not always occur, as parents do tend to love their children, and many disabled people survived infancy. In Rome, despite the dislike of and cruelty towards people with impairments, there is evidence that at least one emperor was disabled: Claudius may well have had cerebral palsy (*clauditas* in Latin means lameness). Claudius’ mother, Antonia, described him ‘as a monster of a man, by nature but only half done’ (ibid., pp. 40–42). Echoed in Shakespeare’s *Richard III*, this develops into an abiding stereotype as the evil and avenging man/monster.

## The Judaeo-Christian tradition

Another seminal source of thinking about disabled people was the Judaeo-Christian tradition that fundamentally disability is a punishment for evil – ‘if humans are immoral they will be blinded by God’ (Deuteronomy, 27: 27); in Exodus (20: 5) God tells Moses that retribution for sin will be inflicted upon the offspring of the sinners for many generations. In the books of Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, the people of Israel are repeatedly punished for their sinful ways through physical impairment (Rose, 1997).

The Jewish faith, however, has a more complex position, with some parts of the Talmud advocating disability as a holy state and a means of getting to heaven. Similar sentiments are expressed towards those who help disabled people. Some of this is reflected in the parables of the New Testament, but usually with Christ performing miracle cures. Rarely are disabled people accepted as themselves.

The Book of Leviticus (21: 16–20) has a clear message that impairment is unclean and polluting, and prevents disabled people from receiving sacraments:

And the Lord said to Moses none of your descendants throughout the generations who has a blemish shall draw near, a man blind or lame or one who has a mutilated face or a limb too long, or a man who has an injured foot or an injured hand or a hunchback or a dwarf, or a man with defective sight or itching disease or scabs or crushed testicles. He may eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy and of holy things, but he shall not come near the veil or approach the altar, because he has a blemish, that he has a blemish, that he may not profane my sanctuaries.

This message was taken seriously. Up until the 1950s people with learning difficulties were not allowed to receive certain sacraments in the Roman Catholic Church.

## The medieval period

Disabled people were treated in medieval Europe as both saints and sinners. On the one hand, they were ‘innocents unstained by normal and sinful human characteristics’ (Barnes, 1991, p. 12) who should be offered asylum and alms; on the other, they were evil changelings – the work of the devil (Haffter, 1968).

Martin Luther, the architect of the Reformation, believed that changelings had no soul and advocated that children so ‘afflicted’ should be taken to the river and drowned. Nevertheless, the bulk of disabled people born into feudal villages or acquiring impairments would have been accepted and did what they could, while those with more severe impairments may have been subject to infanticide.

Veterans of war were often treated better. The first record of a sheltered workshop in Europe was the Congregation of Three Hundred, established in France in 1254 for 300 crusaders who had had their eyes gouged out during the crusades (Ford, 1981).

At times of crisis disabled people were likely to be scapegoated as superstition took over – for example, during the Plague or during the Great Witch Hunt of 1480 to 1680. The ‘Malleus Maleficarum’– ‘the Hammer of Witches’, 1487, written by two priests – was a bestseller in Europe and went to 70 editions in 14 languages. It includes whole sections on how you can identify witches by their impairments or by their creation of impairments in others; or giving birth to a disabled child. Between 8 and 20 million people, mainly women, were put to death across Europe and a large proportion were disabled. Three witches were recorded as hanged after an Oxford trial in 1613, one of whom was put on trial because she was a disabled person using crutches (Rieser, 1995, p. 6). More recent research on the treatment of people with learning difficulties, however, suggests that naturalistic accounts of learning difficulties and mental illness were accepted, rather than the disabled people being demonized (Neugebauer, 1996).

The ‘disabled witch’ comes through in the folklore of Britain and Europe. The Brothers Grimm collected the oral stories of Northern Europe and made them into their fairy tales. The witch in *Hansel and Gretel* is deformed, blind, ugly, disabled and carries a stick (this book has been adapted for use with children as young as two years old). There are also story-books that feature evil imps swapping healthy babies for disabled ones – changelings (Rieser, 1995, p. 5).

