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**CURRENT ISSUES**

**Mad studies and neurodiversity: a dialogue**

Brigit McWade*, Damian Milton and Peter Beresford

*Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK*

*(Received 17 November 2014; final version received 12 December 2014)*

In this paper we explore what we consider to be the shared concerns of those neurodivergent and/or mad-identified scholars and activists who are seeking to make space for themselves within the academy. In doing so, we consider what critical questions and action people involved in these could address together in ways that move beyond identity-based politics.
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**Introduction**

Mad studies and neurodiversity are both emergent areas of scholarship that aim to bring to the academic table the:

- experiences, history, culture, political organising, narratives, writings and most importantly, the people who identify as: Mad; psychiatric survivors; consumers; service users; mentally ill; patients; neuro-diverse; inmates; disabled – to name a few of the ‘identity labels’ our community may choose to use. (Costa 2014)

To date, academic activities around madness and neurological divergence have failed to include those with lived experience, who are ‘frequently frozen out of the processes of knowledge production’ (Milton 2014, 794). This is not limited to the big business of pharmaceuticals, or to the biological or genetic research that seeks to identify bio-markers for and eradicate autism, schizophrenia and the like. Indeed, much of social scientific work in these areas may aim, but continually fail, to include lived expertise equally, positioning patients/users/survivors as outsiders, objects for interpretation and research ‘on’ rather than ‘with’ (Beresford and Russo 2014; Milton and Bracher 2013). Here, we explore the possible points of connection between these two emerging fields, and consider what working together might achieve in terms of political and social change.

**What do mad studies and neurodiversity have to say to each other?**

Discussion between mad studies and neurodiversity scholars is often framed within the field of disability studies. The field of disability studies has a wide scope in terms of the embodiments/experiences it engages with and in its interdisciplinarity. There are some commonalities between these three groups: people with physical/sensory/intellectual impairments, people living with psychiatric diagnoses, and
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neurodivergent people are legislatively categorised as ‘disabled’; the effects of disab-

lisism are psycho-emotional (Thomas 1999); psychiatric ‘treatments’ may result in

physical impairment; and all are discriminated against and oppressed (Beresford

2004). However, these shared elements are countered by many differences both

within movements and between them.

Several authors have engaged in debate over whether madness and distress

should be understood as disability, and what an alliance between mad activism

and disability activism might achieve (see, for example, Anderson, Spandler, and

Sapey 2012; Beresford 2000, 2004; Plumb 1994). The contentious issue of

impairment continues to prove one such challenge to this. Those politically

aligned with the psychiatric survivor movement tend to reject medical concepts

of their distress and as such would not consider themselves to be psychologically

impaired, whereas the social model of disability tends to be read as maintaining

impairment to be a biological fact (Beresford 2004; Plumb 1994). 1

Within the neurodiversity movement, all embodied diversity (including neurological differ-

ences) is accepted as a facet of human nature, whilst the concept of ‘impairment’

and related purist medical models are commonly denounced as normative (Milton

and Lyte 2012).

Graby’s (2015) forthcoming chapter in Madness, Distress and the Politics of Dis-
ablement argues that neurodiversity has the potential ‘to bridge conceptual gaps

between the disabled people’s and survivor movements – such as the sticking point

between them over the concept of “impairment”’. 2 For Graby, the neurodiversity

movement’s claim for the affirmation and recognition of ‘natural’ neurological and/

or behavioural difference means that:

the neurodiversity movement is particularly well placed to bring together broader cate-

gories of marginalised people(s) into a (necessarily loose, but nonetheless potentially

hugely important) solidarity network of movements fighting for radical acceptance of

all types of human diversity, under a broad banner of ‘anti-normalisation’ and chal-

lenges to supposedly ‘universal’ assumptions about ‘human nature’ that privilege

majority and historically dominant groups. (Graby 2015)

This reflects wider debates within the field of disability studies and activism around

how the bifurcation of impairment and disability enacted within the social model

fails to recognise the sociality of medicine and of all embodiment, and the material-

ity of social life (Hughes and Paterson, 1997).


model of disability’ may be useful in taking this project forward, in which ‘disabled

individuals assert a positive identity, not only in being disabled, but also being

impaired. In affirming a positive identity of being impaired, disabled people are

actively repudiating the dominant value of normality’ (Swain and French 2000, 578).

