Inclusive Development as Crip(dys)topic Promise: Querying Development, Dis/ability and Human Rights

Jonah I. Garde

The year 2015 marks the target line of the Millennium Development Goals, a resolution adopted by the United Nations fifteen years ago in the form of eight rather broad objectives whose primary objective is to reduce extreme poverty by half. The goals are also to increase primary education, promote gender equality and women's empowerment, reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, fight diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria, advance environmental sustainability, and establish a global partnership (United Nations 2001). Declared by the UN as the 'Time for Global Action', 2015 reinitiates debates about the future orientation of the international development agenda and the aims and direction of development politics and policies for the next fifteen years, thereby simultaneously negotiating new visions of the 'better future' ahead.

While disability was not explicitly addressed in the original Millennium Declaration, the Millennium Development Goals, or in the ensuing targets and indicators (cf. United Nations 2000, United Nations 2001), the High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda (2013) has shown a growing interest in disability, inclusion, and disability rights. This echoes the demands repeatedly made by a diverse range of non-governmental actors working in the fields of disability rights and development cooperation.

The very idea of development invoked by the development agenda relies upon promises of 'progress' and 'betterment' oriented

Somatechnics 6.2 (2016): 159–178
DOI: 10.3366/soma.2016.0189

www.euppublishing.com/loi/soma

towards the future. These promises produce strong positive affective attachments to development for Western populations and for people in the Global South. Despite its failures as a policy, the idea of development generates hope and expectations; or as Pieter de Vries says, 'development operates as a desiring machine' (2007: 26). Rather than holding on to the promises made fifteen years before, 2015 reveals development's recurring need to reinvent itself by involving new target groups, addressing new problems, and introducing new strategies, thus producing new desires. As Ferguson noted, '"failure" appears to [have been] the norm' for development projects, steadily fabricating the conditions for development's own existence (Ferguson 1997: 8). But even after more than sixty years, the idea of development continues to dominate the cultural and political understandings of global inequalities, whose historical becomings in their socio-political complexities are thereby reduced to one single notion: 'underdevelopment'. As post-development theorists have shown, development's power lies less in bringing about change than in producing knowledge about 'underdevelopment', thus governing the 'Third World' (cf. Escobar 2012 [1995]: 9; Ferguson 2007 [1990]: xiv).

As Escobar has observed, development proceeds by discursively 'creating "abnormalities" (such as the "illiterate", the "underdeveloped", the "malnourished", "small farmers", or "landless peasants"), which it would later treat and reform' (Escobar 2012: 41). Accordingly, the growing demand to address disability within development discourse can be comprehended as seemingly another refashioning of development. By creating a new problem ('exclusion') and a new, previously omitted, target group ('people with disabilities') previously not addressed, Inclusive Development[1] holds up the prospect of finally delivering its pledge.

Interestingly, despite the omnipresence of disability metaphors within the Western development discourses, disability as an analytical tool is largely absent from Development Studies (cf. Grech 2012: 59). To counter this, this article performs a crip reading[2] of historical and contemporary discourses and visual representations to demonstrate that disability has always been a constitutive feature of modern development rhetoric.

'Disabled Development'

In his inaugural address on 20 January 1949, the US president Harry S. Truman announced his vision of the post-war world order as he introduced a new foreign policy programme for the 'development'

of 'underdeveloped areas'. The most frequently quoted part of this address, also known as the Four Point Speech, states:

> More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of *disease*. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a *handicap* and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the *suffering* of these people. . . . I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a *better life* (Truman 1949, emphasis added).

Development Studies has identified Truman's inaugural address as the beginning of the modern development discourse. Initially invoking the label of 'underdeveloped areas' that thereafter became stuck in the cultural and political imaginary of the Global South, Truman's speech provided 'development' with new meanings associated with economic growth, modern technology, and Western knowledge. Within Development Studies, the more common reading of the quote highlights the construction of 'underdevelopment' and the 'Third World' a delineation of the image of a 'modern' and 'developed' West (cf. Escobar 2012 [1995]; Baaz 2005; Sachs 1992; Ziai 2016), whereby the states of the 'Third World' are not only imagined as spatially remote but also as anachronistic on a universal timeline of 'progress'. This spatial and temporal distancing of the 'Other', which established a logic according to which it is necessary to 'catch up' to the West, is derived from colonial concepts of difference which are articulated through time and space (cf. McClintock 1995: 36; Fabian 2014 [1983]). In the historical context of the Cold War and the ideological competition for the Non-Aligned states[3] Truman promised those 'peace-loving peoples' (read 'non-communist'; cf. Ziai 2016: 48) a 'better life' through capitalism and the transfer of Western technologies and knowledge. The modern development discourse with its promises and its particular forms of violence was born (cf. Escobar 2012 [1995]: 3 ff.).

However, little attention has been paid to another facet of this speech: the nexus of 'disability' and 'development' that this special issue occupies. I therefore want to offer a crip reading of Truman's speech and its interpretation as the beginning of the modern development discourse to demonstrate the extent to which prosthetic narratives of disability and rehabilitation have always and already been a crucial part of the development discourse.