Katherine Quarmby (2011) in her analysis of hate crime against disabled people goes back into history for an explanation of the persistent negative attitudes that spawn hate crime. Examining the witch hunts of 1645 and popular pamphlets in which ‘impairments, sin and witchcraft were inextricably linked in society’s collective unconscious,’ she tells how Mathew Hopkins, self-styled Witchfinder General, found a destitute one-legged woman, Elizabeth Clarke, and forcibly questioned her to reveal her accomplices. Clarke along with 18 others was sentenced to death at Chelmsford Assizes. Clarke had to be helped to the scaffold due to her impairment. A noted sceptic of witchcraft at the time, Reginald Scott, said they were commonly perceived as ‘old, lame, blear-eyed, pale, foul, full of wrinkles […] lean and deformed showing melancholy in their faces’. Quarmby goes on to talk about the drowning of a disabled man nicknamed Dummy in Sible Hedingham in 1863 and then, in Lakeside Shopping Centre in March 2005, the drowning of Mark Watts, a man with learning difficulties, which his attackers filmed on their mobile phones having pushed him into the lake while other shoppers stood by and watched. These incidents remind us that the other and different can at any time be scapegoated unless we act consciously against it.

There are many pictures and stories from medieval times of penitent sinners. Groups of penitent ‘cripples’ are depicted trying to get alms and, if they wandered around long enough, feeling humble enough, then maybe they would make it in the next life. A very strong message therefore came across. Disabled people were often scapegoated for the ills of society, as in Brueghel’s painting *The Cripples*, where the fox tails denote wrongdoing. Outside any medieval church are the deformed ones, the gargoyles; and on the inside are the ‘perfectly formed’ pictures around the crypt.

Until the seventeenth century those disabled people rejected by their families relied upon the haphazard and often ineffectual tradition of Christian charity and alms – gifts for subsistence (Barnes, 1991, ch. 2). During the sixteenth century the wealth and power of the Church was greatly reduced due to the confrontation between Church and State in England. There was also a growth in those seeking alms due to a rise in population, poor harvests, the beginning of the commercialization of agriculture, and immigration from Ireland and Scotland (Stone, 1985). To secure the allegiance of local gentry and magistrates, the Tudor monarchs were forced to make economic provision for people dependent upon charity. The 1601 Poor Law marks the first recognition of the need for the state to intervene in the lives of disabled people. Some 200 years earlier, the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 had led to a mandate to local officials to distinguish the ‘deserving poor’ from the ‘undeserving poor’. The bulk of relief went to the deserving poor in the form of ‘household relief to people in their homes. Segregation did not really emerge until the nineteenth century (Barnes, 1991, pp. 14–19).

Close examination of Rembrandt’s sketches reveals that the beggars are often wearing white headbands. This is because in seventeenth-century Holland the bacillus leprosy, brought inadvertently on the back of the ‘spice trade’ from colonies in the tropics, spread quickly around urban areas. An edict was passed by the state that all those who contracted it had to report to The Hague, and once their condition was confirmed they had all their worldly goods confiscated, had to wear a white headband, and they and their families had to rely on alms as penitent sinners. Those with leprosy had to live in segregated colonies and their only reward for penance was rehabilitation in heaven (Toth-Ubbens, 1987).[[1]](#footnote-1)

## The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

The development of industrial capitalism and its inherent requirement for workers to sell their labour power meant that those with significant impairments were excluded from the labour market. Those disabled people who were able to work were forced to the bottom rungs of the labour market ladder (Morris, 1969, p. 9). As a result, disabled people came to be regarded as a social and educational problem, and were increasingly segregated out of the mainstream in institutions of various kinds: workhouses, asylums, colonies and special schools (Oliver, 1990, p. 28). According to Finkelstein (1980), this is Phase 2 of disabled people’s development, the phase when we were separated from our class origins and became a special segregated group, with disability seen as an impairment, requiring segregation from the labour market as well as social restriction.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the policy of segregating severely impaired people into institutional settings slowly spread. The main impetus was the change from working as groups or families on the land, down the mines or as cottage industry to factory work. Such work required set rates of working on repetitive tasks for long hours; time was money. By 1834, Poor Law household relief was abolished for the ‘non-deserving poor’ – the unemployed. The deserving poor were categorized – children, the sick, the insane, defectives and the aged and infirm, the last four being categories of impairment – and provision was uniform across the country. Deterrence was built into relief as a principle of ‘least eligibility’ was introduced. This meant that those on relief would be less comfortable than an ‘independent labourer of the lowest class’ before benefits would be granted (Barnes, 1991, p. 16). Charles Dickens and others have vividly described the horrors of the workhouse. Charities increasingly set up asylums for the insane and then special schools for blind and deaf children. This role was taken over by the state from the 1890s (Hurt, 1988).

