

PREPRINT VERSION

Farewell to social Europe? An entangled perspective on European Disability Policies in the 1980s and 1990s

(Paul van Trigt)

Introduction¹

In a historiographical reflection about Brexit, historian Sandrine Kott points to the paradox that ‘the same people who blame “Europe” for threatening their national welfare state’ often ‘would agree that a special “European social model” exists and that it provides a level of protection and redistribution unmatched anywhere else in the world’. According to Kott, the International Labour Organization (ILO) was ‘instrumental in first defining what could be called a “European social model”’, developed during the interwar period against the competing models of communism and fascism. After the war this model was not initially institutionalized at the European level, but at the national level: the European institutions usually were aimed at an open economic market and left social policies to national governments. During the Cold War the European model that fostered social dialogue, self-administered insurance schemes and social rights was seen as the ‘middle way taken by Western Europe, between the US attitude of “laissez-faire” and the Eastern European welfare dictatorships’. From the 1980s onward the ‘social pact which laid at the heart of the European social model’ was undermined, according to Kott, by conservative European political leaders, a development which appeared to be further strengthened by the fall of communist regimes since 1989.²

In this chapter I will address the way in which the European social model has become contested since the 1980s from a new angle, from the perspective of disability self-advocacy.

Although it is often assumed that welfare states have improved the lives of people with disabilities, this assumption has been increasingly criticized by disability self-advocates since the 1980s. In the literature this critique is often framed as part of a paradigm shift from disability as a social-welfare issue to disability as a human-rights issue.³ However, this shift was in the European context less straightforward than sometimes suggested as I will show in this chapter by approaching the European institutions and self-advocacy from an entangled perspective. Using this perspective requires that I approach developments at the Europe level in relation to what happened at national and other international levels. Europe will be approached in a non-internalist way: the European sphere with European institutions and self-advocates cannot be understood only from an internal European perspective, but has to be investigated as entangled with institutions and self-advocates elsewhere.⁴

Although the historiography about disability and the welfare state is still growing, it is often put in 'national boxes'.⁵ The scarcer literature about the history of European disability policies is often embedded in European studies.⁶ The approach followed in this chapter is inspired by both the application of an entangled perspective to disability history and the increasing attention in the historiography of the European institutions to the entanglement with other international organizations.⁷ In approaching European disability policies in a non-internalist way, this chapter will show that the support of disability self-advocates for the European social model was less self-evident than one would expect from this group: despite their critical perspective, they kept this model on board when the general support for the model became less evident, as Kott pointed out, after 1989.

In the first part of my chapter, I will sketch the evolution of European disability policies in the 1970s and 1980s, a period in which disability came to be seen as a policy area in its own right in the European sphere. This development was stimulated by the International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP, 1981), an event initiated by the United Nations that has had

an impact on disability policies around the world. My analysis in the second part of my chapter addresses developments inside and outside of Europe without which we cannot understand significant changes in the European disability policies in the 1990s. Because the available sources were limited, especially for the 1990s, this chapter has an exploratory character.⁸

A ‘considerable burden’

Considering that what is now the European Union started out initially as the European Coal and Steel Community and European Atomic Energy Community, and that that one of the fundamental aims of this community was to foster the free movement of labour, it is not surprising that the initial concerns of the Community regarding disabled (or as they were then still called handicapped) people was their integration into the labour market, which was not at all simple in the free-market economy and particularly in times of crisis.⁹ In 1973 the document called ‘Proposal for a decision on action by the European Social Fund to assist the social and occupational integration of the handicapped’ declared that: ‘in the countries of the European Community responsible circles are becoming increasingly aware of the problems of handicapped persons’. It established that the number of those persons whose working capacity was reduced because of handicap was increasing and although no precise statistics existed, it was estimated that several millions of people were affected in this way. It then went on to state that:

In economic terms the existence of such large number is a *considerable burden*. Non-rehabilitated handicapped persons do not contribute to the production process, they are below average consumers, they do not pay taxes and they account for a considerable share of the social budget. The integration of handicapped persons into active life

makes it possible to reduce these disadvantages and provides a considerable contribution to the labour force. (...) Vocational and social integration, by giving handicapped persons fresh motivation and new dynamism, helps to make them *more independent and responsible*. This is one of the major factors in a social policy to help these people.¹⁰

With the aim to relieve this ‘burden’, a great deal of policy-making in the 1970s revolved around health and safety regulations with the intention to help to avoid industrial accidents. The rehabilitation of injured people to enable them to re-enter the labour market was another important goal. In the European institutions disability was thus primarily seen as an issue related to a labour-based welfare state which was mainly organized at the national level but embedded in Europe. The framing of disability at the European level did therefore reflect the way in which the concept and the group were often approached in European welfare states.¹¹ As I will show in the next paragraph, the International Year of Disabled Persons as it was given shape by the UN in 1981 did not really contest this framing, but did nevertheless add new layers and strengthened certain tendencies.

New awareness

The main aim of the International Year of Disabled Persons was to integrate disabled people into the mainstream of life. In addition to the UN and its member states, the International Year was also observed at the regional level.¹² The European Parliament passed a resolution on 11 March, 1981 which affirmed a commitment to promote social and economic integration for disabled people, in addition to their vocational integration.¹³ During the International Year the development of a European community action programme concerning disabled people was considered, but mainly because of the economic crisis in that time, this remained only an

idea.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the International Year marks a change in European policies: up to this time, integration was first and foremost understood in terms of vocational rehabilitation. The broad focus of the International Year stimulated the Commission to further expand its efforts in rehabilitation for work with attention to the social integration of the disabled. For the first time, European institutions were challenged to set up a coherent and overall policy on all matters concerning the disabled with the aim to promote social and economic integration and an independent life.¹⁵ In this way, the IYDP stimulated an integrated approach to disability that would become more and more common in Europe and elsewhere.

It took until 1986 before the European Council approved a new disability recommendation. The recommendation itself was meant ‘to promote fair opportunities for disabled people in the field of employment and vocational training’. It also called for realistic targets for the employment of disabled people in firms and the preparation of a code of good practice. It was expected that the Commission would coordinate the exchange of information and experience on the rehabilitation and employment of disabled people between national authorities. Moreover, the recommendation called for ‘giving particular priority to the active involvement of disabled people, whether in a representative or personal capacity, in the taking and implementation of decisions concerning them’.¹⁶

The recommendation shows in the first place that employment remained an important focal point of European disability policies. Secondly, it makes clear how the ‘European social model’ functioned: nation states were responsible for welfare and Europe facilitated the exchange between nations. Thirdly, the recommendation acknowledged in line with the International Year the need to grant more autonomy to disabled people and to foster their initiatives. Within the European institutions this acknowledgement was already marked by the foundation of the ‘Disability Intergroup’ in 1980 in which parliamentarians and self-advocates could informally meet.¹⁷ Partly due to the informal character of the intergroup,

however, the voice of disabled persons was hardly heard in the European institutions, let alone their opinion about the European social model. That would slightly change in the 1990s.

The institutionalization of self-advocates

In the 1980s the possibilities to use the European institutions for improving the situation of disabled persons were limited, certainly when compared to those offered by the UN and several countries. The International Year, as the current literature indicates, had initially the greatest impact on the national level, bringing disability activists in several countries together and challenging governments to deal with disability as an umbrella concept for groups previously approached separately.¹⁸ The transnational exchange between disability activists as invoked by the International Year, most notably Disabled People International (DPI), proved crucial. This cross-disability organization was founded during the International Year out of disabled self-advocates' dissatisfaction with the dominance of non-disabled experts in the international sphere. With the International Year, the UN became an important venue for disability activists to raise their concerns, but it took a while before their ideas such as a (human) rights-based approach to disability were really picked up. One of the reasons why their new perspectives on disability encountered entrance barriers was the fact that disability was already institutionalized in other ways – a phenomenon that could be seen as 'path dependency'. Rehabilitation for instance, was for a long time a much more central concept in the UN disability policies than human rights.¹⁹

