Jan Stoll

The German Disability Movement as a Transnational, Entangled New Social Movement

Abstract

The article examines the Disability Movement in West Germany in the 1970s and 1980s. Therefore, disability activism in West Germany is considered with regard to new social movement research. Furthermore, the author asks for local, regional and national action-frames and addressees of the Disability Movements, based on the assumption that a movement of people personally affected by disabilities will address the national welfare policy or civil rights issues, which are bound to national legislation. The movement initially aimed at local everyday life barriers or national civil rights and societal discrimination. Thus, its action-frames and addressees were spatially bounded. However, following processes of differentiation and professionalisation in the early 1980s, the movement broadened its transnational alliances. One example considered are the attempts for the de-institutionalisation of care and the enabling of self-determined Personal Assistance, which took place in exchange with activists of the Independent Living Movement in the United States. The other example considered is the campaign of German disability activists to support a group of revolutionary people with disabilities in Nicaragua, which sets the movement into the context of new social movements and the alternative milieu with its specific political expression, habits and style.

Keywords: *New Social Movements, Disability Movement, West Germany, United Nations, International Solidarity Movement, Women`s Movement*

DOI: 10.13154/mts.53.2015.63-86

Introduction

Research on new social movements nearly forgot the existence of Disability Movements. This is especially the case for the German Disability Movement.[1] Certainly, it was not a mass movement comparable to the Peace Movement, for example.[2] Even though some reports exist[3], studies with an explicit historiographical emphasis are rare.[4] The aim of this article is to fill this gap and to discuss the transnational entanglements of the West German Disability Movement in the late 1970s and 1980s. On the one hand, one can assume that the Disability Movement addressed first and foremost the national society and the national (social) policy. Consequently, the important question to consider is: how national was the German Disability Movement after all? In addition, the literature stressed the role of local participation of new social movements. In this respect, the local and regional frames of the Disability Movement must be considered as well. On the other hand, it was influenced by the upheaval of "1968" and was in contact with other West German new social movements and furthermore with other Disability Movements abroad. Therefore, transfer-processes attained a specific significance. Which attempts did a new social movement of people with disabilities make and which possibilities did they have to put themselves into the context of other new social movements and, furthermore, into a social environment of the alternative

1 The volumes on social movements in Germany do not list articles on the Disability Movement. See for example Dieter Rucht/Roland Roth: Soziale Bewegung und Protest – eine theoretische und empirische Bilanz, in: Dieter Rucht/Roland Roth (eds.): Die sozialen Bewegungen in Deutschland seit 1945: Ein Handbuch, Frankfurt am Main/New York 2008, pp. 636–668, p. 654; see further the volume Kai-Uwe Hellmann/Ruud Koopmans (eds.): Paradigmen der Bewegungsforschung: Entstehung und Entwicklung von neuen sozialen Bewegungen und Rechtsextremismus, Opladen 1998, which is concentrated on the "paradigms" of new social movement theories such as structural strains, collective identity, framing, resource mobilisation and political opportunity structures. For a similar approach focused on the theories, but with an explicit historiographical perspective see also Jürgen Mittag/Helke Stadtland (eds.): Theoretische Ansätze und Konzepte in der Forschung über soziale Bewegungen in der Geschichtswissenschaft, Essen 2014.

2 See, for example, Christoph Becker-Schaum et al. (eds.): "Entrüstet Euch!": Nuklearkrise, NATO-Doppelbeschluss und Friedensbewegung, Paderborn 2012.

3 See, for example, Swantje Köbsell: Towards Self-Determination and Equalization: A Short History of the German Disability Rights Movement, in: Disability Studies Quarterly 26:2 (2006), available online at: http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/692/869 (accessed on 11.6.2014); Udo Sierck/Christian Mürner: Krüppelzeitung: Brisanz der Behindertenbewegung, Neu-Ulm 2009.

4 Overviews on disability politics and culture in Germany only contain remarks on the Disability Movement. See Elsbeth Bösl: Politiken der Normalisierung. Zur Geschichte der Behindertenpolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bielefeld 2009; Carol Poore: Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture, Ann Arbor 2007; Walter Fandrey: Krüppel, Idioten, Irre: Zur Sozialgeschichte behinderter Menschen in Deutschland, Stuttgart 1990.

milieu? The new social movements were a phenomenon crossing national borders.[5] Thus, other questions concerning the *trans*nationality of the Disability Movement should be considered. As an emancipatory movement it might refer to strategies and claims of other emancipatory movements. Which entanglements can be observed between the different movements? Which concepts were transferred from or to other national movements? To answer these questions, this case study examines the Disability Movement in the West Germany. In the first section, I will explore the structural and political circumstances of the Disability Movement in the West Germany. The second section focuses on the local and national action-frames and addressees of the Disability Movement. In the third section, I will discuss the transnational references of the Disability Movement.[6]

