

Advocacy and Political Action

17

SHARON BARNARTT

KAY SCHRINER

RICHARD SCOTCH

DISABILITY AND POLITICAL ACTION

As is addressed throughout this volume, people with disabilities frequently occupy marginalized social and economic positions in contemporary societies. In recent decades, people with disabilities have increasingly sought to participate collectively in broader decisions about public policy. These political initiatives have taken a variety of forms, depending on the nature of existing political institutions in various national settings and on the nature of the issues in question. In this chapter, we will attempt to describe the diverse nature of disability politics and political advocacy, drawing particularly on areas that have been the subject of established scholarship in disability studies.

In the medical model traditionally used to characterize disability in Western culture, disability is an individualized condition dispersed across the general population rather than a collective one and thus would not naturally serve as the basis for collective political activity (Scotch 1988). In this model, disability is a chronic pathology or impairment associated with an incapacity to perform bodily functions or activities of daily living. This incapacity is considered to be an organic fact that must be overcome through medical intervention, compensated for by rehabilitation, or responded to with social welfare benefits and services. Gatekeeping, which by definition determines who is and is not entitled to claim the label of disabled, is managed by medical and rehabilitative professionals and is nominally apolitical and not considered an appropriate realm for public debate.

In the medical model of disability, the primary role for politics is reallocative, to secure resources for medical and rehabilitative research and services and for benefits and services. Such politics are typically practiced by nondisabled advocates for people who have disabilities rather than by people with disabilities themselves.¹ Such political initiatives frequently emphasize the

AUTHORS' NOTE: Communication concerning this chapter should be directed to Richard Scotch, Associate Professor of Sociology and Political Economy, School of Social Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas, Box 830688, Richardson, TX 75083-0688; e-mail: scotch@utdallas.edu. We would like to acknowledge the assistance of Gary Albrecht, Michael Bury, and the anonymous reviewers for their many helpful suggestions and insights as this chapter was being prepared.

incapacity associated with disability and the moral blamelessness for their conditions of those who are unable to help themselves. These kind of political appeals often feature tales of woe about poster children (of all ages) whose lives will be ruined by their impairments unless help is found, particularly help in the form of a cure.

Such political appeals have often been quite successful, and efforts have been made to medicalize a number of conditions to entitle those who have them to a flow of benefits and services for the “deserving” poor (Fox 1977). In the United States, for example, Congress has often appropriated more funds to research on targeted diseases and conditions than had been requested for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health in response to advocacy by those affected by various illnesses. Many public officials are reluctant to appear insensitive to appeals by those perceived as helpless and blameless.

At issue in such political discourse is often the moral entitlement of those who are “afflicted,” being based on random victimization rather than their own choices and behavior. Questions of personal responsibility are opposed to medical definitions in debates over public funding benefiting people with conditions widely considered to be morally ambiguous, such as HIV/AIDS, psychiatric disorders, obesity, teen pregnancy, or learning disabilities.

Nonmedical models of disabilities are associated with different political forms, issues, and dynamics. A social model of disability conceptualizes disability as a social construction that is the result of interaction between physical or mental impairment and the social environment. Technology, architecture, and spatial organization all reflect concepts of what is “normal” and how “normal” people function, as do cultural attitudes and institutional processes (Higgins 1992). These social characteristics help to define who is “disabled” and who is “normal” and what constitutes an appropriate social response to those who have a disability (see, e.g., Goffman 1963).

In such a social model, people with disabilities may be grouped together into common medical, educational rehabilitative, human service, and custodial systems, but the establishment of such systems and the definition of who is to be considered disabled vary across cultures and historical periods. Gatekeeping under a social model of disability is not solely the province of professionals but can be contested by many within society, including people with disabilities themselves.

The politics of disability takes far different forms within the social model than would be expected in the medical model. Political issues are not simply allocative, although disputes over resources are found here too but may also include conflict over what social roles can appropriately be played by individuals who have disabilities and how the state should support or restrict those roles through its policies. A social model of disability would lead one to expect political conflict over such issues—over what is the appropriate role for people with disabilities in education, employment, public services such as transportation, economic development, and participation in civic life.

By characterizing the social isolation and enforced dependency of people with disabilities as the result of social choices rather than as inevitable results of impairment, the social model suggests analogies between the social status of people with disabilities and other marginalized groups, such as racial and ethnic minorities, women, or gays and lesbians. Within this political framework, disability politics can encompass disputes over civil rights (Scotch 1984). Similarly, politics encompasses conflicts over the role of disabled people collectively in the governance of service systems and other institutions addressing the disability community and the role of individuals with disabilities in shaping and controlling the services they receive.

There is a long history of state policies affecting people with disabilities,² but the creation and operation of these policies have typically been on behalf of people with disabilities rather than with their direct participation. In recent decades, this exclusion has ended with active involvement sought and frequently achieved by advocates who have disabilities themselves and who are considered to be legitimate representatives of the broader disability community.³

Some efforts to redefine the social position of people have occurred through legal advocacy in the courts, particularly in the United States. Enabled by the distinctive American constitutional and legal framework and building on the civil rights advocacy that fought racial segrega-

tion through federal lawsuits in the post–World War II era, a number of class action suits were successfully pursued in the late 1960s and 1970s on behalf of children denied public school education because of their disabilities,⁴ people with disabilities receiving inappropriate treatment in residential institutions,⁵ and others denied fair treatment because of their disabilities. These lawsuits were often the product of public interest law centers such as the Mental Health Law Project, the Center for Law and the Handicapped, and the Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia.

Key judicial rulings helped to establish legal protections for disabled people and helped to foster the growing disability rights movement in the United States. Gerry and Benton (1980) have written that prior to the mid-1970s in the United States,

only in the courts had active conflicts arisen between those who insisted that disabled children and adults had a right to be free of discrimination and those who argued that the very notion of rights was likely to destroy the good will and charity which had allowed disabled people to advance as far as they had. (P. 3)

Yet in the absence of more broadly based political advocacy, litigation-based political strategies tend to be episodic and non-self-enforcing (Carty 1978) and to have limited capacity to effect institutional change (Horowitz 1977). Legal advocacy is a crucial component in ensuring that broader public policies are applied appropriately to individual cases, and legal organizations such as the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF) have been valuable resources in the protection of individuals with disabilities. In the United States, parent groups have been very effective in securing court decisions that have established the rights of children with disabilities to public education and to decent treatment in institutional settings. Nevertheless, we would contend that such advocacy is most effective when it is part of a wider political mobilization of people with disabilities on their own behalf, a process that requires both social solidarity and collective action.

Beyond the United States, there have been a number of other important efforts to secure legal rights for people with disabilities (Jones and Marks 1999a). Legal protections have been enacted in Australia (Jones and Marks 1999b), Canada (Rioux and Frazee 1999), and the United Kingdom (Doyle 1999). In 1994, Sweden established an Office of the Disability Ombudsman to promote full participation and equality for people with disabilities (Wastberg 1999). There have also been efforts through the United Nations (UN) to develop an international legal framework to serve as a model of legal protections for disabled people, beginning with the *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1993 (Michailakis 1999). It is unclear, however, what the short-term impact of these laws has been in actually improving the actual conditions facing people with disabilities.