When disability activists intensified their attempts to influence the European institutions in the 1990s, they ran into this 'path dependency' of disability. It will not be a surprise that the path of European disability policies in the 1990s was still focused on labour. One of the main aims of the Community Action Programmes for Disabled People HELIOS I (1988-1991) and II (1993-1996) was the improvement of employment opportunities by

stimulating the vocational training and rehabilitation of people with disabilities.²⁰ Europe was not alone in following its path as before. At the end of the International Decade of Disabled Persons (1983-1992), that followed on the International Year, it became clear that human rights were not seen as the paradigm for the international disability policies of the future. Although the UN Commission on Human Rights gave some attention to the violations of the human rights of disabled persons, the idea of an international human rights convention was set aside by the UN in favour of the Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Disabled Persons (1993). Under the Rules as a non-binding instrument, countries and international organizations had no real obligation to change their disability policies. In the Asia-Pacific region for instance, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) declared an Asian and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons (1993-2002) that in line with the international decade focussed on ‘the expansion of opportunities for the full participation of people with disabilities in society and their equality in the development process’.²¹ In Europe the welfare state remained the dominant lens through which disability was viewed.

However, continuity in policies should not disguise the increasing role of disabled self-advocates. The already-mentioned development of self-advocacy in the international sphere in the 1980s was not directly visible in Europe. Within Disabled People International, besides national councils, five regional councils were formed including one for Europe. Resources within DPI were mainly used for developing countries, which means that there was no money available for Europe. Regional work was thus for a long time dependent on resources of individual members. DPI Europe was concerned with European initiatives like the computerized database Handynet, but this self-advocacy organization was only one of the myriad NGOs, many run by non-disabled people.²² The influence of disabled people was,

according to disability self-advocate Rachel Hurst, also limited during the HELIOS programmes.²³

A closer look at these programmes and in particular HELIOS II teaches us that her observation is only partly true. In practice, the HELIOS programmes facilitated mainly the exchange of information and in this exchange the voice of disability self-advocates was probably not always heard. The HELIOS II programme, however, was seen as a way to realize a more ‘comprehensive, consistent policy’. Moreover, the ‘dialogue group’ that was already part of HELIOS I was formalized under HELIOS II: ‘this group comprises only representatives of the representative European non-governmental organisations, the aim being to exchange views on HELIOS II activities’.²⁴ In the programme, disabled self-advocates became officially acknowledged as advisers of the European Commission. In this way, the first European cross-disability self-advocacy organization, the European Disability Forum (EDF), was formed as a working group and explicitly integrated into the HELIOS II programme.²⁵ With HELIOS II the European Commission took a step beyond general statements about the importance of self-advocacy: how could this official recognition come about?

Meanwhile, the World Council of Disabled People International could offer money and ‘lobbying skills learnt at the international level’ with which DPI Europe could strengthen its influence in Europe from the early 1990s. When the European Parliament decided not to renew Helios I in 1991, DPI Europe used this decision to ask together with other self-advocacy organizations for a ‘more democratic consultative mechanism’. Moreover, DPI succeeded in the 1990s together with the European Network on Independent Living in obtaining funding from the European Commission for several Independent Living programmes.²⁶ An important symbolic moment was the first European celebration of the International Day of Disabled Persons, 3 December 1992. DPI wanted to use this day, as