In his description of the 'Third World', Truman applies 'handicap' as a metaphor of poverty, which he then sees as a consequence of the 'primitive' and 'stagnant' economic systems of the Global South; according to his logic, disability is a metaphor for 'underdevelopment' and vice versa. This metaphorical use of the negative semantics of disability and 'underdevelopment' builds on a long discursive tradition. Whereas in colonial discourses whiteness and white supremacy were construed via discourses of 'health', 'hygiene', and 'purity' (cf. McClintock 1995: 207 ff.), 'disability', 'degeneration', and 'disease' were used as metaphors of racialised difference to devaluate the cognitive and physical abilities of the colonised (cf. Grech 2015: 9 ff.; Erevelles 2011: 40). Indeed, constructions of mental and bodily differences and disability and constructions of 'race' were mutually constitutive and legitimised the violent exploitation and oppression of the colonised. As Esme Cleall argues in her analysis of British imperial discourses, '"[r]ace" . . . was formative in shaping what we have come to understand as "disability" and vice versa; they were related fantasies of difference' (Cleall 2015: 24; cf. also Chen in this issue). Truman's account of 'underdevelopment' builds on this colonial tradition; since then 'disability' within development discourse no longer points to singular bodies but is attributed to the collective body of the Global South. Furthermore, Truman not only constructs the Global South as disabled body, but imagines the whole world as a geopolitical body whose 'health' is endangered by the disability ascribed to singular body parts/organs. In other words, the disability Truman attributes to the 'Other' becomes a contagious 'threat both to them and to more prosperous areas' (Truman 1949); a danger that is to be averted through Western intervention.

Truman's account of the 'Third World' invokes a place characterised by disability, disease, and suffering that is in need of salvation and rehabilitation by the Western world. This curative logic of development as rehabilitation, to borrow from Kateřina Kolářová (2014), characterises the modern development discourse since its emergence. Together, 'disability' and 'underdevelopment' are projected onto a universal timeline simultaneously referring to and differing from concepts of normative temporality as a time of progress and ability. The semantic proximity between these two concepts reaches its climax in the term 'developmental disabilities', describing the ultimate 'detour from the timeline of normative progress' (Kafer 2013: 25). Furthermore, the intersecting signifiers of disability and 'race' further the temporal distancing of the 'underdeveloped Other'.[4] The appropriation of the semantics of disability,

rehabilitation, and cure amplify development's promises of health, normalcy, prosperity, and progression and fuel the optimistic visions of a 'better future' ahead by invoking ideas of 'betterment' and 'improvement' through what Robert McRuer has termed a 'cultural grammar of rehabilitation' (McRuer 2006: 112).

While metaphors of disability denote deviations from Western concepts of 'good governance', 'economic growth', and 'social order', they provide a script against which the West can define itself, conjuring up fantasies of (bodily) integrity, normal functioning, and capacity. By deferring and displacing disability solely to the Global South the Global North produces the image of itself as able-bodied and able-minded, and therefore superior. Following this binary logic, 'development' becomes the cure for the 'disabling underdevelopment' at once legitimising Western interventions into the formally decolonised independent states in the name of 'development'.

Ableist White Fantasies of Disability and Poverty

Besides the pervasive prosthetic use of disability semantics and metaphors, disability also enters development discourses in the form of policies and practices targeting bodies ontologically deemed 'disabled'. Since the beginning of the new millennium, Inclusive Development in particular is being hailed as the new promising strategy for addressing disability. It is gaining widespread support from various actors in the field as a paradigmatic shift away from the paternalistic, charity-oriented approaches of the past. Its proliferation has become even more virulent since the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (UNCRPD) defined Inclusive Development as a human right in 2006. In Article 32, the state parties commit to '[e]nsuring that international cooperation, including international development programmes, is inclusive of and accessible to persons with disabilities' (United Nations 2006). In the spirit of mainstreaming, it aims to include people with disabilities into all levels and processes of development cooperation. It not only holds out specific measures for people with disabilities similar to older approaches such as community-based rehabilitation (cf. WHO 1980) but also aims to transform socio-cultural perceptions of disability by fostering a paradigmatic change in the way we speak and think about disability, thereby, finally, putting an end to exclusion.

The support for Inclusive Development is usually built on an argument that foregrounds the cycle of disability and poverty, which then – in a circular logic – serves as its justification. The argument

goes like this: people who are affected by poverty do not have access to food, sufficient health care, education, work, and housing. This in turn increases the chance of diseases, injuries, and impairments. And again, it is argued that impairments increase exclusion and marginalisation ultimately leading to increased poverty. Poverty is thus depicted as the cause and the consequence of disability and vice versa. Therefore, any development policy that aims to reduce poverty has to address disability. Take, for example, this account by development researchers Rachel Hurst and Bill Albert. They write:

> Poverty and disability are in this sense locked in the embrace of a real dance of death [sic!]. This is made far worse in developing countries in the South, where the failure of economic and social development is characterized by widespread and seemingly intractable poverty associated with wars and civil unrest, malnutrition, poor sanitation, lack of immunisation, inadequate health care, few safety provisions and pollution (Albert, Hurst 2006: 30).

Such an argument dismisses the historical roots and global causes of poverty and disability. It fails to recognise poverty as an effect of colonial exploitation, transnational value chains, structural adjustment programmes, and global capitalism, as it fails to recognise disability as co-produced through imperial wars, international weapon trade, unsafe labour conditions, and the privatisation of health care (cf. Meekosha 2011: 647 ff.). Instead, Inclusive Development pretends to operate in a space free of domination and power, as if the disabled body was already in place, outside of any social, cultural, and political interpretations of the body. Furthermore, it denies its own contribution in the making of disability through Eurocentric knowledge production (cf. Campbell 2011). Within the narrative of the 'vicious cycle of disability and poverty', disability is commonly framed as a 'risk' that can and should be reduced, prevented, or even eradicated.