THE SOCIAL BASIS FOR COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION

Having a disability does not in itself lead to participation in collective political action with others who have disabilities (Scotch 1988). Many political constituencies form out of geographic communities or out of already socially cohesive groups. Disabilities are spread spatially and demographically across the general population, although many disabilities are concentrated among those with the least economic, social, and political resources in their societies. Disability per se is not generally tied to a distinct social structure within society (Barnartt 1996), and in most societies, it is only in recent history that disability activists have acted on their own behalf as a political interest group. For example, as recently as 1985, Harlan Hahn wrote of the United States, “There is no organized constituency of disabled voters comparable to groups that have been formed by blacks, Hispanics, women, and aging citizens” (Hahn 1985a:309-10). In the

past few decades, however, political organization and activity among people with disabilities have increased in many nations through both social movement organizations and, increasingly, efforts focused on electoral politics.

While some disability advocates commonly refer to “the disability community,” those who actively identify with this community include only a minute portion of the substantial number of people with disabilities in any society. One barrier to collective action is the stigma associated with disabilities. Hahn (1985a) writes, “Persons with disabilities often are understandably reluctant to focus on that aspect of their identity that is most negatively stigmatized by the rest of society and to mobilize politically around it” (p. 310).

However, when disability is created as a social category, particularly through public policy and the provision of health and social services, those as having a disability can become a distinct interest group that may become capable of mobilization. Policy interventions may literally bring people with disabilities together to receive services, facilitating interaction and laying the groundwork for the formation of a collective identity. Rehabilitation facilities, independent living centers, disabled student service networks, and recreational programs have all helped to build solidarity among disabled people.

There are numerous examples of people with disabilities engaged in protests or forming organizations on their own behalf. For example, in Spain in 1894, graduates of the Madrid School for the Blind formed an organization, Centro Protectorio e Instructor de Ciegos, to protest the segregation of the blind and their reliance on begging (Vaughn 1998). In 1935, several hundred unemployed disabled people in New York City formed the League of the Physically Handicapped to protest their exclusion from public jobs through the Works Progress Administration (Longmore 1997). In Great Britain, Finkelstein (1981) reports that following World War II, there was a “rapid growth” in the numbers and size of organizations of people with disabilities.

In the past four decades, political activity by individuals with disabilities and organizations of disabled people has particularly increased. To some extent, political activity has been directed toward increasing the level or scope of government benefits. However, significant activity also has been directed toward the goals of equal access, community integration, and independent living.

Among the explanations that have been offered for this increase are emerging medical and assistive technologies that have supported independence for many people with disabilities, changing ideologies of treatment that have encouraged noninstitutional service strategies, and the models of other minority movements in the 1960s and 1970s that advocated inclusion and social change (Scotch 1989).

Underlying the increasing political mobilization of people with disabilities has been an evolving but distinctive ideology that explains their marginal societal status in sociopolitical terms (Barton 1992; Hahn 1985b). Under a sociopolitical perspective, disadvantage and marginality are characterized as the products of a hostile and disabling environment that must be challenged by political, legal, and social efforts. These efforts are often framed by the political culture of the nation in which they occur. In the United States, for example, political goals have been articulated in terms of individual rights, and those goals have served as a model for movements in a number of other countries. Yet in some other societies, protests may be framed differently, for example, on models of social solidarity or group rights. One particularly thoughtful review of different conceptual bases for disability policy that focus on rights is Jerome E. Bickenbach’s (1993) *Physical Disability and Social Policy*.

ELECTORAL POLITICS: PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AS VOTERS

Among the countries that have democratic systems of government characterized by periodic and free elections for positions in representative institutions, “universal” suffrage, competing political parties, and accountability of elected officials, participation in elected politics is an av-

venue for people with disabilities to secure their political voice.⁶ These countries include the many nations that represent the “third wave” of democratization.

Not much is known about the electoral process in any democratic nation. Only a handful of studies have addressed this topic, and these were conducted in the United States. These studies indicate that U.S. citizens who have disabilities are much less likely to register and vote than are nondisabled individuals (Schur and Kruse 2000; Shields, Schriner, and Schriner 1998).⁷ In addition, this research challenges how well political science findings about “who votes” apply to the disability community. People with disabilities are much *less* likely to vote as they age as compared to nondisabled individuals, who are much *more* likely to vote as they grow older. Furthermore, when other socioeconomic variables such as age, education, and income are controlled for, having a disability is a significant negative factor in determining whether an individual votes (Shields et al. 1998). This new knowledge strongly suggests that the research on political behavior is incomplete without considering whether individuals have a disability—at least in the United States.

Notwithstanding the relative lack of information regarding participation rates and patterns, it seems likely that a study of electoral participation in any nation will begin with a similar set of questions. A primary concern will be accessibility of the polling place. Individuals with disabilities may encounter a variety of architectural barriers. In the United States, election officials admit that some 14 percent of states’ election sites are inaccessible to individuals with mobility impairments (a figure that might be higher if it were based on evaluations conducted by a knowledgeable and disinterested party and if the accessibility criteria included those relevant to people with communication, cognitive, and emotional impairments).⁸

Another issue is the receptivity and responsiveness of election officials. At times, election officials may become sufficiently frustrated with meeting accessibility needs that they urge the disabled voter to vote absentee. Some individuals with disabilities view absentee voting as an inferior form of participation. People with cognitive impairments, blindness, or deafness are sometimes subjected to challenges or encounter election officials who are uninformed about their accommodation needs or who resist taking the necessary steps to make the voting process or polling place accessible. Blind voters have complained that election officials have limited understanding of methods necessary to accommodate them, and deaf individuals have made similar claims. A related issue is the role of family members in the voting process. A recent story published in an English magazine recounts conversations with parents, some of whom believe their disabled children can and should vote and others who confess to marking their children’s ballots for them (“Invisible Voters” 1992).

In addition to these physical and attitudinal barriers, policy barriers may affect participation. In the United States, for example, 44 states disenfranchise some individuals with cognitive and emotional impairments (Schriner, Ochs, and Shields 1997). Other countries have similar prohibitions. England’s Representation of the People Act 1983 disenfranchises people who have been involuntarily admitted to mental hospitals (“Invisible Voters” 1992). Similarly, the constitution of Albania prohibits voting by individuals who have been adjudicated as incompetent.

The dearth of information regarding the voting behavior of people with disabilities and the policies that may affect their turnout suggests a pressing research agenda for the next decade. What are the experiences of people with disabilities when they go to the polls? Do these vary by country and, if so, how? Are the opportunities for participation better in some countries than others? What accommodations and modifications are necessary to ensure that they have the same opportunities and protections as other citizens? What policies are required to encourage them to vote and protect that right to self-governance? These inquiries must be made to develop the knowledge base necessary to promote the participation of people with disabilities in democratic governance.

One particularly thorny set of questions surrounds the issue of competent voting. Democratic theorists typically assume that excluding individuals based on “mental incompetence” or some similar term of definition accomplishes the necessary task of ensuring that electors are competent. Robert Dahl (1989), for example, a prominent American theorist, argues that such individuals are like children and, like children, should be excluded from the electorate.

These theoretical treatments of the competence standard raise several significant questions. The first and most central is the following: What *is* competence with respect to voting? The answer to this question has evaded theorists and policymakers because of the difficulty of saying with certainty what is the minimum set of skills and knowledge one must possess to be entrusted with self-rule. This question will be answered differently depending on the political institutions involved. Taking part in direct democracy presumably places more demands on the individual than does participating in a representative democracy (though, it could be argued, direct democracy also encourages the development of such skills and knowledge to a greater degree than does representative democracy). Irrespective of these differences, however, the question of *defining* the competencies necessary for participation and developing a *valid and reliable scheme* for separating the incompetent from the competent remains a daunting challenge.