announced by the UN, to raise awareness with ‘its message of human rights (not rattling charity cans at street corners!)’.²⁷ After several requests and a threat of action, they received permission to use the official parliament chamber of the EU in Brussels to have a so-called ‘parliament of disabled people’: 440 disabled people from all over Europe came to the parliament to talk with the Commissioner for Social Affairs, members of the European Parliament and Commission officials. The attendees were impressed by the stories told by disabled people and the European Parliament decided to support the ‘Disabled People’s Parliament Resolution to support the UN Standard Rules’ and ‘to research the real situation of disabled people in Europe and to find out what was happening with the rise of violence and fascism’. According to Rachel Hurst, this day was a watershed moment and since then the voice of disabled people at the European level was strengthened.²⁸ The result of these actions was that self-advocates got the opportunity to start in 1993 a working group with self-advocacy organizations that became in 1997 the European Disability Forum (EDF) and that continues to play an important role on the European scene.

Beyond a welfare state perspective?

From the evaluation of HELIOS II it becomes clear that the strengthening of the voice of disabled people went along with the introduction of a new perspective that challenged the welfare state. In an interim evaluation report from January 1996 the commission mentioned the innovative results of the programme, most notably the ‘active participation by the disabled people’ and an ‘approach recognising the equal rights of disabled people as opposed to being based on assistance’. According to the commission, this approach was part of ‘an approach to policy on the disabled in terms of human rights as opposed to a “social welfare” approach’. At the same time the commission noted ‘differing and sometimes contradictory views’ in the programme ‘reflecting the contradictions inherent in all policies concerning the disabled as

implemented in the Member States, and in particular the tensions between the “medical” and “social” concepts of disability’.²⁹ In the final report published in 1998, the programme was seen as a laboratory from which lessons had to be drawn. The focus on exchange was seen as the main limitation because ‘with limited resources’, it remained very dependent on participants at national and local levels for its capacity to bring about ‘real’ change (in services and policy for disabled people). Moreover, it also remained ‘very dependent on local and national participants for its capacity to bring about real participation and consultation for disabled people’. Therefore the programme had, according to the commission, to be followed up by ‘steps to promote a rights based approach in the field of disability’.³⁰

As became clear from the 1998 report, Helios II marked the slow integration of a new, rights-based perspective on disability. Before I discuss the further institutionalization of this perspective, I will first discuss the context in which European institutions could become a venue for disability rights. Important developments in the process of European integration such as the Maastricht Treaty (1992) probably stimulated disability self-advocates to take aim at Europe. Moreover, two developments outside the direct influence of the European institutions played a role in the rise of a rights-based approach to disability at the European level.

In the first place, the reluctance of international organizations to make disability part of their human-rights work seems to have stimulated the development of human-rights (law) expertise within and related to self-advocacy organizations on the European continent.³¹ In 1993, during the international conference for and by people with disabilities in Maastricht titled Eur’able, the German lawyer and self-advocate Theresia Degener mentioned the United Nations report Human Rights and Disability (1991) as the ‘first official study of the causal connection between serious violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms and disability’. Although this study did not result in a direct change at the UN level, we can

observe during the 1990s the increasing attention of European self-advocates to anti-discrimination law and disability and exploratory investigations of human-rights violations. The Dutch council of disabled people initiated a book project about human rights and disability, which was published in 1995 and contained several chapters written by lawyers.³² The knowledge that was developed from this (human) rights perspective had already gained influence during Helios II and continued to do so afterwards. Contrary to what was suggested in the programme evaluations, however, I will argue below that the adoption of a rights-based approach did not naturally come at the expense of the welfare perspective.³³

Secondly, the emancipation of people with disabilities in the United States of America became to be seen as exemplary. The understanding of disability as a (civil) rights issue inspired activists in the US to aim for anti-discrimination laws in the 1980s, resulting in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990. This law was in an interesting way related to the welfare state. As research about the realization of the ADA shows, the relationship between this anti-discrimination law and the welfare state was framed to be almost mutually exclusive. The law was promoted on the grounds that discrimination not only ‘denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis’, but also costs the US ‘billions of dollars’. This framing was crucial for the passage of this law: it was, according to Katharina Heyer, ‘good economic policy to turn people with disabilities from welfare dependents into productive taxpayers’. In the lobbying for the law this ‘welfare argument’ was frequently used. The Republicans and the disability community were even called ‘strange bedfellows’, united in the conviction that ‘only the truly needy should receive welfare and that others should be given the opportunity to work and to become self-reliant and responsible citizens’.³⁴ During the 1990s the ADA would become an international example. In the next paragraph I will discuss the way in which this law was followed up by European self-advocates and the consequences for the European social model.