The deficit-centred image of disability is reinforced through its entanglement with representations of the Global South. Within literature on Inclusive Development people with disabilities in the Global South are frequently referred to as 'the most vulnerable' and 'the poorest of the poor', 'most marginalised, voiceless and disadvantaged' (IDDC 2009: 3). The lives of disabled people are understood in terms of lack – a lack of health, education, wealth, inclusion, and empowerment. Perceived as a singular and homogeneous group, discursively colonised into the monolithic figure of the 'Third-World crip', to adapt Chandra Talpade Mohanty's

(1984) concept, disabled people are construed as passive recipients of aid.

Gender and sexuality become the only additional markers of difference mentioned in the literature on Inclusive Development that disrupt the otherwise homogeneous figure of the 'Third-World crip'. Yet again, gender and sexuality emerge exclusively in relation to risk. For instance, the fifty-page manual for Inclusive Development published by VENRO – an umbrella organisation for German development NGOs – states that 'persons with disabilities are especially vulnerable concerning HIV/AIDS' and that 'approximately 20 million women suffer from long-term complications or disabilities resulting from pregnancies and child birth' (VENRO 2010: 12, translation my own). Thus, pregnancy and childbirth are exclusively framed as a potential 'cause' *for the disability to come*, foreclosing the entitlement to reproductive rights for people *with disabilities*, not to mention the fact that sexuality is only intelligible in terms of heterosexual reproduction. The vulnerability discourse not only draws upon the negative imaginary of HIV/AIDS in the Global South but also exceptionalises people with disabilities as significantly more vulnerable, weak, and helpless, thereby furthering ableist conceptions of disability. In other words, within such logic desiring disability or even assuming sexual and reproductive rights for people with disabilities becomes unintelligible.

The image of the poor, powerless, uneducated, 'backward' 'Third-World crip' prevails in development literature on inclusion. Within this construction the Global South serves as vehicle for a phantasmatic imaginations of the West. By picturing the Global South as a place of 'horror' that is particularly hostile to people with disabilities, the West can imagine itself as progressive and superior, thus obscuring the discrimination, injustices, and violence people with disability in the Global North face, 'as these spaces are constructed as infinitely more '"civilised", "developed", "caring", even "human"' (Grech 2012: 60).

Two visual campaigns of the Austrian branch of Light for the World can serve as concrete examples of this mode of representation. Light for the World, founded in Austria in 1988 as Christoffel Blindenmission, is an international non-governmental organisation that focuses on ocular health, inclusive education, and the empowerment of persons with disabilities. In its mission statement, printed online, the organisation describes itself as an 'organization whose *vision* is an inclusive society where *no one is left behind*' (Light for the World 2013, emphasis added). In 2007, the NGO produced a

TV-spot with the motto 'Give a Future' (Schenken Sie Zukunft) to advertise sponsorships to finance children's education, rehabilitation, and medical care. The spot features childlike drawings of a group of identical looking Black disabled bodies, which are literally being knocked over by their disabilities, while statistics about 'preventable' disabilities and a comparison of purchasing power between Austria and an unspecified 'developing country' are shown, until one body is 'lifted' into a wheelchair as the narrator's voice states the benefits of a donation and the background changes into a bright yellow screen. Give a Future: the TV spot interpellates the 'good' and 'caring' Austrian viewers as saviours, guiding the Black children with disabilities into a bright future. Building again on the narratives of the vicious cycle of disability – poverty, the infantilisation of Blackness and disability, as well as the trope of preventable disabilities, it becomes obvious that the envisioned future cannot include disability. Indeed, 'it is the very absence of disability that signals a better future' (Kafer 2013: 2). In development discourse, disability becomes the antithesis of futurity and 'progress'. Moreover, the investment of disability into Western discourses of progressiveness and futurity is contingent upon the assimilation of the Southern disabled body to a Western ideal of normalcy (cf. Whebi, Elin, El-Lahib 2010: 417). The temporality of development is conceptualised as what Alison Kafer has termed 'curative time':

> a time frame that casts disabled people [as] out of time, or as obstacles to the arc of progress. In our disabled state, we are not part of the dominant narrative of progress, but once rehabilitated, normalized and hopefully cured, we play a starring role: *the sign of progress*, the *proof of development*, the triumph over the mind and body (Kafer 2013: 28, emphasis added).

Consequently, disabilities situated beyond such normalising techniques, those not capable of rehabilitation to (ableist) body-mind norms drop out of the temporal logics of Inclusive Development. In other words, the temporalisation of the disabled body in the Global South is twofold, first along the lines of compulsory able-bodiedness, and second as a sign of 'underdevelopment' and 'backwardness'. Only 'overcoming' disability allows for the 'development' associated with an adjustment to normative temporalities and futurities. 'The gift of the future' in the form of rehabilitation is supposed to initiate a process of catching up to Western temporal regimes and the linearity of progress.

In 2008, Light for the World Austria produced a poster campaign with the slogan 'I can make the blind sighted' (Ich kann Blinde sehend machen) to collect donations for eye surgeries in the 'Third World'.

The visual representations of the posters can be divided into two groups, one portraying a smiling white person with the eponymous slogan, the other one a close-up of a Black person whose face is mostly covered by an oversized gift ribbon. While viewers are given the names and place of residence of the depicted white persons and can recognise them as the subjects voicing the slogan, looking at the posters with the Black persons in them we only learn that they are a 'blind person in the Third World'. They appear without a name and without words or speech, and therefore without an identity or a voice. They are interchangeable and anonymous. They are, once again, represented as homogeneous passive objects of help, whereas, by contrast, the white Western subjects are constructed as active agents of change and the bringers of 'light'/sight. The oversized ribbons placed over the faces of the Black people not only effectively reinforce their objectification; they also open the interpretation for at least two possible readings: In the first reading the ribbons signify the receiving of the 'gift' of normative sightedness. However, the possible counter-reading that I want to suggest conceives the Black persons themselves as providing a gift – they are bestowing a good conscience on the donor subject.