Disability Activism in West Germany as a New Social Movement

The background of disability activism in West Germany, its emergence and claims, was determined by the federal welfare policy as well as differing degrees of social reputation of the affected. The social policy after the Second World War reacted to the overwhelming amount of war veterans, war widows and orphans with a system of care and supply, which addressed these victims of war.[7] Social policy as well as the

5 See for example Holger Nehring: Transnationale soziale Bewegungen, in: Jost Dülffer/Wilfried Loth (eds.), Dimensionen internationaler Geschichte, München 2012, pp. 129–149; Martin Klimke: The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties, Princeton/Oxford 2010; Marcel van der Linden: Das Zusammenspiel der sozialen Bewegungen in Westeuropa: ArbeiterInnen-, Jugend- und Frauenbewegungen, in: Peter Birke/Bernd Hüttner/Gottfried Oy (eds.): Alte Linke – Neue Linke?: Die sozialen Kämpfe der 1968er Jahre in der Diskussion, Berlin 2009, pp. 115–135;

6 The sources for this case study are mainly publications of the Disability Movement, especially its periodicals. Furthermore considered were documents from the *Archiv des Evangelischen Werkes für Diakonie und Entwicklung*, an important welfare institution with emphasis on aid for disabled persons, and the *Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis der Heinrich-Böll Stiftung*, the archive of the political party *Die Grünen*, which attracted protagonists of the new social movements. In addition, one record stems from the Federal Archives. Due to this selection, the perspective is merely one-sided. It is centred on the Germans' perception of the discussions about Independent Living as well as on their view on Nicaragua.

7 See Elsbeth Bösl: Politiken der Normalisierung: Zur Geschichte der Behindertenpolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bielefeld 2009; see also David A. Gerber: Disabled Veterans, the State, and the Experience of Disability in Western Societies, 1914–1950, in: Journal of Social History 36:4 (2003), pp.899–916; James M. Diehl: Change and Continuity in the Treatment of German Kriegsopfer, in: Robert G. Moeller (ed.): West

public differentiated between the causes of disability. The so-called "causal principle" codified a hierarchical view on people with disabilities: whereas the war veterans were provided with pensions, other disabled people – the so-called civil impaired: men, who were disabled after accidents or by birth, women or children with disabilities, and people with mental disabilities – were mainly disregarded by social policy, and in fact, by society. They remained in care of traditional, often confessional, institutions or in family custody. The hierarchy of people with disabilities was affirmed by the prevalent scientific and social concept: the so-called medical model of disability. This approach emphasised the individual defect of a person with disability, and intervention had to cure the person through medical treatment and therapeutic interventions, for instance medical attendance, prosthetic provision.[8] In close connection to the medical model of disability, the system of rehabilitation focused a "functional normalisation" and was oriented on medical and occupational rehabilitation.[9]

In connection with growing prosperity, welfare policy changed in the mid-1960s: laws and their enforcement began to include other groups of people with disabilities.[10] Social policy expanded further through the governing coalition by social-democrats and liberals since 1969 and the chancellors' claim of democratisation and interior reforms. The funding for rehabilitation, for example, rose, which led to an expansion of rehabilitation centres. At the same time, a definition of disability spread, which

Germany under Construction: Politics, Society, and Culture in the Adenauer-Era, Ann Arbor 1997, pp. 93–108; Michael Geyer: Ein Vorbote des Wohlfahrtsstaates: Die Kriegsopferversorgung in Frankreich, Deutschland und Großbritannien nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg, in: Geschichte und Gesellschaft 9:2 (1983), pp. 230–277. The volumes of the series *Geschichte der Sozialpolitik in Deutschland seit 1945*, edited by the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the German Federal Archives, 11 volumes, Baden-Baden 2001–2008, provide an excellent access and detailed information on German welfare policy.

8 See, for example, Elsbeth Bösl: Was ist Disability History?: Zur Geschichte und Historiografie von Behinderung, in: Elsbeth Bösl/AnneKlein/Anne Waldschmidt (eds.): Disability History: Konstruktionen von Behinderung in der Geschichte: Eine Einführung, Bielefeld 2010, pp. 29–43; Gabriele Lingelbach/Sebastian Schlund: Disability History, Version 1.0, in: Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte, 8 July 2014, available online at: http://docupedia.de/zg/Disability_History?oldid=92951 (accessed on 17 July 2014).

9 See Elsbeth Bösl: Politiken der Normalisierung: Zur Geschichte der Behindertenpolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, p. 48.