Second, is it *necessary* to adopt legal prohibitions against voting by incompetent people, or do laws against influencing others' votes through bribery or other criminal acts provide equivalent protections against the incompetent voter? Finally, if we must have laws that disenfranchise individuals based on mental competency, what is the most objective way to identify these persons? The U.S. experience, we would suggest, is not the approach that should be taken. In most U.S. states, some individuals with cognitive and emotional impairments are disenfranchised—but, undoubtedly, some individuals who are truly unable to competently cast a ballot are not identified through this statutory scheme, and others who truly are competent to vote are disenfranchised. The potential constitutional deficiencies of the laws in many U.S. states, when coupled with the difficulties in determining the abilities necessary to define voting competence, call for a closer look at the issue of competence and its place in democratic theory and practice. The competence standard is perhaps the purest example of the political nature of the disability category.

PARTICIPATION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AS CANDIDATES AND ELECTED OFFICIALS

Another item for the research agenda arises when considering the issue of disability in the broader context of campaigns and elections. Knowledgeable observers report that persons with disabilities hold or have held elected offices in several countries,⁹ but there is little if any scholarly inquiry regarding the way disability is portrayed in campaigns. This may be a crucial factor in shaping the electorate's response to people with disabilities and the "problem" of disability. Information observations of U.S. politics indicate that disability is often an issue in campaigns, particularly contests for the presidency. In the 1996 campaign, for example, the Republican Party candidate, Senator Robert Dole, a World War II veteran, lost the use of his arm from an injury sustained in combat. His disability was labeled a "badge of honor." The Democratic Party candidate, Bill Clinton, was not disabled, but the Democratic national convention featured an address by Christopher Reeve, an actor who became quadriplegic after a riding accident. Reeve, a controversial figure in the U.S. disability community (Stanglin 1996), issued a plea for funding for research to cure paralysis. In neither of these instances was civil rights for people with disabilities a major focus of the campaign message, although in both parties' campaigns, disability rights was a minor emphasis.

To the extent that people with disabilities can exercise some influence of their portrayal in campaigns, they will be able to influence the outcomes of elections and the public policies that elected officials propose and adopt. Achieving this level of influence will require complete access to campaign activities, which will only be possible if the electoral system is more accessible to people with disabilities. Television and radio ads, printed material, and live events should be conducted in such a way that individuals with all kinds of impairments can obtain information necessary to be well informed but are often not. Moreover, because they tend to be less affluent than nondisabled individuals, people with disabilities around the world are less likely to have

the wherewithal to contribute money, time, or other resources to political candidates. Because disabled people have fewer resources and opportunities to be heard in the electoral process, they may continue to have a lower visibility in elections, particularly in those democracies where having such resources greatly influences the degree of access to the political process.

REPRESENTATION

The issue of representation is also important. The mere presence of disabled individuals in elected bodies by no means ensures that “disability issues” will be represented in those institutions’ decisions. In Uganda, for example, the constitution (newly written in 1995) guarantees representation by reserving five seats in parliament for persons with disabilities. *Disability International* reported that a deaf man, Alex Ndeezi, was recently elected to the national parliament and became the first deaf parliamentarian in Africa. Ndeezi has become a “leading defender of gender balance and marginalized groups” (Mutabazi 1997) and joins four other individuals with disabilities in the national parliament.¹⁰

This strong national presence of persons with disabilities is quite remarkable and has occurred in many nations around the world with growing democratic participation in government. In the Soviet Union, along with a number of other political organizations founded in the wake of the Helsinki Accords in the late 1970s, the Action Group to Defend the Rights of the Disabled in the USSR was founded in 1978 to advocate for legal rights for Soviets with disabilities (Raymond 1989). In the Philippines, a national political party was recently established to represent the interests of disabled persons (Venus Ilagan, personal communication, March 1, 1999).

Nevertheless, issues often occur concerning who can legitimately represent the interests of people with disabilities. Many individuals with disabilities have questioned whose interests are actually advanced by politically engaged nondisabled professionals who serve disabled people and have contended that only people with disabilities should speak exclusively on their own behalf. Others have questioned whether parents or other family members of disabled individuals should be seen as a part of the “disability community” and allowed to represent that community in political forums. These questions become even more complex when applied to individuals with severe cognitive or psychiatric impairments who may have difficulty articulating their own interests in political discourse.

LOBBYING AND PRESSURE GROUPS

In addition to participation as elected officials or through political parties, disabled people in many nations have formed organizations whose purpose is to represent the disability community and influence governmental bodies responsible for the enactment and implementation of public policy. In recent decades, a number of umbrella organizations have been formed to coordinate political activity and speak with one voice on behalf of the disability community. In Great Britain, for example, the British Council of Organisations of Disabled Peoples (BCODP) formed in 1981 (Campbell and Oliver 1996) to represent 80 organizations and approximately 200,000 Britons with disabilities (Gooding 1994:160). In the United States, the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities was organized in 1975, with 19 constituent groups, and it has since been replaced by several longstanding and ad hoc coalitions of disability organizations engaged in political advocacy. In Canada, the Coalition of Provincial Organizations of the Handicapped (COPOH) was founded in 1976 with affiliates from most Canadian provinces.¹¹ In Denmark, De samvirkende Invalideorganisationer (DSI) has been active in promoting the integration into Danish society of Danes with disabilities for decades (Jorgenson 1982).

Parallel to the formation of these national coalitions has been the creation of cross-national coalitions. Some international groups have organized around specific disabilities, such as the African Union of the Blind, founded in 1987, whose activities have been supported by the Norwegian Association of the Blind and Partially Sighted (Vaughn 1998:131). In 1981, Disabled People's International (DPI) was formed, an international cross-disability coalition of more than 110 organizations, including many from developing nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia (Driedger 1989). DPI, which is led by people with disabilities, has been especially active in advocating for disability rights in international governmental, particularly nongovernmental activities, and in supporting the development of organizations of people with disabilities around the world. Pelka (1997) quotes Joshua Malinga, a former DPI chairperson from Zimbabwe, who remembered the 1980 organizational meeting of DPI in Singapore:

It was at this meeting that most of us from Africa first understood what was meant by a 'disability rights movement.' We had never thought about disabled rights as a cause, to the disabled community as a community. . . . It was a shift from looking at disability as a health issue, to looking at it as a human rights issue. (P. 103)

Perhaps the most established political role for disability advocates has been in the United States, where a number of organizations maintain active lobbying roles in Washington and many state capitals. Scotch (1984, 1989) and Percy (1989) have described the extensive and significant role of representatives of disability organizations in the United States in disability policy development in the 1970s and 1980s. Bowe (1992) writes that "in Sweden and Denmark . . . the State has given over most of the control of many disability policies to organized representatives of people with disabilities" (p. 45). Organizations of people with disabilities in many other countries, including Canada, Singapore, England, Ireland, and the Netherlands, have participated in the reformulation of outdated disability policies (Miller, Chadderdon, and Duncan 1981).

Most American disability policies since the mid-1970s, including the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act, were drafted with the active participation of representatives of organizations of disabled people (Pfeiffer 1993). In addition, in the 1990s, many appointed government officials responsible for making and enforcing government disability policies were recruited to their posts from organizations of people with disabilities. In a number of instances, the prior connections among government appointees from the disability movement have meant that the longstanding absence of communication and cooperation among competing public bureaucracies has been overcome.