A Europeans with Disabilities Act?

Without these developments we cannot really understand the institutionalization of disability self-advocacy and the change in policies in Europe during the 1990s, most noticeably the inclusion of disability in article 13 of the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). Legal experts were heavily involved in the lobbying of the European Disability Forum to include disability in this treaty, an addition to the Maastricht treaty (1992) which was the founding treaty of the European Union. The inclusion of disability in the Treaty of Amsterdam was not intended by the European institutions.³⁵ However, the EDF had developed an argument on how disability could be part of the broadening and deepening of existing anti-discrimination measures and received support from the Intergovernmental Conference Reflection Group that prepared the negotiations – with only one dissenting voice (‘widely presumed to be the U.K. Conservative Government of the time’).³⁶ The wish of the European disability NGOs for a general non-discrimination provision was not granted, but the inclusion of disability in the Amsterdam Treaty was seen as a breakthrough because European governments acknowledged for the first time the reality of the discrimination experienced by people with disabilities.³⁷ According to Mark Priestley, the Amsterdam Treaty gave momentum to the ‘disability rights’ agenda and made possible the introduction of a Framework Directive on Non-discrimination in Occupation and Employment in 2000 as the ‘first legislative intervention on disabled people’s rights’.³⁸

Because of this, the impression could be given that European disability policymakers made a shift from the welfare state and ‘social Europe’ to an equal-rights approach. This impression seems to be underlined by the role played by British self-advocates at the European level. British activists belonged to the driving forces behind the European disability self-advocacy in contrast to the UK government, which played an obstructing role during the

negotiations about Article 13 and the following Framework Equal Treatment Directive (2000).³⁹ They not only brought the social model of disability, as coined by Mike Oliver, to Europe, but in their own country and in Europe they fought for anti-discrimination laws.⁴⁰ These British perspectives included critical evaluations of the welfare state, although less critical and less legalistic than in the American context.⁴¹ Can we therefore say that Europe in the late 1990s followed the Anglo-American shift to equal rights that did ‘replace and not complement measures of social security’?⁴²

A closer look at the European discussions reveals that the Americans with Disabilities Act and the British Disability Discrimination Act (1995) could not easily be translated to a ‘Europeans with Disabilities Act’ (Waddington) because of the tension ‘between the solidarity-based social welfare model, traditionally associated with Europe, and the more individualistic civil rights approach, traditionally associated with countries such as the United States’.⁴³ In the literature about disability policies and movements this tension is often framed in a negative way, opposing the welfare approach to the equal-rights approach. That seems, however, not to be intended by the European institutions. In the post-Amsterdam disability policies we still find a lot of attention to employment, as for instance in the case of the 2000 Directive. Moreover, equal rights were often not seen in opposition to a welfare approach. Mabbett has pointed to a Comité des Sages, established by the European Commission in 1994 to reflect on the future of the Community Chapter, that argued ‘that the crisis of the welfare state called for a new unified approach to rights’ beyond the separation of civil and social rights. She also mentions the development of the concept ‘social exclusion’ that ‘widened the traditional focus of poverty policy beyond concern with income adequacy and towards issues of access to employment, housing, health care and education’. The ‘inclusion of disability, age and sexual orientation’ in article 13 has therefore, according to Mabbett, to be seen as part

of the ‘modernizing and restructuring’ of the way ‘European welfare states regulate the life courses and family arrangements of their citizens’.⁴⁴