10 Wilfried Rudloff: Rehabilitation und Hilfen für Behinderte, in: Hans Günter Hockerts (ed.): Geschichte der Sozialpolitik in Deutschland seit 1945 5: Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1966–1974: Eine Zeit vielfältigen Aufbruchs, Baden-Baden 2006, pp. 559–590; for a more general overview see Hans Günter Hockerts: Metamorphosen des Wohlfahrtsstaats, in: Martin Broszat (ed.): Zäsuren nach 1945: Essays zur Periodisierung der deutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte, Munich 1990, pp. 35–45; Claus Offe: The German Welfare State: Principles, Performance, Prospects, in: John S. Brady et al. (eds.): The Postwar Transformation of Germany: Democracy, Prosperity, and Nationhood, Ann Arbor 1999, pp. 202–224.

incorporated all previously separately labelled groups of people with disabilities.[11] The public and in particular the media became concerned about marginal groups (*Randgruppen*) of society.[12] Nevertheless, persons with disabilities still faced discriminations: they were mostly considered as pitiful, helpless and needy beings, cared for by health professionals, therapists, scientific experts and benefactors.[13]

The promise of democratisation and modified demands of people with disabilities provided the basis for the emergence of the first Clubs of Disabled and their Friends (*Clubs Behinderter und ihrer Freunde* or CeBeeF) in the late 1960s.[14] These were the first clubs of mostly younger people with disabilities, who met with non-disabled people. Furthermore, they did not organise merely one group of people with disabilities, for example war veterans or people with cerebral palsy, but demanded a cooperative cross-disability organisation. In addition, a course on "coping with the environment" ("*Bewältigung der Umwelt*") arose in the early 1970s at the adult education centre in Frankfurt, led by the disabled activist Gusti Steiner and the non-disabled investigative journalist Ernst Klee. Whereas the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends concentrated on the organisation of leisure time activities, the course on "coping with the environment" criticised mobility restrictions, especially for wheelchair users. In the late 1970s another organisation of disability activists came into being: the so-called "cripple-groups".[15] These three different organisations formed Disability Movement in West Germany in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

11 See Elsbeth Bösl: Politiken der Normalisierung: Zur Geschichte der Behindertenpolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, p. 339.

12 The democratisation of the German public media analyses Christina von Hodenberg: Die Journalisten und der Aufbruch zur kritischen Öffentlichkeit, in: Ulrich Herbert (ed.): Wandlungsprozesse in Westdeutschland: Belastung, Integration, Liberalisierung, 1945–1980, 2nd ed., Göttingen 2002, pp. 278–311. In the mid-1960s, the German sociologist Friedrich Fürstenberg described the phenomenon of members of society, who stand at the margins, not because of a lack of income, but rather due to "social disintegration": Friedrich Fürstenberg: Randgruppen in der modernen Gesellschaft, in: Soziale Welt 16 (1965), pp. 236–245.

13 See, for example, Gabriele Lingelbach: Die Konstruktionen von "Behinderung" in der Öffentlichkeitsarbeit und Spendenwerbung der Aktion Sorgenkind seit 1964, in: Elsbeth Bösl/AnneKlein/Anne Waldschmidt (eds.): Disability History: Konstruktionen von Behinderung in der Geschichte: Eine Einführung, Bielefeld 2010, pp. 127–149.

14 The term "Disabled" ("Der Behinderte") as a substantive is a specific German word, which identifies a person through his being disabled or impaired. This term was quite common throughout the 1970s until the 1990s.

15 See Poore: Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture, Ann Arbor 2007, p. 290.

Considering the definitions given in the literature, a new social movement is a "mobilising collective actor, […] who pursues the objective to cause, prevent or withdraw fundamental social change".[16] Following this definition by the political scientist Joachim Raschke, the protagonists must work with certain continuity, provide for a high symbolic integration, and a low specification of roles by variable forms of organisation and action. The designation by the sociologist Dieter Rucht is another equally common cited definition. He states that a social movement is a system of action, which exists at least for a certain duration and which is carried by mobilised collective actors. These networks of groups and organisations share collective identity and aspire towards social change through public protests.[17] The historians Jürgen Mittag and Helke Stadtland argue that all of these definitions are based on underlying concepts and therefore depend on its specific context. Jürgen Mittag and Helke Stadtland propose to identify "constitutive elements" of new social movements.[18] Although there are further criteria or paradigms defining new social movements, I will concentrate on a short depiction with regard to forms of organisation and their aims for social change.[19]

All of these groups – the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends, the course on "coping with the environment", and the "cripple-groups" – only had a small degree of formalisation. Whereas the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends were often organised in the legal form of a registered association, the course on "coping with the environment" had no formal membership, and neither had the cripple-groups. They strove towards flat hierarchies between the members and were marked by a downright anti-redtapism. In contrast to the existing unions and associations of people with disabilities, they

16 Joachim Raschke: Zum Begriff der sozialen Bewegung, in: Roland Roth/Dieter Rucht (eds.): Neue soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Frankfurt am Main/New York 1987, pp. 19–30, p. 21; Raschke's definition is consistently consulted, recently again by Jürgen Mittag/Helke Stadtland: Soziale Bewegungsforschung im Spannungsfeld von Theorie und Empirie: Einleitende Anmerkungen zu Potenzialen disziplinärer Brückenschläge zwischen Geschichts- und Sozialwissenschaft, in: Jürgen Mittag/Helke Stadtland (eds.): Theoretische Ansätze und Konzepte in der Forschung über soziale Bewegungen in der Geschichtswissenschaft, Essen 2014, pp. 13–60.