These modes of representation draw on colonial visual traditions that serve to secure the superiority of white Western identities. Upholding colonial and missionary desires, Light for the World Austria aims to 'bring light' in a dual sense: 'bringing light' not only refers to the curative fantasy of 'overcoming blindness' through rehabilitation and normative sightedness, but also relates to the colonial fantasy of overcoming 'backwardness' through Western knowledge, enlightenment, and civilisation – a fantasy historically signified through metaphors of light and darkness. In both the curative and the colonial fantasies darkness represents the abject Other, whereas light denotes normativity.

Although the slow process of recognising the colonising effects of cultural representations of Black identities in the charity/aid ads that have been witnessed in the more recent campaigns of Austrian development organisations, this process becomes void when it comes to representations of Black *disabled* identities. Overtly racist representations – such as the figurative charity/aid ad that features sad Black children with flies in their eyes being saved by benevolent white donors – that otherwise have decreased or become more subtle are re-entering the representational frameworks through the intersections of disability and 'race'. An intersectional recognition of the power of disability's significations has yet to occur.

The signification of disability as a deflection of normalcy entangled with the narrative of tragedy and injustice ascribed to the Global South arguably gestures towards disability's function as a signifier of 'underdevelopment' and a justification for interventions in the name of 'development' and 'inclusion'. Within this representational system of Inclusive Development the white able-bodied subject remains the primary referent, while the Black disabled body its aberration. In short, the Global South becomes the projection screen for *white ableist fantasies*.

Narrating Human Rights, Excluding Inclusion

Yet, while drawing heavily on colonial binaries and discourses of tragedy and overcoming, Inclusive Development simultaneously adopts the rhetoric of inclusion, disability rights, and human rights, explicitly aligning itself with the diction of the 'social model' (cf. Oliver 1983). For example, the title of the manual to Inclusive Development published by the Austrian Development Agency does not only frame inclusion as a 'human right and [our] mission', it prefaces the introduction with the slogan 'Behindert ist, wer behindert wird' – a slogan akin to 'disabled by society not by our bodies' (ADA 2013: 2). Similar trajectories of relating to the rhetoric of the disability rights movement can be found in various other documents published by development organisations. In fact, Inclusive Development appropriates the language of disability rights and social empowerment. This results in an ambivalence: negative representations of disability conflated in the figure of the 'Third-World crip' co-exist alongside the rhetoric of a rights-based approach to inclusion and development, thus blurring the lines between deficit-oriented and social understandings of disability (cf. McRuer 2007).

While adopting the language of rights in describing disability and inclusion, the attitudes of many development organisations actually continue to be rooted in medical understandings of disability. Consider, for instance, the aforementioned rhetoric of the Austrian Development Agency: despite borrowing from the language of rights and social movements they continue to define impairment/disability as a 'lack of physical abilities' (ADA 2013: 4, my translation). Another example of these conflicting yet integrable rhetoric can be found in the manual for Inclusive Development by VENRO. While emphasising the importance of a rights-based and social-model understanding of disability several times, stating that 'disability is a normal aspect of life'

and even depicting the medical and charity-based approaches as belonging to the past, they nevertheless integrate the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (WHO 2001) into their discussion of disability, which has been critiqued for its understanding of disability as an abbreviation of a statistical norm, its individualisation of disability, and its failure to acknowledge the social construction of disability labels and definitions (cf. Barnes, Mercer 2010: 38 f.). Consequently, VENRO frames disability in terms of 'lack' and 'suffering' (VENRO 2010). Despite all efforts to comprise social and cultural factors of disablement, medical and deficit-centred understandings prevail. For instance, many examples of German and Austrian policy papers on Inclusive Development refer to the right to physical and mental integrity (Article 17) and the right to health (Article 25) laid out in the UNCRPD (United Nations 2006). While having major significance in protection from violence and abuse, it makes a right to disability, incapacity, and/or sickness unintelligible and unattainable. Disability can only be understood as an aberration from 'normal' embodiment. A crip position that is critically engaging with the idea of 'development' has to unmask the deficiencies of the rhetoric of rights employed in the discourse of Inclusive Development (cf. Cornwall, Nyamu-Musembi 2004: 1433–1434).

Those working in the field of Inclusive Development often support their argument for inclusion and intervention through development work by invoking the UNCRPD and the assertion that excluding disability from the development agenda would be a violation of human rights. But as Helen Meekosha and Karen Soldatic (2011) have shown, the UNCRPD is based on a Eurocentric understanding of disability, thus marginalising Indigenous and other forms of disability knowledges. Together with the WHO classification it builds a specific norm setting that Campbell has called 'geodisability knowledge' (2011: 1456 ff.). Yet, while being Eurocentric, this specific knowledge production is represented as universal and objective. The hegemonic power of this form of 'geodisability knowledge' results in the compulsion to obey Western definitions of disability in order to access rights (cf. ibid.: 1383).

Also, Shaun Grech and Karen Soldatic have shown that the UNCRPD's recognition of rights is anchored in the political concept of citizenship, which restricts the possibilities for legal action against transnational organisations such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund and prohibits refugees, asylum-seekers, and undocumented migrants from making a claim against their respective countries of residence (Soldatic, Grech 2015).