While access to positions of power and influence has had many important benefits for the disability community, it has often created dilemmas for those holding them, who must balance their loyalties to their constituencies with the practical considerations of public policymaking. Nevertheless, because so many aspects of life for people with disabilities are shaped by public policy, institutionalized participation in policy debates within government appears to have incorporated the experience of disability into many policy decisions. When regular participation does not occur, however, disability advocates may need to turn to more contentious nonelectoral political action to represent their own interests.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

There has been little scholarly attention paid to social movement activities occurring in the disability community. There are books written by advocates (e.g., Hartman and Johnson 1993), books presenting an advocate's point of view (e.g., Woodward 1982), journalistic accounts of the awakening of the disability community (e.g., Kleinfield 1977; Shapiro 1993), and accounts of specific protests (e.g., Christiansen and Barnartt 1995). Within general scholarly anthologies about social movements (e.g., Goldberg 1991), the disability movement does not show up, with

one exception (Johnson 1983). Only a few scholarly articles have analyzed the general issue of social movements in the disability community from a social movement perspective.

In this section, we examine movement politics in the disability community, with a particular focus on the United States. Movement politics, referred to within some of the literature as contentious politics (Tarrow 1996), occurs outside of normal political institutions, mobilizes participants on the basis of beliefs, involves long-term political actions that seek social change, and uses tactics and strategies that are other than “politics as usual” (Meyer 1993). This form of politics is resorted to by those with little influence within mainstream political institutions (Piven and Cloward 1979), although social movement organizations may combine it with less disruptive tactics such as lawsuits, letter-writing campaigns, or voter registration drives. Most organizations of people with disabilities, however, choose a less disruptive political style. Oliver (1990) writes of this choice for the disability movement:

Should it settle for incorporation into state activities with the prospect of piecemeal gains in social policy and legislation with the risks that representations to political institutions will be ignored or manipulated? Or should it remain separate from the state and concentrate on consciousness-raising activities leading to long-term change in policy and the empowerment of disabled people, with the attendant risks that the movement may be marginalized or isolated? (P. 128)

Actors who participate in contentious politics tend to be angry, emotional, and demanding. They are protesting issues about which they feel so strongly that they are willing to engage in risky behavior and angry rhetoric, even if they sometimes alienate potential supporters. Disability protestors have been willing to confront public officials, block traffic, occupy public places and government offices, or be arrested for their causes. In 1972, for example, members of the cross-disability group, Disabled in Action, blocked traffic in the New York financial district. In 1977, disabled protesters occupied federal government offices in 10 cities around the United States to demand that the delayed regulations for Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act be issued (Scotch 1984). In 1981, in Canada, coordinated national protests were organized by the Council of Canadians with Disabilities to advocate for a human rights amendment to protect the civil rights of Canadians with disabilities (Pelka 1997). Through much of the 1980s, members of American Disabled for Accessible Public Transit (ADAPT) chained themselves to buses and disrupted meetings of the American Public Transit Association to protest inaccessible public transportation. In 1988, deaf students at Gallaudet University in Washington, D.C., forced the closure of their campus for a week, demanding that a deaf person be hired as university president (Christiansen and Barnartt 1995). British organizations of people with disabilities have engaged in similar disruptive tactics; Gooding cites a 1993 *New Statesman* report of a national register maintained by the Direct Action Network of more than a thousand disability activists willing to take part in civil disobedience (Gooding 1994).

Typically, protests involve not just short-term objectives but also a sense of shared purpose based on a vision of an alternative to existing social arrangements. The goal of an inclusive, barrier-free society may motivate disability activists beyond the specifics of an exclusionary policy or demeaning practice. Len Barton (1992) writes,

A politics of disability can draw some lessons from feminist thought and practice. For example, connecting the personal with the political so that what has been depicted in mainly individual terms can be viewed as a social predicament. Making their standpoints known to themselves and to others is a central part of the agenda. . . . This can be a means of developing a stronger individual and collective sense of worth and effort. (P. 9)

While mainstream research in politics has traditionally tended to view protests and other nonelectoral political activities as ineffective, social movement research suggests that protest activity, particularly when it is disruptive, may be successful in influencing public policy

(Gamson 1990; Piven and Cloward 1979). Disability movements appear to be influential in securing short-term policy goals and in changing the terms of the larger debate over how government and society at large ought to address the role of people with disabilities.

CONTENTIOUS ACTIONS IN THE AMERICAN DISABILITY COMMUNITY: A CASE STUDY

While disability movements have formed in many nations around the world, the movement in the United States is probably the most extensive and the one with the longest and broadest history of contentious disability politics. This section presents empirical results from a study by Barnartt and Scotch (forthcoming) of protests in the disability community from 1970 to 1999. That study used media and other reports of 646 specific instances of protest activity by disability activists in the United States.¹² The reports were compiled from 4 newspapers of national scope, which covered the entire period; more than 100 newspapers with more limited geographical or temporal scope; and some non-newspaper sources, including books, disability periodicals, and disability-related e-mail discussion lists. The published media reports were identified by the use of Internet search engines as well as other methods (see Barnartt and Scotch [forthcoming] for further methodological details). Using event history analysis, this research focuses on the actual protest event, not on protesters or social movement organizations. Variables that represented characteristics of the protests, such as location, date, target, and issue, were created, and the data were coded and entered into computer files for quantitative analysis.

Here we examine patterns of movement that political action has taken over time, changes in types of issues over time, changes in organizational involvement over time, and changes in types of organizations over time. Table 17.1 shows the numbers of protests in each year.

No reports of protests could be located for 1971 or 1972. From 1972 through 1987, the number of reported protests fluctuated between 4 (1978) and 18 (1977). After 1987, contentious political activity began to explode, with at least 18 protests every year. In 1987, there were 10 reported protests, but the next year, there were 41. The highest levels of protest were in 1991, 1992, and 1997, with 55, 57, and 80 protests, respectively.

These figures are contrary to the perception of many journalists (Lembke 1975; Schultz 1977) and academics (Anspach 1979; Treanor 1993), who perceived an increasingly active disability movement to exist by the mid-1970s. The numbers in Table 17.1 suggest that significant political power was unlikely to have derived from the small numbers of protests. By 1975, there had been only 20 marches or other forms of disruptive protest. The new phenomenon of visibly disabled people engaging in disruptive protests resonated within the national media, however, and led to the perception, by journalists and scholars, that there was an active and politically powerful social movement of people with disabilities.

What made protest activity begin in 1972, and how do we explain the fluctuations in the numbers of protests in subsequent years? Even when the social stage is set for collective action, as seemed to be the case by the end of the 1960s, collective action is unlikely to occur without some proximate cause. There must be the emergence of some specific grievance that sparks collective action. According to our database, the central political issue that provoked protests by disability activists from 1972 to 1977 was the struggle to pass and implement the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, particularly the provision in that law that prohibited discrimination on the basis of disability in federally supported programs, Section 504 (Scotch 1984). These highly visible protests were conducted by a broad cross-disability coalition, a somewhat new development in the disability movement. In 1972, protests in New York and Washington focused on President Nixon's two vetoes of earlier versions of this law. Many protests in 1976 and particularly 1977 urged the release of federal regulations implementing Section 504, which had been held up for

Table 17.1 Disability Protests by Year

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number</i>
1972	9
1973	6
1974	5
1976	7
1977	18
1978	4
1979	10
1980	8
1981	14
1982	5
1983	13
1984	9
1985	17
1986	13
1987	10
1988	41
1989	39
1990	35
1991	55
1992	57
1993	49
1994	18
1995	29
1996	40
1997	80
1998	26
1999 ^a	30

a. Through July 26 only.

several years by cautious federal officials (Scotch 1984). Although the officials involved denied any connection, after a delay of more than three years, the Section 504 regulations were issued following these widely publicized disability protests. The apparent success of the protestors fueled the growth of the movement.