The proposition from the neurodiversity movement is that we should reclaim

and redefine ‘impairment’, in the same way as the first disability rights activists

challenged the meaning of ‘disability’. If we were to understand all humans as

beings with embodied differences, negative connotations attached to ‘impairment’

might be avoided. Autism, Asperger’s and related neurodivergence would no longer

be understood as ‘impairments’ in medical terms. Similarly, Graby (2015) argues

that mental distress could be understood as an effect of psycho-emotional disablism,

rather than an ‘impairment’.
Alliance activism

Recent discussions during the mad studies stream at the 2014 Lancaster Disability Studies conference highlighted that we need more work on what our theoretical, conceptual, ethical and methodological tools will be for producing a mad-infused and/or neurodiversity-infused knowledge, or praxis. A dialogue between mad studies, neurodiversity and disability studies might move us beyond the limitations of identity-based politics that create ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’. In doing so it should bring us into conversation with other disenfranchised groups, such as refugees and asylum seekers, people without work, lone parents, and organised activist groups, such as trade unions (McKeown 2014). This conversation is supported by work such as Imogen Tyler’s (2013) Revolting Subjects, in which she uses a theory of ‘social abjection’ to trace the links between seemingly disparate groups of people. Similarly, in her work on transgender Sally Hines (2013) argues that Iris Marion Young’s (1990) concept of a ‘politics of difference’ will move us beyond a focus on individual suffering towards building collective identities in order to address inequalities, such as disablement, disenfranchisement, marginalisation and impoverishment. The aim is to stop thinking about how we are the same and begin to work with our differences collectively.

It is our hope that building solidarity across experiences of marginalisation and disablement can move us beyond defining how we each individually deviate from the norm. At a time of increased psychiatrisation coupled with aggressive and devastating public spending cuts and government policies, we need to think collectively about how these processes affect us all. For example, there are strong resonances here with issues faced by the transgender community who must attain a psychiatric diagnosis and medical certification in order to be recognised as their acquired gender, and who must identify as either male or female and nothing in-between (Hines 2013). The intersections between neurodiversity and trans* and queer identities are already being realised around the term ‘neuroqueer’. This term signifies what doctors do to us, it also represents a site of reclamation – to resist … both compulsory able-bodiedness and compulsory heterosexuality’ (Yergeau 2014; original emphasis).

Yeo and Bolton (2013) argue that alliances should also be built with refugees and asylum seekers. For example, the ‘bedroom tax’ was used first on refugees and asylum seekers before its national implementation. Working together across differences of this kind would mean our collective activism and campaigns would be more informed around political marginalisation and impoverishment that reaches far and wide (Yeo and Bolton 2013). An asylum seeker and mental health service-user who took part in their research argued that ‘if the money spent on his psychiatrist … were to come to him directly, he would be able to buy food, would have less stress and his mental health would improve’ (Yeo and Bolton 2013, 41). We take this as a rally call for activism that accommodates and addresses inequalities intersectionally, and that can intervene in realistic and helpful ways to the current crisis in mental health and welfare systems.

We write at a time when activist concepts such as recovery, inclusion, access and hope have been co-opted, appropriated and politically neutralised by policy-makers, service-providers and government (Costa 2009; McWade 2014; Morgan 2013). User-led services and organisations continue to be most severely affected by spending cuts (Morris 2011), whilst anti-stigma campaigns endorsed by the Royal College of Psychiatrists continue to be pumped with millions of pounds to sell a sanitised...
version of ‘mental health’ to the masses (Armstrong 2014). Personalisation has been implemented through a free market ideology that has seen the dispossession and even some deaths of disabled people. It is ‘time to talk’, and not in the way the establishment wants us to, with individualised and neatly packaged tales of recovery. Instead, let us build upon the rich histories of activism and bring our shared experiences of oppression and marginalisation together.
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Notes
1. We note that there are many interpretations and developments of the social model that move beyond this dualism. Further, there are also activists working within the area of mental health who do accept medical models of distress.
2. We would like to thank Steven Graby for sharing his work with us pre-publication.
3. The stream was convened by Peter Beresford and Brigit McWade, who would like to extend their thanks to Hannah Morgan for her support of the stream and the facilitation of this working partnership. Read more online: http://madstudies2014.wordpress.com/.
4. In this case, who is and is not ‘impaired’.
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