Furthermore, setting the framework for Inclusive Development, the politics of human rights is grounded in a binary opposition distinguishing those who violate rights from those who are presented as the protectors or dispensers of rights. Asking 'who always rights and who is perennially wronged' (2004: 527), Gayatri Spivak points to the intrinsic paradox of the project of universal human rights, where subject positions are already distributed along the lines of class and geopolitical location, thus reinstalling the colonial dichotomy. The project of Inclusive Development is inherently intertwined with this paradox. While it certainly has empowering elements, such as providing access to resources, it simultaneously re-colonises people with disabilities as victims *and* other subjects in the Global South as violators of their rights. The bodies of disabled people are further violated by being turned into 'symbols of human rights violations' (Kim 2011: 97) and signifiers of 'underdevelopment'. Detached from all cultural and historical particularities, the disabled body represents injustice and exclusion.

When the rhetoric of inclusion as a human right enters the development discourse, inclusion comes to be understood as an externally imposed process, with the knowledge about inclusion again being located in the West. This representational frame works to place the Global South as incapable of providing appropriate measures of rehabilitation, anti-discrimination, and inclusion, calling on Western development NGOs to intervene and defend and dispense human rights. This becomes apparent in statements such as 'people with disabilities have to understand that they have rights – human rights' (VENRO 2004: 15, my translation). There is no need for VENRO to explain further who should disseminate this understanding. These politics of location are rooted in the epistemic violence, reproducing the colonising dichotomies of who are the dispensers and protectors of human rights and who are at the receiving end. The Global South is represented as ignorant, incapable, and unjust, whereas development NGOs are positioned as possessing *the* knowledge about human rights and disability. The colonial gesture could not be more obvious. In other words, any politics of inclusion based on a human rights regime generates new epistemic forms of exclusion. Consequently, it would be more accurate to think of Inclusive Development as *excluding inclusion*.

However, the UNCRPD and the idea of human rights in general cannot be dismissed completely. This relates not only to the political struggles that lead to the fulfilment of the UNCRPD, but also to the desire for human rights and the empowering, if limited, aspects of

legal recognition it provides, which cannot be discredited. Therefore, Spivak suggests thinking about rights as 'enabling violation' (2004: 524) in order to acknowledge the inherent contradictions of the simultaneity of agency and re-colonisation.

Institutionalised Ableism and the (Non-)Performativity of Inclusion

Given the epistemic violence of the rights-based framework, we have to ask what does Inclusive Development actually *do*, how is inclusion performed within development? As Robert McRuer has observed, 'the work [the vocabularies of independence and inclusion] perform is not fully predictable' (2007: 6). What work does the affirmative rhetoric of inclusion within development discourse perform?

Inclusion is a—if not *the*—buzzword of Western disability rights movements, and thus invoked, it suggests an anti-ableist position, even though the concept itself is slippery and lacks any clear-cut definition. The concept points to a twofold meaning: first, it points towards a desired future that is not yet in place; second, it designates political measures that supposedly work towards such a future. The almost unquestioned social consent about inclusion being *good* and desirable allows for its association with happiness, justice, and a 'better life'. But, as Shaun Grech has noted, 'including disabled people in development is seen as a logical and justified demand, dependent on the inherent assumption that development is positive, empowering or at least not harmful' (Grech 2011: 93–94).

It is striking that the narrative about inclusion is often accompanied by a discourse of aid effectiveness, conceptualising people with disabilities as an unused economic resource whose work power is inactive. This argument is often deployed in relation to the Millennium Development Goals and their aim to halve global poverty, a goal that 'cannot be met if people with disabilities are not included' (VENRO 2010: 6, my translation). Obviously relying on a neoliberal discourse, this argument conceives 'development' solely in terms of economic growth. It also implies that the goal of the Inclusive Development endeavour is the participation of people with disabilities in the creation of value through labour. Thus, the ability to valorising one's work power becomes the condition of inclusion. People with disabilities who cannot or do not want to match these neoliberal ableist norms drop out of Inclusive Development's grid. 'What emerges perhaps most clearly is that the neoliberal stance is built around, necessitates and promulgates normalised able-bodiedness, a clear

paradox in the rhetoric of inclusive development – *development is not for every "body"*' (Grech 2011: 96). This is further reflected in a recurring cost-benefit discourse reproduced in policy papers and handbooks. Furthermore, Inclusive Development aims to participate in the processes of poverty reduction conducted through the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers[5] (cf. VENRO 2010: 13 f.), concealing the neoliberal politics of austerity they call forth, while the austerity measures strongly affect the lives of people with disabilities.