17 See Dieter Rucht: Öffentlichkeit als Mobilisierungsfaktor für soziale Bewegungen, in: Friedhelm Neidhardt (ed.): Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Meinung, soziale Bewegungen: Sonderheft 42/2002 der Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Opladen 1994, pp. 337–358, p. 338f.

18 Jürgen Mittag/Helke Stadtland: Soziale Bewegungsforschung im Spannungsfeld von Theorie und Empirie: Einleitende Anmerkungen zu Potenzialen disziplinärer Brückenschläge zwischen Geschichts- und Sozialwissenschaft, in: Jürgen Mittag/Helke Stadtland (eds.): Theoretische Ansätze und Konzepte in der Forschung über soziale Bewegungen in der Geschichtswissenschaft, Essen 2014, p. 21.

19 For an overview over the different theoretical paradigms of new social movement research, see Kai-Uwe Hellmann/Ruud Koopmans (eds.): Paradigmen der Bewegungsforschung: Entstehung und Entwicklung von neuen sozialen Bewegungen und Rechtsextremismus.

did not assimilate just one type or cause of disability – they were built up of persons with different causes of disability. Certainly, the degree of institutionalisation varied between these three forms of disability organisation, but they fit into the definition of a new social movement. Besides their local basis, these groups built regional and nationwide networks between each other, which congregated for special actions or discussions.

What is about the overall aims for social change, and the high degree of symbolic integration of the Disability Movement? Especially, their different concepts of integration and emancipation contained new ideas and set a sense of identity to the mainly younger people with disabilities. Their claim for integration of people with disabilities into society and their assault on societal discrimination can be interpreted as self-advocacy for social change. The Clubs of Disabled and their Friends developed a concise and innovative concept of rehabilitation and integration and emphasised the need for a growing self-confidence and the responsibility of the disabled for their own rehabilitation. Their ideas of an "equal and active partnership"[20] between disabled and non-disabled were realised in cooperative groups with impaired and non-impaired members. The "aim of social integration" filled a gap in the official rehabilitation concepts, which lacked concrete ideas on the so-called social rehabilitation. The Clubs of Disabled and their Friends offered a way to achieve "social integration" "through the way of friendship, of mutual understanding and the therefrom accruing tolerance for the partner".[21] The course on "coping with the environment" followed a similar approach of cooperation of disabled and nondisabled to achieve their goals.[22] As in the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends, this course aimed at the self-confidence of the disabled as well as their public representation. Even though the group consisted of just two dozen activists, it was stunningly stable during the mid- and late 1970s.[23] It set an example for groups in several other cities to attack the everyday-life barriers and accessibility-restrictions.

20 Zielsetzung der Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft der Clubs Behinderter und ihrer Freunde e.V., Sitz Mainz, undated, in: German Federal Archives: Archival Inventory B 189, No. 9447 [fol. 96–97].

21 Ibid. See, for example, the letters to the editor in the periodical of the *Club Behinderter und ihrer Freunde* (CeBeeF), the "CeBeeF-Magazin". Politicians as well as rehabilitation experts wrote to the magazine to express their respect for the ideas of integration and its attempts of realisation.

22 Gusti Steiner: Selbsthilfe als politische Interessenvertretung: Zum Konzept der politischen Selbsthilfe, in: Peter Günther/Eckhard Rohrmann (eds.): Soziale Selbsthilfe: Alternative, Ergänzung oder Methode sozialer Arbeit?, Heidelberg 1999, pp. 127–144.

23 See, for example, the portrait of an activist in a brochure by the Federal Centre for Health Education, published on the occasion of the International Year of the Disabled in 1981: Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung (ed.): Jeder ist ein Teil des Ganzen: Freizeit

The cripple-groups, in turn, refused the largely common term "disabled", which was criticised to fog "the real social conditions, whereas the name cripple expresses explicitly the distance between us and the so-called non-disabled".[24] The most prominent exponent of the cripple-groups, Franz Christoph, polemically described this distance to the different experiences of life of the disabled and the non-disabled. Raised and educated in special institutions, people with disabilities were exposed to the "hierarchy of bodies", as he puts it: "The one with two arms hit the one-armed, the one-armed hit the one with the residual arm!"[25] These fights, Franz Christoph stated, would be conducted for the approval of the non-disabled, because "every disabled is dependent on non-disabled".[26] Following Christoph, this was the case, because non-disabled people represented normalcy. From this point of view, normality was criticised. In contrast, the fashionable "chatter of integration" would hinder the non-disabled to admit their difficulties with the disabled.[27] The exclusion of the non-disabled from the cripple-groups was one consequence of this programmatically "cripple-position" (*Krüppel-Standpunkt*). Another consequence was the denial of the call for integration, which was regarded as a passive, other-directed process and as a requirement for conformance. Instead, the cripples appreciated emancipation as an active and self-determined process that had to precede the integration.[28]

Besides their organisational forms and their aims for social change, the movement organisations intended to underline the affiliation to the movement sector.[29] One example is the specific adjacency of the cripple-groups to the Women's Movement.[30]

mit behinderten Menschen, published in 1981, in: Archiv des Evangelischen Werkes für Diakonie und Entwicklung: Archival Inventory Hauptgeschäftsstelle (HGSt) No. 2924.