The ‘insane’, which included ‘idiots’, ‘lunatics’ and the mentally infirm, were, after the 1845 Lunacy Act, able to be detained on the certification of a doctor. This was based on a theory advanced by the medical profession that mental illness had physiological causes that were treatable. This marked the beginning of the medical profession’s state-endorsed involvement in the lives of disabled people (Barnes, 1991). This power is still exercised today; as a disabled person, if you want a Blue (parking privileges) Badge, Disability Living Allowance or Incapacity Benefit you have to be examined by a doctor. Now Atos, a global leader in digital transformation, has won a contract to prove through a computerized test that many claimants with established work-limiting impairments are fit for work. This is leading to many being wrongly put on lower benefits and some committing suicide (*Guardian*, 14 February 2011). Interestingly, the same article reported that 40 per cent of such decisions were overturned on appeal. Disabled people are not trusted in general and there is always a belief that people will pretend to be disabled to get benefits fraudulently, but this does not explain the continual checking of our impairments even when medical science has no solutions and our conditions are stable or deteriorating. In fact, the same *Guardian* article reported a fraud rate of less than 1 per cent despite outrageous headlines to the contrary in the *Daily Mail*. Far more disabled people who are entitled to benefits don’t claim them than the bogus claims from non-disabled people that are made; the latter, in reality, being rarities. This symbolic treatment of disabled people who are at the margins of the workforce very much defined who was part of the workforce and who was not (Oliver, 1990).

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, another strand of thought became highly influential – the eugenics movement. This had and continues to have a disastrous effect on the lives of disabled people. Drawn from the ideas of Aristotle, eugenics thinking first wrongly applied Darwin’s theories of natural selection to ideas about racial degeneration and was then applied to disabled people. The birth of disabled children, it was claimed, would weaken the gene pool and outbreed non-disabled people. This, in turn, would weaken the European population in its task of colonizing and controlling the rest of the world (see Chapters 3 and 4, this volume, for a discussion of racism and imperialism).

## The twentieth century

Traditional myths that there were genetic links between physical and mental impairments, crime, unemployment and other social evils were constantly proposed by the likes of Galton (1883, 1909), Dugdale (1895) and Goddard (1913), and many others. They wished to improve the British and American ‘races’ by preventing the reproduction of ‘defectives’ by means of sterilization and segregation. In the UK in the 1900s, pressure from eugenicists for ‘voluntary’ sterilization increased (Ryan with Thomas, 1987) (see the website www.eugenicsarchive.org for much more detail).

These ideas spread quickly to intellectuals of all political complexions as the century of science got underway: H.G. Wells, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Bernard Shaw and D.H. Lawrence, W.B. Yeats, J.M. Keynes, Winston Churchill and Aldous Huxley, to name but a few.

If I had my way, I would build a lethal chamber as big as Crystal Palace, with a military band playing softly, and a Cinematograph working brightly; then I’d go out in the back streets and the main streets and bring them in, all the sick, the halt and the maimed; I would lead them gently, and they would smile me a weary thanks; and the band would softly bubble out the ‘Hallelujah Chorus’.

So wrote D.H. Lawrence in 1908 in a letter to Blanche Jennings (Boulton, 1979, p. 81). This was part of an elitist intellectual culture, which included a dislike for the industrial world and the social disorder it had spawned, and eugenicist views towards disabled people (Carey, 1992).

The Mental Deficiency Act of 1913 was the result of eugenicist agitation and it led to the incarceration of ‘idiots’, ‘imbeciles’, ‘the feeble-minded’ and ‘moral imbeciles’, the last category usually referring to young people who had had illegitimate children. Many were incarcerated for life in sex-segregated institutions to prevent them from reproducing. At first it was argued that units or extra classes attached to ordinary schools were best, but soon the eugenicist view prevailed and the early part of the century saw large numbers of segregated schools for ‘crippled children, epileptics, educable morons and feeble minded children’ (Copeland, 1997, p. 714; see also Hurt, 1988).