To measure the success of neoliberal inclusion 'disability-sensitive indicators' (for example, counting the number of accessible buildings or the number of trained special-education teachers) are created, which are again based on geodisability knowledge production, as though disability 'could be a thoroughly comprehended object of knowledge' (Johnson, McRuer 2014: 130). This model of inclusion is depoliticising and technocratic, working as a containment strategy rather than creating social change. People with disabilities are counted, categorised, rehabilitated, and employed (cf. Campbell 2013: 213). The most common indicators advanced by Inclusive Development – inclusive education and rehabilitation – are two forms of these techniques of normalisation that distinguish those bodies that can be included from those that cannot be assimilated within neoliberal conditions of compulsory able-bodiedness and able-mindedness. This exclusionary idea lies at the heart of the Inclusive Development discourse; therefore, Inclusive Development can be understood as a form of institutionalised ableism. The projects implemented in the name of Inclusive Development incorporate those subjects deemed *able* to assimilate into a global system of unequal power relations, making them controllable. Besides other intersecting systems of oppression, this global regime of power rests upon an ableist dichotomy that is institutionalised by different international policies and regulations. This exclusionary idea lies at the heart of the Inclusive Development discourse; therefore, Inclusive Development can be understood as a form of institutionalised ableism. Consequently, the promise to end exclusion cannot be kept. On the contrary, it seems that the rhetoric of Inclusive Development summons a before-and-after narrative that obscures ongoing forms of discrimination. By positioning Inclusive Development as a promising concept, any discourse about persistent exclusion is foreclosed. As Sara Ahmed put it, 'the sign of inclusion makes the signs of exclusion disappear' (Ahmed 2012: 65). What is largely absent from the conversation about inclusion (and development) is an approach that is, first, intersectional – that is, it takes into account the multiple ways in which

systems of privilege and oppression work to locate subjects differently within societies, along with the sometimes diametrically opposed desires that result from these locations – and, second, is critical of neoliberal containment strategies and biopolitical incorporations that masquerade as inclusion and work at the expense of subjects and bodies deemed 'not able' for inclusion. Given the racialising, colonising, and ableist discourses inherent in Inclusive Development, the upholding of the promise of inclusion is at the least questionable.

Inclusive Development predominantly serves to paint a positive image of those organisations associated with it by working as a 'non-performative speech act', which Ahmed describes as speech acts 'taken up as if they are performatives (as if they have brought about the effects they name), such that the names come to stand in for the effects' (ibid.: 117). In other words, rather than ending exclusion, Inclusive Development perpetuates exclusionary systems of power and thereby facilitates the persistence of development as a tool of government. Nonetheless, Inclusive Development employs a before-and-after narrative that evokes a semblance of inclusion *as if* it were already in place. Inclusive Development is successful in so far as it seems to perform inclusion. Instead of questioning the very structures that produce disability and querying ableist norms of development, Inclusive Development advertises 'betterment' through technocratic approaches confirming the centrality of development. As the name of the campaign 'End Exclusion – Let's Enable the Millennium Development Goals' (European Union, 2010–2013) itself ironically proves, Inclusive Development is less about empowering people with disabilities than it is about enabling the idea of 'development' itself. With all its promises, lures, and (cruel) optimism, the firm belief in 'development' remains unchallenged.

Crip(dys)topics Promises

Considering the binary positions inscribed in the politics of human rights, the depoliticisation and technocratisation embedded in the development machinery, the colonising representation of 'Third-World crips', the (re-)production of white ableist fantasies, and the processes of normalisation that go hand in hand with Inclusive Development, it becomes clear that Inclusive Development cannot live up to its promise to end exclusion.

Yet, the 'cruelly optimistic' (Berlant 2011) attachment to inclusion as an object of happiness covers up the material and epistemic violence perpetuated by the project. It is exactly these promises (of inclusion; of

happiness; of betterment) that sustain the apparatus, as 'the idea of development relies on the production of desires, which it cannot fulfill' (De Vries 2007: 30). Inclusive Development operates by generating an image of a utopian future that is 'always already out of place' (ibid.). The utopian leitmotif that legitimises interventions in the name of Inclusive Development is unavailable from the beginning, as development (re)produces the circumstances that the utopia wishes to overcome. A 'criptopia' (Kolářová 2014: 270), within which neoliberal inclusionism is subverted, norms of compulsory able-bodiedness and able-mindedness are ruptured, and disability is a central category of comprehension understood as politically valuable and culturally specific, is opposed to the utopia generated by Inclusive Development, which remains hinged upon able-bodiedness and able-mindedness. In fact, Inclusive Development articulates an anti-utopia – a 'cripdystopia'.

Nevertheless, it remains essential to engage with the desires generated by such policies and projects as these, because the utopian vision cannot be discharged completely. In light of Spivak's concept of human rights as 'enabling violation' (2004: 524) we have to consider in what way Inclusive Development has the potential to enable people with disabilities in the Global South to strategically invoke and demand these promises without necessarily sharing the future vision articulated by Inclusive Development. Most importantly, in re-negotiating the utopian vision while making use of its potential enablement, it is necessary to scrutinise and reflect the hegemonic entitlements and normative inscriptions that call into question the very ideas of disability, human rights, development and cripness itself, and to continue the search for criptopia(s) (cf. Kolářová 2014: 270 ff.). A critically crip perspective re-orientates the utopia articulated by Inclusive Development and disturbs its normative regime by dismissing liberal fantasies of the autonomous subject. Instead, the critically crip perspective imagines abject bodies beyond multiple borders and centres itself on non-Eurocentric, indigenous epistemologies of cripness, 'precarious populations' (Puar 2011), and – according to Western norms – 'undocumented [and possibly *undocumentable*, JG] disabilities' (Mollow 2014), while following McRuer's caution that 'as we look elsewhere, … we might not find "disability" or the able-bodied-disabled binary as we think we know them' (2010: 171). This re-orientation requires a politics of recognition that is not limited to rights and normalisation but is instead based on embedding disability in the historical becomings of global inequalities and is paralleled by material redistributions. Eventually, it has to search for

possibilities of solidarity and alliances based on a meaningful intersectional understanding of power that maintains a sceptical distance from the exclusionary logics of identity politics, while at the same time it becomes obligatory to contemplate who can and who cannot afford to take an anti-normalising position. Indeed, seeking criptopia is not naïve wishful thinking about a 'better world' but a political desire to stretch the boundaries of the thinkable and the desirable. As Gloria Anzaldúa has noted, 'nothing happens in the "real" world unless it first happens in the images in our heads' ([1987] 2007: 109). Acknowledging the ambivalence and paradoxes of the current epistemologies of Inclusive Development might be the first step towards a transformative politics that re-orientates recognition beyond Eurocentric understandings of disability, rights, development, and inclusion – the first step necessary for imagining multiple criptopias.