24 Redaktion der Krüppelzeitung: Warum Krüppelzeitung?, in: Krüppelzeitung 2 (1980), p. 4.

25 Franz Christoph: Ein Behinderter, der sich selbst Krüppel nennt, wehrt sich gegen Normalität, in: Sozialmagazin 5:3 (1980), pp. 56–59, p. 56.

26 Ibid.: Ich bin ein Krüppel: Was es wirklich bedeutet, behindert zu sein – Ungesellige Anmerkungen zum Jahr der Behinderten, in: Sozialmagazin 5:12 (1980), pp. 26–31, p. 28.

27 Ibid.: Behinderten-Standpunkt. Ein Behinderter, der sich selbst Krüppel nennt, wehrt sich gegen Normalität, in: Sozialmagazin 5:3 (1980), pp. 56–59, here p. 58.

28 See, for an overview, on the critique of integration Swantje Köbsell: Im Prinzip: „Jein": Zum Verhältnis der deutschen Behindertenbewegung zur Integration behinderter Menschen, in: Markus Dederich et al. (eds.): Inklusion statt Integration?: Heilpädagogik als Kulturtechnik, Gießen 2006, pp. 62–72; Udo Sierck/Christian Mürner: Krüppelzeitung: Brisanz der Behindertenbewegung, Neu-Ulm 2009, p.105f.

29 For the terminology of movement organisations and the movement sector see John D. McCarthy/Mayer N. Zald: Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory, in: The American Journal of Sociology 82:6 (1977), pp. 1212–1241.

30 For the Women's Movement see for example Ute Gerhard: Frauenbewegung, in: Dieter Rucht/Roland Roth (eds.): Die sozialen Bewegungen in Deutschland seit 1945: Ein Handbuch, Frankfurt am Main/New York 2008, pp. 187–217; Eva-Maria Silies: Ein,

The exclusion of non-disabled out of the cripple-groups was quite radical and called for explanation. Christoph did this, for example, in interviews within the movement-public in the periodical *Luftpumpe*.[31] Here he compared the annual publishing of the disabled-calendar by the non-disabled Klee with a women's-calendar, edited by a man. At the height of the difference feminism represented by the Women's Movement, the latter was inconceivable. Therefore, the former was sharply criticised by the cripple-groups. But it was not only the exclusion of men by the Women's Movement that caused the references of the Disability Movement to the women's movement. At the same time, this approach was an assurance of the Disability Movement to belong to the movement sector. Furthermore, the main bond between women's movement and disability movement was their claim for identity politics. Both, women and persons with disability, traced not just issues of civil rights, but also consciousness-raising issues, because they were affected by discrimination. Later on, during the 1980s, the orientation on the Women's Movement was challenged through the debates concerning bioethics and prenatal diagnosis, which were triggered mainly by the cripple women groups. In contrast to the entanglements between movements, the Disability Movement made clear constraints. For example, the activists abandoned the well-established disability associations and welfare service organisations. Those were sharply criticised for their politics and actions. They were accused of just maintaining well-paid functions and remaining in an overthrown view on disability that disavows the need for participation and emancipation.[32]

Looking at the different forms of organisations, aims and strategies, it becomes evident that the Disability Movement can described as a new social movement. The Clubs of Disabled and their Friends, the course on "coping with the environment" and the "cripple-groups" were not the only movement-organisations in the German Disability Movement, but they were the most important ones. Besides being were influential,

zwei, viele Bewegungen?: Die Diversität der Neuen Frauenbewegung in den 1970er Jahren der Bundesrepublik, in: Sebastian Gehrig/Cordia Baumann/Nicolas Büchse (Eds.): Linksalternative Milieus und Neue Soziale Bewegungen in den 1970er Jahren, Heidelberg 2011, pp. 87–106; Kristina Schulz: Der lange Atem der Provokation: Die Frauenbewegung in der Bundesrepublik und in Frankreich 1968–1976, Frankfurt am Main 2002.

31 See Lothar Sandfort: Interview mit Franz Christoph. Teil II, in: Luftpumpe 4:3 (1981), pp. 19–22.

32 See, for example, the criticism on the charity "*Aktion Sorgenkind*" ("Campaign for problem children"), in: Luftpumpe 4:2 (1981); for the "*Aktion Sorgenkind*" and its influential representations on disability during the 1960s see Gabriele Lingelbach: Konstruktionen von "Behinderung" in der Öffentlichkeitsarbeit und Spendenwerbung der Aktion Sorgenkind seit 1964, in: Elsbeth Bösl/AnneKlein/Anne Waldschmidt (eds.): Disability History: Konstruktionen von Behinderung in der Geschichte: Eine Einführung, Bielefeld 2010, pp. 127–149; see also Carol Poore: Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture, Ann Arbor 2007, pp. 277–284.

they illustrate the scope of possibilities of articulation within a movement-sector. These three movement-organisations existed parallel and built local, regional and national networks, which are considered below.