Moreover, the scholars who worked together with the European self-advocates were explicitly aiming at a fusion of the Anglo-American civil-rights model and the European social-welfare approach. The wish for a ‘Europeans with Disabilities Act’ did not prevent scholars such as Lisa Waddington, who has worked together with the European Disability Forum, from arguing for a new synthesis between the two approaches and ‘a system based on a broader notion of social justice that stressed the right of each individual to a basic income and the opportunity for economic success’ and a ‘set of economic and social rights that are grounded on principles of respect for human dignity’.⁴⁵

We can thus observe in both the European policies and in the literature of activist scholars an attempt to combine the European social model with a civil-rights and anti-discrimination-oriented model. Therefore we have to be careful about claiming a paradigm shift, as is already captured in the formulation of Waldschmidt that European disability policies changed during the 1990s from ‘a formerly disregarded branch of traditional social policy into a modern formation which comprises *not only* social protection and labour market integration, *but also* equal rights and non-discrimination.’⁴⁶ Interestingly, the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities that was drafted by the United Nations in the years 2002-2006 includes rights that could be related to both an anti-discrimination and a welfare perspective. The inclusion of social rights seems not so much an effort of the European Union, which was involved in the drafting, but could partly be attributed to European international lawyers and self-advocates.⁴⁷ In the historiography of disability self-advocacy this relatively recent, positive engagement with the welfare state and the European social model is often overlooked.

Conclusion

What does this history of European disability policies and self-advocacy add to the historiography of the European welfare state? In the first place, it reminds us that the welfare state was supported by the European institutions – a construction that was called the European social model. During the 1970s and 1980s Europe stimulated the transnational exchange of expertise about disabled persons. But also during the 1990s and 2000s, when disability was no longer exclusively seen through the lens of welfare, the idea of ‘social Europe’ and the welfare state did not disappear. This chapter makes clear that in particular disability self-advocates did not say farewell to social Europe, a position that can be understood if we not only look at the interaction of the European arena with national arenas, but also take into consideration the influence of actors like the UN and disability activists from the US or outside the European institutions. Secondly, the chapter illuminates the influence of the (human) rights model of disability in the European context, which has hardly been addressed in the general historical literature until now. The model is often associated with a shift from a welfare perspective on disability to a civil-rights and anti-discrimination approach. In Europe we see the influence of this model, mainly brought in by British activists inspired by developments in the US. During the 1990s the European Disability Forum was successful in bringing the anti-discrimination perspective into the spotlight. However, different from the US context and from what sometimes is suggested in the literature, this did not mean that the welfare perspective was put aside. This becomes clear if we take into consideration that the entrance of disabled citizens into the European arena went along with increasing attention to legal expertise. In this knowledge production scholars tried to combine the anti-discrimination approach with the tradition of ‘social Europe’. The increasing attention to equal rights since the 1990s has therefore to be understood as an extra layer to the perspective of the welfare state and ‘social Europe’ and not as a paradigm change.

¹ The author wishes to thank Karin van Leeuwen and Monika Baar for comments on earlier versions of this chapter and Johan Wesemann for his stories about European self-advocacy, and acknowledges the support of the ERC Consolidator Grant Rethinking Disability under grant agreement number 648115.

² Sandrine Kott, “Social Europe, Democracy and Brexit,” *Contemporary European History* 28, no. 1 (2019): 46-49.

³ Paul van Trigt, “Inequality in Global Disability Policies since the 1970s,” in *Histories of Global Inequality*, ed. Christian O. Christiansen and Steven L.B. Jensen (Houndsmills: Palgrave MacMillan, forthcoming).

⁴ Sebastian Conrad, *What is Global History?* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016), in particular chapter 4; Mark Priestley, “In search of European disability policy: Between national and global,” *ALTER: European Journal of Disability Research/Revue européenne de recherche sur le handicap* 1, no. 1 (2007): 61-74.