The Rehabilitation Act success contributed to a growing willingness in the disability community to plan and participate in disruptive collective action. In 1981, protests occurred in response to cuts in social programs by the Reagan administration.

However, at least two other issues showed up in the early 1980s that might have been expected to attract disability protests but did not. One was the controversy over the so-called

Baby Doe regulations. These regulations related to the extent to which hospitals must keep babies with several physical impairments alive or, alternatively, when a hospital could let such an infant die.¹³ The other was a controversy over the right of a woman named Elizabeth Bouvia, who had severe physical impairments, to take her own life. This controversy also involved the extent to which hospitals should or could keep someone alive—by force, if necessary—who did not want to stay alive. There were no protests identified by the searching mechanisms used here that focused on either of these cases.¹⁴ However, the organization Not Dead Yet refers to this situation as the basis for its establishment.

The surge in protest activity that began in 1988 does not have a single cause. Rather, there seems to be several factors at work. One cause may have been the success of the Deaf President Now (DPN) protests at Gallaudet University. Gallaudet, a university in Washington, D.C., serving deaf students, had never been led by a deaf president, and students demanded that the university trustees select one in a series of large-scale demonstrations (Christiansen and Barnartt 1995). Partly as a result of that protest, there appears to have been a change in political culture regarding disability around that time, which resulted in more sympathy and empathy for disability issues in Congress than had heretofore been seen (Altman and Barnartt 1993). This change in political culture may have brought with it an opening up of the political opportunity structure (Tarrow 1994), which was supportive of the introduction of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) into Congress. The responsiveness of the American government to disability protests also may have increased with the transition from the Reagan to the Bush administration, which included more officials with some connection to disability (Altman and Barnartt 1993). This opening of the political opportunity structure may have been perceived by activists as something to be exploited with increased protest activity.

In addition, the introduction of the first version of the ADA in Congress in 1988 probably spurred some protest activity; it clearly provided a target for some protests. Although there is little evidence of a huge increase in protests specifically aimed at the ADA, some of the protests between 1988 and 1990 were aimed at its issues. A few protests had demanded one or more of the provisions that were eventually included in the law, especially the transportation provisions, but the numbers of these protests are smaller than one might have expected. Between the introduction of the ADA into Congress and the fact that there was now also a track record of widely publicized and successful protests, we have the beginnings of an explanation for the rise in the numbers of protests.

The large numbers of protests in 1992 and 1993 may be explained in part by protests against telethons that many disability advocates consider demeaning and exploitative of disability as tragic and catastrophic. In 1992, there were 18 such protests, and in 1993, there were 10. The large numbers of protests in 1997 are partially explained by the events of August 9, 1997. On this day, ADAPT sponsored protests against Greyhound in 40 cities across the country (“Protesters Serve Notice” 1997). Although the number of protests in 1998 decreased somewhat, the number of protests for the first half of 1999 suggested that protest activity has not begun to die down.

Analysis of the specific protest issues does not tell us enough about why the levels of protest waxed and waned or why they increased overall during this period. To do that, we examine changes over time in several other factors. Some disability movement researchers (e.g., Longmore 1997; Young 1998) claim that the current disability movement is more cross-disability than it had been in the past because of the presence of cross-disability organizations such as the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities (ACCD), which was founded in 1974. They further imply that this is one reason for the increasing number of protests during this time. Longmore (1997) states that current disability protests exemplify “an ecumenical ideology of disability issues and an inclusive definition of disability identity” (p. 97).

Table 17.2 shows the percentages of protest demands that were cross-disability by decade. It shows that there was considerable variation by decade, with the largest percentage of cross-disability demands showing up in the earliest decade (56 percent). The number of protest demands that were cross-disability was substantially lower in the 1980s (22.5 percent), although the numbers increased again in the 1990s (50 percent).

Table 17.2 Percentage of Demands That Were Cross-Disability, by Decade

<i>Decade</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Number</i>
1970s	55.7	34
1980s	22.5	38
1990s	50.4	210

Table 17.3 Percentage of Protests That Had Organizational Involvement, by Decade

<i>Decade</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Number</i>
1970s	55.7	34
1980s	68.9	104
1990s	64.1	241

ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

Table 17.3 shows the percentages of protests that were conducted by organizations by decade. It shows that while about 55 percent of the protests were conducted by organizations in the 1970s, this increased to almost 69 percent in the 1980s. However, in the 1990s, organizational involvement decreased slightly to about 64 percent of protests. Thus, while more protests were conducted by organizations than were not, organizational involvement in protests was somewhat variable. It did increase from the earliest decade, but, overall, it seems to be lower than in other social movements. (However, that is somewhat difficult to evaluate because many studies of social movements analyze only organizational records.)

In addition, patterns of organizational involvement changed. By the 1990s, there were more state-level branches of national organizations and more organizations that participated in so few protests that they were not coded separately, as well as at least eight new organizations participating in protests than had occurred in the 1970s and 1980s (data not shown).

One of the largest changes has to do with ADAPT's role in protests. ADAPT is one of the most well-known organizational players in the American disability community. Organized in 1984, this organization's initial goal was to promote accessible public transit systems; it has more recently become focused on guarantees of personal assistance services to support disabled people living in the community. (Its acronym originally stood for Americans Disabled for Public Transit; with its change of focus, the acronym now stands for Americans Disabled for Attendant Programs Today.) ADAPT was a major organizational player in protests that occurred in the 1980s; it organized about two-thirds of those protests, which had organizational involvement. However, the proportion of organizational-led protests attributed to ADAPT decreased after 1990, when ADAPT-led protests constituted only a little more than 40 percent of such protests.

Increases in organizational involvement, after the early years of a movement, can occur for several reasons. Existing organizations can become radicalized and begin to view their organizational goals as being most readily attained through protest. Alternatively, new organizations

can emerge whose stated purpose is to produce social change and engage in collective action in order to produce that change. In a climate of successful collective action, it is less likely that an organization already involved in collective action will cease to do so, although it is imaginable if an organization decides to devote its resources to other aspects of social change.

CHANGES IN ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Rather than there being one social movement organization or even a few organizations that represent the diverse community of potential beneficiaries of these protests, a large number of organizations have been involved in disability-related protests. Organizations can vary on many dimensions. One of these is whether the focus is on a single issue or multiple issues. Organizations can also vary on a dimension that might not have an analog in other social movements—that of how many types of impairments they appeal to or recruit from. If we add this to the dimension of numbers of issues their scope encompasses, we can create a two-dimensional characterization of organizations: single-disability, single-issue organizations; multiple-disability, single-issue organizations; single-disability, multiple-issue organizations; and multiple-disability, multiple-issue, or cross-disability organizations. (Because there were no single-disability, single-issue organizations, this category is not included in this discussion.)