Local, Regional or National Disability Movement

A movement of personally affected – the general assumption – addressed mainly federal politics, the national welfare system, and, due to their language, the national public. The aims of the Disability Movement lay in practical improvements of welfare and human rights legislation, which were tied to the national legislation. They called for a reduction of discrimination and integration which aimed at least at German speaking societies, local, regional or nationwide. So, in this section, the question is not only how transnational was the movement, but also how national or even local was it? On the one hand, the local frames of the movement organisations became obvious – they were initial points of articulation and protest. On the other hand, its aims lay often on national levels. Which were the frames of action and the addressees of the claims?

Initially, the claim of the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends was to organise age-based leisure time activities for their members – their focus was local.[33] In addition, the different local groups of the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends founded a national association in 1971: the Federal Joint Initiative of the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends (*Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Clubs Behinderter und ihrer Freunde,* or *BAG*). With their new approaches regarding rehabilitation and integration, they soon entered the important pre-parliamentary committees of rehabilitation and care for the disabled.[34] This possibility to influence expert commissions highlighted the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends as groups with local as well as regional and national frames. On the local level, they advocated for the reduction of everyday life barriers and offered leisure time activities to their members. On the national level, they pled for adaptations of rehabilitation concepts in expert commissions. These commissions were an important key, because they addressed welfare policy and administration as well as single special institutions.

33 See, for example, Norbert Breeger: Selbstorganisationsversuche Behinderter am Beispiel des Club 68 – Verein für Behinderte und ihre Freunde e.V. in Hamburg, in: Peter Runde/Rolf G. Heinze (Eds.): Chancengleichheit für Behinderte: Sozialwissenschaftliche Analysen für die Praxis, Neuwied 1979, pp. 237–253.

34 Zielsetzung der Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft der Clubs Behinderter und ihrer Freunde e.V., Sitz Mainz, undated, in: German Federal Archives: Archival Inventory B 189, No. 9447 [fol. 96–97].

On the contrary, the activists of the course on "coping with the environment" acted mainly on local levels: they criticised everyday life barriers in the form of stairs in front of public buildings or the inaccessibility of the public transport system in Frankfurt. The strategies of the course were more confrontational and uncompromising than these of the Clubs of Disabled and their Friends: keen on public impact, they demonstrated in front of the main post office in Frankfurt, because it was just not possible for wheelchair-users and other mobility impaired persons to enter the building. In another attempt, they blockaded a tram in Frankfurt.[35] In this case as well, access for wheelchair-users was not possible. Their challenge of barriers was meant universal and exemplified in local frames. Furthermore, – due to the public presence of its protagonist Klee in the liberal media – they were an example for theoretical concepts and for political action for other groups. The cripple-groups acted mostly on local levels as well. An example was the reduction of the special transport system in Bremen at the turn of the year 1980/81. In demonstrations and street blockades, the activists protested against the reduced possibilities to use the special transport service. At the same time, they demanded access to the regular transport system.[36]

A national frame for protest of the Disability Movement was set in 1980 by a sentence of a German regional court. Here, a tourist sued for a reduction of costs for a journey to a Greek seaside hotel. The tourist claimed many deficits: challenged were dirty bed linen and the crowded beach. Furthermore, the grievances included the presence of a group of Swedish people with disabilities. The court stated in its sentence, that "it cannot be denied, that a group of severely disabled can vitiate the holiday pleasures of sensitive people".[37] Subsequently, people with disabilities as well as younger special-educationalists were filled with indignation.[38] This was an opportunity for a nationwide protest mobilisation. At a nationwide demonstration on the 8th of May, some 3,000 to 5,000 participants demanded the retraction of the sentence. This was the beginning of a more connected movement in West Germany with a dense frequency of meetings on a national level. Addressing national society, the medial

35 Ernst Klee: Behindert: Über die Enteignung von Körper und Bewußtsein: Ein kritisches Handbuch, Frankfurt am Main, 2nd ed., 1980, pp. 238f.

36 See, for example, Henry: Unbeschränkter Fahrdienst: Eine Bremer Peinlichkeit im Jahr 1981, in: Krüppelzeitung 1 (1981), pp. 4–17. The articles in the movement's periodicals rarely comprise full denominations of the authors.

37 Sentence of the Regional Court in Frankfurt, cited from *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*: Heile Urlaubswelt, 22 April 1980, p. 27. See also Ernst Klee: Behinderte im Urlaub: Eine Dokumentation, Frankfurt am Main 1980, pp. 30–35.