⁵ Monika Baar, “De-pathologizing Disability: Politics, Culture and Identity,” *Neue Politische Literatur* 62 (2017) 281-303.

⁶ Anne Waldschmidt, “Behindertenpolitik (in) der Europäischen Union,” in *Aufbrüche und Barrieren. Behindertenpolitik and Behindertenrecht in Deutschland und Europa seit den 1970er-Jahren*, ed. Theresia Degener and Marc von Miquel (Beilefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2019), 79-105.

⁷ Gildas Bregain, “An entangled perspective on disability history: The disability protests in Argentina, Brazil and Spain,” in *The Imperfect Historian. Disability Histories in Europe*, ed. Sebastian Barsch, Anne Klein and Pieter Verstraete (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2013), 133-153; Wolfram Kaiser and Kiran Klaus Patel, “Multiple connections in European co-

operation: international organizations, policy ideas, practices and transfers 1967-92,”

European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire 24, no. 3 (2017): 337-357.

⁸ The archives of the European Disability Forum are not (publicly) available yet. The analysis in the first part of this chapter is partly derived from Monika Baar's paper "From Social Welfare to Human Rights: Disability Policy", based on an analysis of the reports on the social situation of Europe and presented during the conference Experts and Expertise in European International Organizations in Maastricht in 2014.

⁹ Anne Waldschmidt, "Behindertenpolitik (in) der Europäischen Union," *Aufbrüche und Barrieren*, 86.

¹⁰ Commission of the European Communities (CEC), "Proposal for a decision of the council on action by the European Social Fund to assist the social and occupational integration of handicapped persons", 16 November 1973, accessed 4 June 2019, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51973PC1958&from=GA>.

¹¹ Cf. Priestley, "We're all".

¹² Monika Baar and Anna Derksen, "Das Internationale Jahr der Behinderten 1981 in historischer Perspektive," in *Aufbrüche und Barrieren*, 161-184; Monika Baar, "The European 'Disability Revolts' of 1981: How Were They Related to the Youth Movement?," in *A European Youth Revolt: European Perspectives on Youth Protest and Social Movements in the 1980s*, ed. Knud Andersen and Bart van der Steen (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 159-171.

¹³ Mark Priestley, "We're all Europeans now! The social model of disability and European social policy," in *The Social Model of Disability: Europe and the Majority World*, ed. C. Barnes and G. Mercer (Leeds: The Disability Press 2005), 17-31, 19.

¹⁴ Baar, "European 'Disability Revolts'"; D. Driedger, *The Last Civil Rights Movement. Disabled People's International* (London: Hurst, 1989).

¹⁵ Anne Waldschmidt, “Disability policy of the European Union: The supranational level,” *ALTER, European Journal of Disability* 3 (2009): 8-23; Priestley, “We’re all”.

¹⁶ “Council Recommendation of 24 July 1986 on the employment of disabled people in the Community”, accessed 4 June 2019, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31986H0379&from=EN>; Priestley, “In search of”.

¹⁷ Waldschmidt, “Behindertenpolitik,” 99.

¹⁸ Baar, “The European ‘Disability Revolts’”; Baar and Derksen, “Das Internationale Jahr”; Monika Baar and Anaïs van Ertvelde in this volume.

¹⁹ Van Trigt, “Inequality”.

²⁰ Waldschmidt, “Disability”.

²¹ Osamu Nagase, *Difference, Equality and Disabled People: Disability Rights and Disability Culture* (Master’s Thesis Institute of Social Studies The Hague 1995); Penny Price and Yutaka Takamine, “The Asian and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons 1993-2002: What have we learned?,” *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal* 14, no. 2 (2003): 115-127; cf. Antony Anghie, “Whose Utopia? Human Rights, Development, and the Third World,” in *Qui Parle* 22, no. 1 (2013): 63-80.

²² Rachel Hurst, “Disabled Peoples’ International: Europe and the social model of disability”, in *The Social Model*: 65-79, in particular 67-68.