A great wave of building ensued following the First World War with large institutions and colonies being erected on the outskirts of towns. Simon and Binet’s false science of IQ testing, refined by supporters such as Cyril Burt (1977), was developed to distinguish the educable from the ineducable. An IQ of less than 50 meant you were destined for a mental deficiency institution as a child and probably for life. It is estimated that 50,000 children with no mental deficiency were sent to these institutions prior to 1950, on the false diagnosis of doctors who, at this time, subscribed to bogus theories, such as that someone’s intelligence could be determined by their head shape and size (Humphries and Gordon, 1992).

Children perceived to be ineducable, including many with cerebral palsy, Down’s syndrome and speech impairments, went to junior training establishments right up until 1972. At that time, some 60,000 children joined the education system in severe learning difficulty schools. Today, many with the same conditions successfully attend ordinary schools. The history of people with learning difficulty has recently been developed as a learning pack for schools, students and the general public around the film *No Longer Shut Up*, based on the life of an activist and previous inmate of a long-stay hospital, by UK Disability History and the Open University. The more this hidden history is known and discussed the better chance there is of positive attitudinal change.[[3]](#footnote-3)

In the USA, compulsory sterilization was in wide use by the 1930s. Forty-one states had provision for the sterilization of the insane and feeble-minded, and 17 states prohibited people with epilepsy from marrying. In many states women born deaf were sterilized. Twenty-seven states still had these laws until very recently, though they were seldom enforced. In China, some 30 million people with ‘mental incapacity’ have been compulsorily sterilized under a law that was enacted in 1995. This is an abuse of their human rights and, as the *Guardian* reported in 1997, is a particular outrage, since it is known that many of these women have developed their condition from iodine deficiency in their environment.

Recently it has been reported that in Scandinavia and France, ‘mentally defective’ women were compulsorily sterilized up until the 1980s. This all took place despite the findings of a study carried out for the Wood Committee in 1929 which showed that only 7.6 per cent of patients in one particular asylum had ‘defective’ parents.

Disabled people are seen as a burden, and at times of economic stress this view intensifies. The Nazis, when they came to power in Germany in 1933, introduced a law for the Prevention of Hereditary Diseases that led to the forced sterilization of more than 300,000 people. Under the Third Reich, propaganda films were made to show how we were a burden on the state. We were the ‘useless eaters’, and we should be got rid of. In the beginning, voluntary euthanasia was advocated to end the suffering of ‘the incurable’, but this ultimately evolved into mass murder. In November 2003 the German government acknowledged that 240,000 physically and mentally disabled people were murdered in 1939/1940 at the hands of the doctors of the Third Reich in six so-called clinics, which were staffed by many of those who went on to run the concentration camps where six million Jews were exterminated (Burleigh, 1994). More recently in *War Against the Weak* (Black, 2003), the author estimates that more than one million disabled people died in this programme in the German Empire.

With cutbacks in the Welfare State, the eugenicist argument is currently undergoing a revival in Britain. A poll on Good Morning Television (GMTV) revealed that 86 per cent of people who rang in thought that a doctor was right to abort two disabled children. In Holland and Tasmania, laws have been introduced to allow voluntary euthanasia. This is indicative of the way in which, through history, people have been socialized to view disabled people. The medical ethics committees are allowing the Genome Project to map the seat of all genetic disorders. Soon science will have the capability to eradicate many forms of impairment. It remains to be seen whether society wishes to cut off such a great source of leadership, innovation and hope. Do we want a Society without Beethovens (deaf), Einsteins (dyslexic/autistic), Hans Christian Andersons (autistic), Stephen Frys (bipolar) or Tanni Greys (spina bifida)?