Acknowledgements

I want to express my deepest gratitude to all the cripqueer and queercrip collectives who shared knowledges and experiences with me, helping me to first unravel and then productively confuse my thoughts again. Most importantly, Sushila Mesquita, who persistently offered their critique and taught me how to be academically bold, and Kateřina Kolářová and Kathi Wiedlack, who have put so much love and work into this special issue: I appreciate your constant support and your comments on the text that pushed me to further develop – in the best sense possible – my argument. To the anonymous reviewers I owe thanks for their insightful comments and questions that helped me to rethink, revise, and, I hope, strengthen my arguments.

Notes

1. I have deliberately capitalised Inclusive Development to call attention to how it is constituted as a discourse with a shared set of beliefs and goals.
2. My understanding of crip reading refers to the practices of counter-reading (cultural) texts, which not only expose normalcy and techniques of Othering but also reveal resistance and semantic shifts which question dominant representations and open up possibilities for crip (dis-)identifications. See, for example, Kolářová 2014: 260 f.; McRuer 2006: 47). For an extended discussion of a crip reading of development literature, see Garde 2015: 76 ff.
3. In the context of the Cold War, the Non-Aligned Movement encompassed a group of states neither aligned nor opposed to the Eastern or the Western bloc, questioning their hegemony.
4. See also Mel Y. Chen's essay in this special issue on the genealogy of Down syndrome, which further points to the synchronicity of the racialisation and temporalisation of disability.

5. Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) are documents required by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as a condition for debt release. The PRSPs contain a poverty analysis and a programme that outlines macroeconomic, structural, and social policies aimed at reducing poverty and increasing growth.

References

Ahmed, Sara (2012), *On Being Included. Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Anzaldúa, Gloria [1987] (2007), *Borderlands/La Frontera. The New Mestiza*, San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.

ADA (2013) *Menschen mit Behinderung. Inklusion als Menschenrecht und Auftrag. Anleitungen zur Inklusion von Menschen mit Behinderungen in das Projekt-Zyklus-Management der OEZA*, Vienna: ADA.

Baaz, Maria Eriksson (2005), *The Paternalism of Partnership. A Postcolonial Reading of Identity in Development*, London and New York: Zed Books.

Barnes, Colin and Geof Mercer (2010), *Exploring Disability. Second Edition*, Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.

Berlant, Lauren (2011), *Cruel Optimism*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Campbell, Fiona Kumari (2011), 'Geodisability Knowledge Production and International Norms: a Sri Lankan Case Study', *Third World Quarterly*, 32:8, pp. 1455–74.

Campbell, Fiona Kumari (2013), 'Re-cognising disability: Cross-examining Social Inclusion Through the Prism of Queer Anti-Sociality', *Jindal Global Law Review*, 4:2, pp. 209–38.

Cleall, Esme (2015), 'Orientalising Deafness: Race and Disability in Imperial Britain', *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 21:1, pp. 22–36.

Cornwall, Andrea and Celestine Nyamu-Musembi (2004), 'Putting the "Right-Based Approach" to Development into Perspective', *Third World Quarterly*, 25:8, pp. 1415–37.

De Vries, Pieter (2007), 'Don't compromise your desire for development! A Lacanian / Deleuzian rethinking of the anti-politics machine', *Third World Quarterly*, 28:1, pp. 25–43.

Erevelles, Nirmala (2011), *Disability and Difference in a Global Context. Enabling a Transformative Body Politic*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Escobar, Arturo [1995] (2012), *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton, NJ, and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Fabian, Johannes [1983] (2014), *Time and the Other. How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Ferguson, James [1990] (1997), *The Anti-Politics Machine. 'Development', Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Garde, Isa Jonah (2015), *Cripping Development? Ambivalenzen 'Inklusiver Entwicklung' aus crip-theoretischer Perspektive*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Grech, Shaun (2011), 'Recolonising Debates or Perpetuated Coloniality? Decentring the Spaces of Disability, Development and Community in the Global South', *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15:1, pp. 87–100.

Grech, Shaun (2012), 'Disability and the Majority World: a Neocolonial Approach', in D. Goodley, B. Hughes and L. Davis (ed.), *Disability and Social Theory. New Developments and Directions*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 52–69.

Grech, Shaun (2015), 'Decolonising Eurocentric Disability Studies: Why Colonialism Matters in the Disability and Global South Debate', *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 21:1, pp. 6–21.

High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda (2013), 'A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development. The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda', *High-Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda*, 11 May 2016, http://www.post2015hlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/UN-Report.pdf

IDDC (2009), 'Make development inclusive. How to include the perspectives of persons with disabilities in the Project Cycle Management Guidelines of the EC. Concepts and guiding principles', *Make Development Inclusive*, 1 August 2009, http://www.make-development-inclusive.org/toolsen/pcm1.pdf.

Johnson, Merri Lisa and Robert McRuer (2014), 'Cripistemologies: introduction', *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*, 8:2, pp. 127–47.

Kafer, Alison (2013), *Feminist, Queer, Crip*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kim, Eunjung (2011), '"Heaven for Disabled people": Nationalism and International Human Rights Imagery', *Disability & Society*, 26:1, pp. 93–106.