38 For information on the social worker's movement see, for example, Markus Köster: Holt die Kinder aus den Heimen!: Veränderungen im öffentlichen Umgang mit Jugendlichen in den 1960er Jahren am Beispiel der Heimerziehung, in: Matthias Frese/Julia Paulus/Karl Teppe (eds.): Demokratisierung und gesellschaftlicher Aufbruch: Die sechziger Jahre als Wendezeit der Bundesrepublik, Paderborn 2003, pp. 667–681.

attention became more important. Especially, in anticipation of the International Year of Disabled Persons in 1981, which was claimed by the United Nations, the movements protagonists seized a chance to advocate for the self-determination assertions. Different groups from all over the country formed the alliance "Action group against the United Nations Year" (*Aktionsgruppe gegen das UNO-Jahr*) and prepared a protest-campaign, which continued during the whole year of 1981. First, they performed a satirical demonstration in front of the venue of the official opening ceremony in West Germany in January 1981 to protest against the "nondisabled benefactors", the politicians, rehabilitation-experts, scientists and directors of special institutions, who overpraised their achievements without the participation and the criticism of the affected. Later on, protesters entered the meeting hall, and occupied the stage. They interrupted the speeches and read a declaration, which was considered to be "one of the most important early West German statements of disability rights", due to its social perspective of disability.[39] In contrast to the medical model of disability, which declared the impaired individual as needy, the activists brought out the role of society. They emphasised the disabling circumstances, which endured in inaccessibility, discrimination and exclusion. Furthermore, an emblematical protest-incident was the so-called crutch-strike in June 1981: Franz Christoph hit the Federal President's shin with his crutches at the opening ceremony of a national rehabilitation exhibition. In addition, the activists arranged a "cripple-tribunal" at the end of the year 1981, following the idea of the International War Crimes Tribunal in 1966. On the 12th and 13th of December, the violations of human rights in the German welfare state were accused in eight sections, namely special institutions and asylums, the arbitrariness of the administrations, mobility, sheltered workshops for disabled people, women, pharmaceutical industry, rehabilitation centres and psychiatry.[40] The local involvement was still very important for the organisations. In city councils or communal committees, they could demand the reduction of barriers in the townscape or act as advisors in questions of barrier-free building projects. Overall, the movement organisations increasingly addressed national frames.

These protest-campaigns and demonstrations of 1981 were tiring and energy-sapping for the relative small amount of activists in the Disability Movement. Subsequently, the Disability Movement differentiated and professionalised and concentrated on project work, as for example on the provision of assistance for those people with

39 Carol Poore: Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture, Ann Arbor 2007, p. 280. For the words of the declaration in English translation see Carol Poore. The original wording can be found in Anneliese Mayer: Behinderteninitiativen in der Bundesrepublik, in: Gusti Steiner (ed.): Hand- und Fußbuch für Behinderte, Frankfurt am Main 1988, pp. 165–174, pp. 167f.

40 Susanne von Daniels et al. (eds.): Krüppel-Tribunal: Menschenrechtsverletzungen im Sozialstaat, Cologne 1983.

disabilities in need of care. The guiding principle was to enable the affected to stay in the accustomed living environment and to prevent hospitalisation. Other activists engaged in the establishing political party *Die Grünen* (The Greens). With its origins in the ecological movement[41], the self-appointed "anti-parties party" claimed to be the parliamentary arm of the new social movements. Observable is the sociocultural and habitual adjacency between new social movements and the newly founded party.[42] The Disability Movement might also have been attracted by the guiding principles of *Die Grünen*: Policy was formulated within new temporal and spatial frames, as changes were demanded in the here and now as well as in local or regional frames. Furthermore, the denotation of problems shifted from questions related to working- and industrial society to quality of life issues.[43]

Even though the claims and demands for emancipation, self-determination and participation of the German Disability Movement were not necessarily bound to a national reference-frame, the scope of action addressed the German public, benefactors and politicians. This is valid especially for the 1970s and the turn to the 1980s. The Disability Movements' actions aimed at rather local or regional aspects of accessibility and mobility. The activists only partly addressed a national frame, either through concrete involvement in national expert committees or, more abstract, through the demand for integration, addressed to social policy makers and the German public. Furthermore, the protest repertoire indicated a transnational dimension.

Transnational Entanglements of the German Disability Movement

After depicting the Disability Movement in West Germany as a new social movement setting its frames in local and national levels, its transnational and cross-movement entanglements will be discussed below. Which frames were set across national borders – and why? And which adaptions and learning processes can be observed between different movements? The protest waves since the late 1960s and the appearance of

41 See Silke Mende: "Nicht rechts, nicht links, sondern vorn": Eine Geschichte der Gründungsgrünen, Munich 2011; E. Gene Frankland/Donald Schoonmaker: Between Protest and Power: The Green Party in Germany, Boulder 1992.