Multiple-disability, single-issue organizations focus on one specific issue but appeal to people who have a variety of types of impairments. ADAPT is one such organization. Its issue initially was the fairly narrow issue of accessibility of public transportation systems. Although a single, narrow issue, it was one that appealed to people who may have had a variety of types of mobility impairments as well as to some people with other types of impairments, such as blind people. However, there are also a number of other multiple-disability, single-issue organizations. One such organization is Not Dead Yet, whose opposition to assisted suicide is based on the notion that it is easier for society to assist the disabled in killing themselves than it is to assist them to live independent and productive lives with disabilities; they object to any legalization of assisted suicide for this reason. Another organization is Jerry's Orphans. This organization protests the portrayal of people with disabilities in telethons, Jerry Lewis's involvement in the telethons, and some of his statements about disability, such as his statement that he would rather be dead than be disabled. Other such organizations include The FDR in a Chair Campaign, which focused on how President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was to be portrayed in a new memorial, which opened in 1997. Concrete Change focuses on the accessibility of housing, and Concerned Rail Corridor Riders focuses on the accessibility of trains in the Chicago suburbs. All of these organizations are multidisability, in the sense that their issue relates to more than one type of impairment, but their rallying cry involves a single issue.

Single-disability, multiple-issue organizations focus on multiple issues, but these issues are of interest primarily to people with one type of impairment. Such organizations do not recruit from all sectors of the disability community, and the issue or issues that form their central concern are not applicable to people with all types of impairments. Such organizations include the National Association of the Deaf (NAD), the National Federation of the Blind (NFB), the American Council of the Blind (ACB), and Support Coalition International (SCI), an organization that focuses on issues related to psychiatric disabilities.

Multiple-issue, multiple-disability groups are not homogeneous. Rather, the category includes several subcategories. Some, such as the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities (ACCD) and Disabled in Action (DIA), have attempted to represent people with all types of impairments on issues, such as laws or discrimination patterns, which have the potential for affecting all disabled people. They truly attempt to be cross-disability organizations.

Other organizations such as The Association for the Severely Handicapped (TASH) and The ARC (The Association of Retarded Citizens) do not represent all people with impairments. Rather, they represent people with a number of types of impairments on a number of types of issues. TASH focuses on people, primarily children, with multiple impairments or extremely se-

Table 17.4 Type of Organization, by Decade

Decade	% (N)							
	<i>Multiple Disability, Single Issue</i>		<i>Single Disability, Multiple Issue</i>		<i>Cross-Disability</i>		<i>Totals^a</i>	
	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1970s	0.0	(0)	11.4	(4)	88.6	(31)	100	(35)
1980s	62.5	(70)	2.7	(3)	34.8	(39)	100	(112)
1990s	52.7	(133)	8.3	(21)	38.9	(98)	99.9	(252)

a. Two organizations were coded when possible; therefore, the totals for this table do not equal the totals shown in Table 17.3.

were impairments, while The ARC focuses on issues relevant to people with mental retardation, no matter what its source. Thus, these groups are multiple impairment, multiple issue, but they are not comprehensively cross-disability in their coverage.¹⁵

Table 17.4 shows that multiple-disability, single-issue groups were nonexistent in the 1970s. However, such groups comprised a majority (62.5 percent) of groups leading protests in the 1980s. Their “market share” dropped in the 1990s, to a little more than half of the protests. Organizations that we have been characterized as being single disability, multiple issue only conducted a minority of protests in any decade. However, they conducted comparatively more in the 1970s (11 percent) than in the other two decades. Clearly, this type of organization has never been a major player in the protest arena. Cross-disability organizations, contrary to the prognostications mentioned above, conducted most of the protests only in the 1970s, when they conducted almost 90 percent of all protests with an identified organization. Since then, this type of organization has conducted less than 40 percent of all reported protests.

Thus, we see that not only were more organizations becoming active in the protest arena as the cycle of protest heated up, but they also represented a different type of organization. These new organizations solved, to some extent, the problem posed by the political separation that was engendered by the medical community’s division of impairment types (Zola 1983). Focusing on all types of impairments was clearly an impossible task, unless there were to be hundreds of disconnected groups. If so, that was not a strategy that would create the types of communication and interaction networks that would most facilitate collective action. So these groups coalesced around crosscutting issues, which affected many impairment groups. They organized around the issue instead of the type of impairment. Three of these issues were public portrayals of individuals with disabilities, fundraising telethons, and assisted suicide; the groups that formed around these issues were The FDR in a Chair Campaign, Jerry’s Orphans, and Not Dead Yet, respectively.

This appears to have been an important solution to the problem posed by some types of separation engendered by the physical fact of impairment. These new groups were not as all-encompassing as were groups active in the 1970s, such as Disabled in Action or ACCD, either in the scope of their issues or in their desired membership. They were, however, much more inclusive than were the single-disability groups. For example, none of these new groups and none of their issues appealed to deaf people or appear to have attempted to recruit them. Or, if they did, it was most likely to have been without success since their issues are not the issues to which most deaf people are attracted. These issues were also unlikely to resonate with people with psychiatric impairments or who saw themselves as psychiatric survivors.

Clearly, then, the pattern of organizational structure of the protests that have been held in the disability community has undergone changes in recent years. These changes made the successful mobilization of larger numbers of aggrieved activists possible since they expanded the

scope of issues while not limiting themselves to impairment groups that might have small populations—or would have small populations of potential activists.

CONCLUSION: A RESEARCH AGENDA ON DISABILITY POLITICS

In this chapter, we have sought to provide a broad overview of the breadth and variety of organized political action by people with disabilities, focusing in particular on participation in electoral politics and on the activities of disability social movements. As discussed above, while there is a long history of political activity by and on the behalf of people with disabilities, disability politics has become far more widespread in the post–World War II era, particularly in the past three decades of the twentieth century. This has been building on the example of similar movements for self-determination and inclusion by other politically marginalized social groups around the world.

The growing ubiquity of disability politics, however, has not led to a corresponding body of scholarship. While there have been a number of important theoretical works on how disability can be viewed as a political phenomenon, there is only a modest body of empirical research beyond a number of anecdotal case studies. The problem is twofold. Within mainstream social science disciplines, such as political science, sociology, and history, disability in general and the politics of disability in particular are rarely considered. In these fields, disability is largely neglected in research compendia, professional journals, and curricula both in liberal arts and specialized graduate courses. Even when disability politics is addressed in the social sciences, it is often from a perspective largely uninformed by the experience of disability or the insights of disability studies scholarship. To address this vacuum, professional societies, graduate training programs, academic journals, and authors of textbooks that deal with politics and government should be pressed to incorporate disability issues and the political concerns and strategies of people with disabilities into their institutional activities. One model for activity is the American Sociological Association, which has recently published a collection of syllabi and instructional materials for teaching the sociology of disabilities (Schlesinger and Taub 1998). Many of the materials included in this compilation address disability politics. Another model is the 1993–1994 special issues of the *Policy Studies Journal* on disability policy edited by Sara D. Watson and David Pfeiffer, particularly the 1994 issue that dealt with disability politics and practice (21:4 Winter 1993 and 22:1 Spring 1994). These issues included articles by a number of prominent political scientists and other researchers on a variety of disability-related topics in politics and policy.

Within the growing field of disability studies, consideration of political factors, broadly defined, has been central and has shaped much of the discourse since the early 1980s, particularly in Great Britain and in the United States (Hahn 1993). However, much of this body of work involves theoretical analysis informed by personal accounts. As has been noted at several points in this chapter, there is very little systematically gathered empirical data on political action by people with disabilities, whether through voting, seeking political office, or social movement activity. Much of the data that do exist deal only with the United States. While there is tremendous value in individual case studies, the development and pursuit of a collective research agenda on political action within disability studies would help build a more coherent and comprehensive body of knowledge on disability politics. And while some disability studies scholars would object to the assumptions and methodologies of mainstream political and social science, there would be value in applying these established analytical techniques to achieve a better understanding of the political status and behavior of people with disabilities.