Kolářová, Kateřina (2014), 'The Inarticulate Post-Socialist Crip. On the Cruel Optimism of Neoliberal Transformations in the Czech Republic', *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 8:3, pp. 257–74.

Light for the World (2013), 'Our Mission', *Light for the World,* 11 May 2016, http://www.light-for-the-world.org.

McRuer, Robert (2006), *Crip Theory. Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability*, New York and London: New York University Press.

McRuer, Robert (2007), 'Taking It to the Bank: Independence and Inclusion on the World Market', *Journal of Literary Disability*, 1:2, pp. 5–14.

McRuer, Robert (2010), 'Disability Nationalism in Crip Times', *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 4:2, pp. 163–78.

Meekosha, Helen (2011), 'Decolonising Disability: Thinking and Acting Globally', *Disability & Society*, 26:6, pp. 667–82.

Meekosha, Helen and Karen Soldatic (2011), 'Human Rights and the Global South: the Case of Disability', *Third World Quarterly*, 32:8, pp. 1383–97.

Mitchell, David T. and Sharon L. Snyder (2001), *Narrative Prosthesis. Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*, Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade (1984), 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', *Boundary 2*, 12:3, pp. 333–58.

Mollow, Anna (2014), 'Criphytemologies. What Disability Theory Needs to Know about Hysteria', *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 8:2, pp. 185–201.

Oliver, Michael (1990), *The Politics of Disablement*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Puar, Jasbir (2011), 'CODA: the Cost of Getting Better. Suicide, Sensations, Switchpoints', *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 18:1, pp. 149–58.

Sachs, Wolfgang (1992), 'Introduction', in W. Sachs (ed.), *The Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, London and New York: Zed Books, pp. 1–6.

Soldatic, Karen and Shaun Grech (2015), 'Transnationalising Disability Studies: Rights, Justice and Impairment', *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 34:2, http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/4249/3588.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (2004), 'Righting Wrongs', *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 103:2–3, pp. 523–81.

Truman, Harry S. (1949), 'Inaugural Address', *Harry S. Truman Library & Museum*, 11 May 2016 http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm.

United Nations (2000), 'United Nations Millennium Declaration', *UN Documents –Gathering a Body of Global Agreements*, 11 May 2016, http://www.un-documents.net/a55r2.htm.

United Nations (2001), 'Road Map towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration', *Documents,* 11 May 2016, http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/56/a56326.pdf.

United Nations (2006), 'Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities', *United Nations*, 11 May 2016, http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml.

VENRO (2004), *Entwicklung braucht Beteiligung. Wege zur gleichberechtigten Teilhabe von Menschen mit Behinderung in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit*, Bonn: VENRO.

VENRO (2010), *Gewusst wie – Menschen mit Behinderung in Projekte der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit einbeziehen. Handbuch für inklusive Entwicklung*, Bonn: VENRO.

Whebi, Samantha, Lindsay Elin and Yahya El-Lahib (2010), 'Neo-colonial Discourse and Disability: the Case of Canadian International Development NGOs', *Community Development Journal*, 45:4, pp. 404–22.

World Health Organization (1980), *Training the Disabled in the Community. An Experimental Manual on Rehabilitation and Disability Prevention for Developing Countries*, by E. Helander, P. Mendis, G. Nelson, Geneva: World Health Organization. DPR/80.1, version 2.

World Health Organization (2001), *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health*, Geneva: WHO.

Ziai, Aram (2016), *Development Discourse and Global History. From Colonialism to the Sustainable Development Goals*, London and New York: Routledge.

Your short guide to the EUP Journals Blog http://euppublishingblog.com/

A forum for discussions relating to Edinburgh University Press Journals

1. The primary goal of the EUP Journals Blog

To aid discovery of authors, articles, research, multimedia and reviews published in Journals, and as a consequence contribute to increasing traffic, usage and citations of journal content.

2. Audience

Blog posts are written for an educated, popular and academic audience within EUP Journals' publishing fields.

3. Content criteria - your ideas for posts

We prioritize posts that will feature highly in search rankings, that are shareable and that will drive readers to your article on the EUP site.

4. Word count, style, and formatting

- Flexible length, however typical posts range 70-600 words.
- Related images and media files are encouraged.
- No heavy restrictions to the style or format of the post, but it should best reflect the content and topic discussed.

5. Linking policy

- Links to external blogs and websites that are related to the author, subject matter and to EUP publishing fields are encouraged, e.g.to related blog posts

6. Submit your post

Submit to ruth.allison@eup.ed.ac.uk

If you'd like to be a regular contributor, then we can set you up as an author so you can create, edit, publish, and delete your *own* posts, as well as upload files and images.

7. Republishing/repurposing

Posts may be re-used and re-purposed on other websites and blogs, but a minimum 2 week waiting period is suggested, and an acknowledgement and link to the original post on the EUP blog is requested.

8. Items to accompany post

- A short biography (ideally 25 words or less, but up to 40 words)
- A photo/headshot image of the author(s) if possible.
- Any relevant, thematic images or accompanying media (podcasts, video, graphics and photographs), provided copyright and permission to republish has been obtained.
- Files should be high resolution and a maximum of 1GB
- Permitted file types: *jpg, jpeg, png, gif, pdf, doc, ppt, odt, pptx, docx, pps, ppsx, xls, xlsx, key, mp3, m4a, wav, ogg, zip, ogv, mp4, m4v, mov, wmv, avi, mpg, 3gp, 3g2.*