²³ Hurst, “Disabled”, 68.

²⁴ CEC, “Proposal for a Council Decision establishing a third Community action programme to assist disabled people (HELIOS II (1992-96))”, 23 October 1991, accessed 4 June 2019, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51991PC0350&rid=2>.

²⁵ Official Journal of the European Communities no C 25/1, “Amended proposal for a Council Decision establishing a third Community action programme to assist disabled people – Helios II (1993 to 1997)”, 28 January 1993, accessed 4 June 2019,

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51992PC0482&rid=39>.

²⁶ Hurst, “Disabled”, 71.

²⁷ Ibidem, 73.

²⁸ Ibidem, 73-74. Cf. Monika Baar and Paul van Trigt, “British and European Citizenship: Entanglements through the Lens of Disability”, *Contemporary European History* 28, no. 1 (2019): 50-52.

²⁹ CEC, “Interim evaluation report on the HELIOS II programme”, 23 January 1996, accessed 4 June 2019,

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51996DC0008&rid=97>.

³⁰ CEC, “On the evaluation of the third community action programme to assist disabled people (Helios II) 1993-96”, 20 January 1998, accessed 4 June 2019, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:51998DC0015&rid=3>.

³¹ Priestley, “We’re all”.

³² Paul van Trigt, “A Blind Spot of a Guiding Country? Human Rights and Dutch Disability Groups Since 1981”, *Moving the Social* 53 (2015): 87-102, 95.

³³ Theresia Degener, “A New Human Rights Model of Disability”, in *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. A Commentary*, ed. V. Della Vina, R. Cera and G. Palmisano (Cham: Springer 2017), 41-59.

³⁴ Quoted by Katharina Heyer, *Rights Enabled. The Disability Revolution, From the US, to Germany and Japan, to the United Nations* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015) 33-34.

³⁵ Aart Hendriks, “Promoting Disability Equality after the Treaty of Amsterdam: New Legal Directions and Practical Expansion Strategies,” in *Disability rights in Europe: from theory to practice*, eds. Anna Lawson and Caroline Gooding (London: Bloomsbury Publishing 2005),

187-198, 190; European Disability Forum, *Guide to the Amsterdam Treaty* (Brussels, 1998), accessed 4 June 2019, <https://www.independentliving.org/docs3/edf98.html>.

³⁶ Theresia Degener and Gerard Quinn, "A Survey of International, Comparative and Regional Disability Law Reform," in *Disability Rights Law and Policy: International and National Perspectives*, eds. Mary Lou Breslin and Silvia Lee (2002), 3-125, 106.

³⁷ Degener and Quinn, "A Survey," 106-107.

³⁸ Priestley, "In search of".

³⁹ Baar and Van Trigt, "British and European Citizenship"; Deborah Mabbett, "The Development of Rights-based Social Policy in the European Union: The Example of Disability Rights," in *Journal of Common Market Studies* 43, no. 1 (2005): 97-120, in particular page 110.

⁴⁰ Priestley, "We're all".

⁴¹ Heyer, *Rights Enabled*, 47-48; Priestley, "In search of".

⁴² Waldschmidt, "Disability policy," 21.

⁴³ Hendriks, "Promoting," 188; L.B. Waddington and M.Diller, "Tensions and Coherence in Disability Policy: The Uneasy Relationship between Social Welfare and Civil Rights Models of Disability in American, European and International Employment Law", in *Disability Rights Law and Policy*, 241-280.

⁴⁴ Mabbett, "Development," 103-104 and 106.

⁴⁵ Degener and Quinn, *Human Rights*, 118-119; Waddington and Diller, "Tensions," 278-279.

⁴⁶ Waldschmidt, "Disability policy," 8 (my italics).

⁴⁷ Theresia Degener and Andrew Begg, "From Invisible Citizens to Agents of Change: A Short History of the Struggle for the Recognition of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities at the United Nations," in *The United Nations Convention*, 1-39.