What should this research agenda include? Topics for which far more research is needed include the following:

- voting studies and examination of barriers to political participation;
- examinations of how lobbying and pressure group activity shape disability policy;
- research on recruitment, mobilization, and leadership within and across social movement organizations;
- analyses of the effectiveness of alternative political strategies and tactics; and
- historical studies of important organizations and political leaders within disability movements.

While there is not enough known about those countries where the most research has been focused, the United States and Great Britain, there is also a tremendous need for studies of disability politics in other nations, particularly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and a general need for comparative political research. Political theory and public law would also be productive fields for analytical work on disability politics on topics such as distributive justice, democratic theory, and equal protection. In short, there is an important need for studies relating to disability in every subfield within the overall study of government and politics. The bibliography that follows provides some valuable models for this needed work.

NOTES

1. The literature commonly makes the distinction between organizations *for* people with disabilities, which are often led by nondisabled individuals and typically include charitable organizations or professional associations, and organizations *of* people with disabilities, whose membership and leadership are predominantly composed of individuals who themselves have disabilities (see, e.g., Oliver 1983:134-36).

2. In *The Disabled State*, Deborah Stone (1984) has examined how disability is defined as the basis for eligibility for public welfare in the United States, Germany, and Great Britain. A very broad cross-cultural and broadly historical overview that addresses some apparent social constants in law and disability is provided in Scheer and Groce (1988).

3. One broad analysis of recent disability policies in the United States and Great Britain and the politics that have shaped them is provided by Caroline Gooding in her 1994 book *Disabling Laws, Enabling Acts: Disability Rights in Britain and America*.

4. For example, *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (1971) established a right to appropriate education for children with mental retardation, and *Mills v. Board of Education* (1972) extended this right to all children with disabilities. These rulings served as the basis for the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act, now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

5. For example, *Wyatt v. Hardin* (1971) established a right to treatment for individuals involuntarily committed to public mental institutions, and *New York State Association for Retarded Children v. Carey* (1975) established a constitutional right to protection from harm for children in institutions for mental retardation.

6. We will not discuss more participatory forms of democracy such as direct democracy. Nor will we discuss the arguments that democracy, when limited to the political sphere, is insufficient. These arguments portray purely political forms of democracy as inconsistent with broader values of economic and social equality. Some proposed that the democratic process be extended to social and economic relations. It is also argued that democracies, which are thought to be purely political, do in fact govern economic and social relations without this fact being widely understood or admitted.

7. In the 1994 midterm election, 56 percent of people with disabilities were registered to vote, as compared with 71 percent of nondisabled individuals; only 33 percent of people with disabilities reported voting, as compared to 54 percent of nondisabled individuals (Shields et al. 1998).

8. Only some countries have legal guarantees that polling places will be accessible. The Canadian province of Ontario, for example, does not require that election places be architecturally accessible, nor does it require that interpreters be present during election periods (Fraser Valentine, personal communication, April 7, 1999). The U.S. Americans with Disabilities Act requires that all activities of state and local governments, including the conduct of elections, be accessible, but the program accessibility standard is, in practice, quite weak (Schriner, Batavia, and Shields forthcoming).

9. These include Joshua Malinga of Zimbabwe, who was mayor of Bulawayo (Barbara Duncan, personal communication, February 26, 1999); Joseph Sinyo of Kenya, a member of the national parliament (Barbara Duncan, personal communication, February 25, 1999); Kalle Konkkola, who has served on the city council of Helsinki, Finland (Barbara Duncan, personal communication, March 3, 1999); Midori Hirano, who was elected to 1998 to the Kumamoto prefecture in Japan (Barbara Duncan, personal communication, March 10, 1999); a Philippine congressman, Ernesto Herrera (Venus Ilagan, personal communication, March 1999); and several individuals with disabilities who have served or are serving in the national parliament of South Africa (Lucy Wong-Hernandez, personal communication, February 26, 1999).

10. Approximately 47,000 Ugandans with disabilities serve in the country's governing bodies. This total includes about 40,000 who have been elected at the village level (Jenny Kern, personal communication, March 1, 1999).

11. In 1985, COPOH renamed itself the Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities (CCD).

12. Data were also collected on foreign protests. However, only 57 protests in other countries were located; the countries most likely to be represented were the United Kingdom (23 protests), Canada (6), Germany and Italy (4 each), and France (3). Other countries had fewer than 3 protests.

13. Although the disability community did not use this situation as an occasion for disruptive collective action, many disability groups were involved in the court cases that confronted this issue (Pelka 1997:37-38).

14. The one exception was a protest about the Elizabeth Bouvia situation—but this was clearly aligned with the “right-to-life” movement rather than with any disability movement (“Picketers at Hospital” 1987).

15. There are other organizations in all of these categories, but they are not, or have not so far been, involved in contentious politics. One relatively new organization, which attempts to be multiple disability, multiple issue, is the American Association of People with Disabilities.