This brief excursion through the history of disabled people should cause us to ask if normality and uniformity are so important, or is it difference that makes life interesting? The medicalization of impairment ignores the social context. In 1972 in the UK a child with Down’s syndrome (an extra chromosome) would be deemed ineducable. Today, many such children who have attended mainstream schools are able to sit seven or eight GCSEs and are accepted by their peers. What would their lives be like if prejudice and discrimination were to be eradicated? Yet the medical profession insists on genetically screening all pregnant women over 30 for Down’s syndrome with a view to termination if it is identified. We would not have Pablo Pinedas – a Spanish actor (Me Too/Yo Tambien, 2009) and teacher completing his Master’s Degree in Spain who has Down’s syndrome (*Inclusion Now*, 2010).[[4]](#footnote-4)

# The struggle for human dignity

The oppression of disabled people, over the years, has not gone uncontested. On the contrary, many disabled people have consistently struggled for human dignity and for inclusion in mainstream society. The National League for the Blind and Disabled and the British Deaf Association, for example, were both run by disabled people and, from the 1890s, campaigned for rights. In the 1920s, when unions of disabled veterans were formed all over Britain, sit-ins and occupations were held in an attempt to force the introduction of legislation for disabled people’s rights. In the 1920s and 1930s, there were hundreds of thousands of First World War veterans with no rights at all in the UK. Even those young people incarcerated in institutions for the blind or deaf had a culture of resistance; for example, when sign language was banned deaf pupils managed to develop their own pigeon sign language.[[5]](#footnote-5)

In 1944 the Disabled Persons Act was passed. This included a quota system, whereby 3 per cent of the jobs in any given business had to be allotted to disabled people. This was to accommodate injured war veterans, and was abolished by the Disability Discrimination Act of 1995.[[6]](#footnote-6)

In the 1970s, war veterans in the USA started the disability movement there and successfully campaigned until they achieved full civil rights legislation in the Americans with the Disabilities Act of 1990 (Dreiger, 1989).[[7]](#footnote-7) In the 1970s in the UK, the Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation was formed. This was initiated by Paul Hunt, who lived in a Cheshire home that he called the new workhouse. He wrote a letter to the *Guardian* (20 September 1972) calling upon severely physically impaired people to form a new consumer group to put forward their views. This and a number of other organizations run by disabled people and formed in the 1970s amalgamated into the British Council of Organizations of Disabled People (BCODP). The Council, which supports the ‘social model’ of disability, now represents some 300,000 disabled people who all control their own organizations. The BCODP also linked a number of the local Centres for Independent Living and Local Coalitions of Disabled People (Campbell and Oliver, 1996). These organizations campaigned for full civil rights legislation. Fifteen attempts were made from 1980 to 1995 to get a Civil Rights Bill through Parliament in the UK. Instead, all that was achieved was the 1995 Disability Discrimination Act. The Direct Action Network of disabled people expressed the frustration of millions of disabled people in a series of actions that brought London and other cities and towns to a standstill. As a result, the Labour government set up a ministerial task force to advise on the implementation of full antidiscrimination legislation based on the ‘social model’ of disability. Disabled people are still struggling for the rights to use public transport, to get into buildings, to go to school or college with their friends, to get a job and even to go to the cinema. In October 1998, the MP Glenda Jackson announced that £500 million would be spent on making London Transport buses accessible. In 2005, more was achieved with the introduction of the Public Service Duty to promote disability equality. In 2011, Disabled People Against the Cuts (DPAC) have taken on the mantle of DAN[[8]](#footnote-8) to challenge the human rights abuses of the

1. This book is written in Dutch, with an English summary. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In Phase 1, disabled individuals were part of a greater feudal underclass. In Phase 3, which is just beginning, disability comes to be seen solely as *social restriction*. The surplus value generated in capitalist societies, combined with modern technology, means that we can be exploited as workers by capitalism in much the same way as non-disabled people. However, it also means that we can make the case *not* to be segregated either in the world of work, or more generally in mainstream society. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. There are education resources for schools and colleges on the history of learning disability from 1900 to the present day, 2016 (www.open.ac.uk/health-and-social-care/research/shld/education-resources). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Interview with English subtitles (www.youtube.com/watch?v=74xGSYUs0YM). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The book *Out of Sight* contains first-hand oral histories and photographs of life in special schools and institutions in the first half of this century (Humphries and Gordon, 1992). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. War and Impairment: The Social Consequences of Impairment (2014) UKDHM (http://ukdhm.org/2014-broadsheet/). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This is a good account of the international development of the Disabled People’s Movement. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Direct Action Network ([www.worldofinclusion.com/res/qca/DAN\_To\_Boldly\_Go\_5.jpg](http://www.worldofinclusion.com/res/qca/DAN_To_Boldly_Go_5.jpg)).
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