REFERENCES

-
- Altman, Barbara and Sharon N. Barnartt. 1993. “Moral Entrepreneurship and the Passage of the ADA.” *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 4 (1): 21-40.
- Anspach, Renee. 1979. “From Stigma to Identity Politics: Political Activism among the Physically Disabled and Former Mental Patients.” *Social Science and Medicine* 13A:765-73.
- Barnartt, Sharon. 1996. “Disability Culture or Disability Consciousness?” *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 7 (2): 1-20.
- Barnartt, Sharon and Richard Scotch. Forthcoming. *Social Movements in the Disability Community*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Barton, Len. 1992. “Disability and the Necessity for a Socio-Political Perspective.” Pp. 1-14 in *Monograph 51: Disability and the Necessity for a Socio-Political Perspective*. Durham, NH: World Rehabilitation Fund.
- Bickenbach, Jerome E. 1993. *Physical Disability and Social Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bowe, Frank. 1992. “Commentary.” Pp. 45-46 in *Monograph 51: Disability and the Necessity for a Socio-Political Perspective*. Durham, NH: World Rehabilitation Fund.
- Campbell, Jane and Michael Oliver. 1996. *Disability Politics: Understanding Our Past, Changing Our Future*. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Carty, Lee A. 1978. “Advocacy.” Pp. 144-64 in *Disability and Rehabilitation Handbook*, edited by Robert M. Goldenson. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Christiansen, John and Sharon Barnartt. 1995. *Deaf President Now: The 1988 Revolution at Gallaudet University*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Doyle, Brian. 1999. “From Welfare to Rights? Disability and Legal Change in the United Kingdom in the Late 1990s.” Pp. 209-26 in *Disability, Diversity, and Legal Change*, edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Basser Marks. The Hague, the Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- Driedger, Diane. 1989. *The Last Civil Rights Movement: Disabled People's International*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Finkelstein, Victor. 1981. *Attitudes toward Disabled People*. New York: World Rehabilitation Fund.
- Fox, Renee. 1977. “The Medicalization and Demedicalization of American Society.” Pp. 9-22 in *Doing Better and Feeling Worse: Health in the United States*, edited by John H. Knowles. New York: Norton.
- Gamson, William. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. 2d ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Gerry, Martin and J. Martin Benton. 1980. "Section 504: Expanding Educational Opportunities." Unpublished paper.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goldberg, R. A. 1991. *Grassroots Resistance: Social Movements in Twentieth Century America*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Gooding, Caroline. 1994. *Disabling Laws, Enabling Acts: Disability Rights in Britain and America*. London: Pluto.
- Hahn, Harlan. 1985a. "Introduction: Disability Policy and the Problem of Discrimination." *American Behavioral Scientist* 28 (3): 293-318.
- . 1985b. "Towards a Politics of Disability Definitions, Disciplines, and Policies." *Social Science Journal* 22 (4): 87-105.
- . 1993. "The Potential Impact of Disability Studies on Political Science (as Well as Vice Versa)." *Policy Studies Journal* 21 (4): 740-51.
- Hartman, T. S. and M. Johnson. 1993. *Making News: How to Get News Coverage for Disability Rights Issues*. Louisville, KY: Advocado.
- Higgins, Paul C. 1992. *Making Disability: Exploring the Social Transformation of Human Variation*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 1977. *The Courts and Social Policy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- "Invisible Voters." 1992. *New Statesman & Society* 5 (197): 19-20.
- Johnson, R. A. 1983. "Mobilizing the Disabled." Pp. 82-97 in *Social Movements of the 60's and 70's*, edited by Jo Freeman. New York: Longman.
- Jones, Melinda and Lee Ann Bassar Marks. 1999a. "Law and the Social Construction of Disability." Pp. 3-24 in *Disability, Divers-ability, and Legal Change*, edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Bassar Marks. The Hague, the Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- . 1999b. "Disability, Rights and Law in Australia." Pp. 189-208 in *Disability, Divers-ability, and Legal Change*, edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Bassar Marks. The Hague, the Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- Jorgenson, I. Skov. 1982. "Independent Living for Handicapped Persons in Denmark." Pp. 7-29 in *Independent Living: An Overview of Efforts in Five Countries: Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Yugoslavia, Costa Rica, and Japan*, edited by Denise Galluf Tate and Linda M. Chadderdon. East Lansing: University Center for International Rehabilitation, Michigan State University.
- Kleinfield, Sonny. 1977. *The Hidden Minority: A Profile of Handicapped Americans*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Lembke, D. 1975. "Handicapped: A Pushy New Political Force." *Los Angeles Times*, July 16, pp. 1+.
- Longmore, Paul. 1997. "Political Movements of People with Disabilities: The League of the Physically Handicapped, 1935-1938." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 17 (2): 94-98.
- Meyer, D. S. 1993. "Protest Cycles and Political Process: American Peace Movements in the Nuclear Age." *Political Research Quarterly* 46:451-79.
- Michailakis, Dimitris. 1999. "The Standard Rules: A Weak Instrument and a Strong Commitment." Pp. 117-30 in *Disability, Divers-ability, and Legal Change*, edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Bassar Marks. The Hague, the Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- Miller, Kathleen S., Linda M. Chadderdon, and Barbara Duncan, eds. 1981. *Participation of People with Disabilities: An International Perspective: Selected Papers from the 1980 World Congress of Rehabilitation International*. East Lansing: University Center for International Rehabilitation, Michigan State University.
- Mills v. Board of Education, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C. 1972).
- Mutabazi, Pascal. 1997. "Deaf Politician Elected in Uganda." *Disability International* 9:10.
- New York State Association for Retarded Children v. Carey, 393 F. Supp. 715 (E.D.N.Y. 1975).
- Oliver, Michael. 1983. *Social Work with Disabled People*. London: Macmillan.
- . 1990. *The Politics of Disablement*. London: Macmillan.
- Pelka, Fred. 1997. *The ABC-CLIO Companion to the Disability Rights Movement*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 324 F. Supp. 1257 (E. D. Pa. 1971).
- Percy, S. L. 1989. *Disability, Civil Rights, and Public Policy: The Politics of Implementation*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Pfeiffer, David. 1993. "Overview of the Disability Movement: History, Legislative Record, and Political Implications." *Policy Studies Journal* 21 (4): 724-34.
- "Picketers at Hospital Protest Judge's Decision." 1987. *The Denver Post*, January 24, p. B3.

- Piven, F. F. and R. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Random House.
- "Protesters Serve Notice on Greyhound." 1997. *Ragged Edge* (September/October):6.
- Raymond, Paul D. 1989. "Disability as Dissidence: The Action Group to Defend the Disabled in the USSR." Pp. 235-52 in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*, edited by William O. McCagg and Lewis Siegelbaum. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Rioux, Marcia H. and Catherine L. Frazee. 1999. "The Canadian Framework for Disability Equality Rights." Pp. 171-88 in *Disability, Divers-ability, and Legal Change*, edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Bassar Marks. The Hague, the Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- Scheer, Jessica and Nora Groce. 1988. "Impairment as a Human Constant: Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspectives on Variation." *Journal of Social Issues* 44 (1): 23-38.
- Schlesinger, Lynn and Diane E. Taub, eds. 1998. *Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Teaching Sociology of Disabilities*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Schriner, K., A. I. Batavia, and T. Shields. Forthcoming. "The Americans with Disabilities Act: Does it Secure the Fundamental Right to Vote?" *Policy Studies Journal*.
- Schriner, K., L. Ochs, and T. Shields. 1997. "The Last Suffrage Movement: Voting Rights for People with Cognitive and Emotional Disabilities." *Publius* 27 (3): 75-96.
- Schultz, T. 1977. "Handicapped: A Minority Demanding Its Rights." *New York Times*, February 13, pp. 8+.
- Schur, L. A. and D. L. Kruse. 2000. "What Determines Voter Turnout? Lessons from Citizens with Disabilities." *Social Science Quarterly* 81 (2): 571-87.
- Scotch, Richard K. 1984. *From Good Will to Civil Rights: Transforming Federal Disability Policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- . 1988. "Disability as the Basis for a Social Movement: Advocacy and the Politics of Definition." *Journal of Social Issues* 44 (1): 159-72.
- . 1989. "Politics and Policy in the History of the Disability Rights Movement." *The Milbank Quarterly* 67 (Suppl. 2, Pt. 2): 380-400.
- Shapiro, J. 1993. *No Pity: People with Disabilities Forging a New Civil Rights Movement*. New York: Times Books.
- Shields, T., K. F. Schriner, and K. Schriner. 1998. "The Disability Voice in American Politics: Political Participation of People with Disabilities in the 1994 Election." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 9 (2): 53-76.
- Stanglin, Douglas. 1996. "Disability Protest." *U.S. News and World Report* 121 (9): 20.
- Stone, Deborah A. 1984. *The Disabled State*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tarrow, S. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. "Social Movements in Contentious Politics: A Review Article." *American Political Science Review* 90 (4): 874-83.
- Treanor, R. B. 1993. *We Overcame: The Story of Civil Rights for Disabled People*. Falls Church, VA: Regal Direct.
- Vaughn, C. Edwin. 1998. *Social and Cultural Perspectives on Blindness: Barriers to Community Integration*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Wastberg, Inger Claesson. 1999. "The Office of the Disability Ombudsman in Sweden." Pp. 131-38 in *Disability, Divers-ability, and Legal Change*, edited by Melinda Jones and Lee Ann Bassar Marks. The Hague, the Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.
- Woodward, J. 1982. *How You Gonna Get to Heaven if You Can't Talk with Jesus: Depathologizing Deafness*. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.
- Wyatt v. Hardin, 325 F.Supp. (M.D. Ala. 1971).
- Young, Jonathan. 1998. "The President's Committee on the Handicapped and the Origins of Cross-Disability Organizing." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Disability Studies, June, Oakland, CA.
- Zola, Irving K. 1983. "The Evolution of the Boston Self Help Center." Pp. 143-53 in *A Way of Life for the Handicapped*, edited by G. Jones and N. Tutt. London: Residential Care Association.