42 See Silke Mende: "Nicht rechts, nicht links, sondern vorn": Eine Geschichte der Gründungsgrünen, pp. 60–64.

43 Ibid., pp. 43f; see also Karl-Werner Brand: Kontinuität und Diskontinuität in den neuen sozialen Bewegungen, in: Roland Roth/Dieter Rucht/Sabine Berthold (eds.): Neue soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Frankfurt am Main/New York 1987, pp. 30–44.

new social movements in Western Europe and the United States were described as an expression of a "transnational cycle of contention".[44] Indeed, the forms of action – provocative and public protests – indicate an embedment in a broader context of conflict, still in the 1980s.

A transnational cross-movement reference was produced by Gusti Steiner and Ernst Klee, the organisers of the course on "coping with the environment", who referred explicitly to the American Civil Rights Movement. The strategy of upgrading the formerly pejorative terms, its positive reinterpretation and therefore the following self-conscious representation, were adopted and converged into the slogan "being-disabled is beautiful".[45] Steiner wrote in 1974 that the

> American negroes began their struggle for liberation from the condition of being dependant on the white majority, their becoming independent, with the unmasking of their other-directed self-perception and the search for a new identity and a new self-consciousness. their emancipation began with the confession to their otherness. they had accepted themselves in their being, in their skin colour, and began to perceive their curly hair as beautiful, they did not use cosmetics to straighten it. the other-directed self-perception was replaced by the self-determined 'BLACK IS BEAUTIFUL'[46]

The recognition of being deviant seemed to be one of the fundamental sources for people with disabilities to achieve the claimed self-consciousness. Even more, the appreciation and revaluation of being deviant was origin of the political protests. This strategy was explicitly linked to the US-American Civil Rights Movement. As in the case of cross-movement references of the cripple-groups to the Women's Movement, this was also a strategy to pretend affiliation to the movement-sector.

In the stage of professionalisation and differentiation since 1981, the entanglements became more obvious, their contexts more practical. The approach of the German Disability Movement to create new possibilities for enabling people with disabilities to

44 Marcel van der Linden: Transnational Labour History. Explorations, Aldershot 2003, p. 117; see Arthur Marwick: Youth Culture and the Cultural Revolution of the Long Sixties, in: Axel Schildt/Detlef Siegfried (eds.): Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies: 1960–1980, New York 2006, pp. 39–58.

45 See Ernst Klee: Behindertsein ist schön: Unterlagen zur Arbeit mit Behinderten, Düsseldorf 1974.

46 Gusti Steiner: Behindert-sein ist schön: Entwurf eines neuen Selbstbewußtseins, in: Ernst Klee: Behindertsein ist schön: Unterlagen zur Arbeit mit Behinderten, Düsseldorf 1974, pp. 122–133, p. 124f. The use of a small letter scripture derives from the German original and was quite common in the alternative milieu, see Sven Reichardt: Authentizität und Gemeinschaft: Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren, Berlin 2014.

live self-determined lives in a self-chosen environment led to first attempts to organise home care and assistance. In 1978, the Association for the Promotion of Integration (*Vereinigung Integrations-Förderung,* VIF) was established in Munich.[47] The Association for the Promotion of Integration worked with civilian servants[48] and voluntary helpers. It organised assistance for people in need of care, which enabled especially people with disabilities to leave institutional care or prevented them from being taken there. This addressed one of the most ubiquitous critiques of the Disability Movement, namely the system of segregation in special-care homes, where paternalism, restrictions, and strict rules impeded the disabled to participate in everyday life and labelled them helpless, needy, and dependent. The rejection of these representations and the criticism of dependency led back to requirements of the anti-psychiatry Movements, first and foremost in Italy, later on in Germany as well.[49]

The ideas of de-institutionalising care through the provision of home care and assistance spread in the German Disability Movement. Several smaller organisations came into being in the course of 1981. Forms and possibilities of living besides institutionalised care and education were discussed. Different projects were introduced. At first, the Netherlands came to the fore: Travel reports gave an account of the situation in Dutch institutions, which were considered to be more liberal than the German ones.[50] The prevalent concept of integration seemed to guarantee a greater freedom of choice. Community-based services appeared increasingly in several German cities as well. This was identified as a reaction to the previous situation of care, because the "concept of stationary services, dislocated from communities, has failed".[51] At the same time, the concepts of the American Centres for Independent Living (CIL) were noticed as well. The Disability Movement in the United States was perceived as

47 See an early portrait: Vereinigung Integrations-Förderung, in: Vereinigung Integrations-Förderung e.V. (ed.): Behindernde Hilfe oder Selbstbestimmung der Behinderten: Neue Wege gemeindenaher Hilfen zum selbständigen Leben, Munich 1982, pp. 262–273.

48 The German civilian service was a possibility to avoid the compulsory military service. It was mostly served in hospitals or residential care homes. See Patrick Bernhard: Von "Drückebergern" zu "Helden des Alltags". Zur Geschichte der Wehrdienstverweigerer in der Bundesrepublik 1945–1990, in: Christian Müller/Dierk Walter (eds.): Ich dien' nicht! Wehrdienstverweigerung in der Geschichte, Berlin 2008, pp. 127–147.

49 See for example Franz-Werner Kersting: Juvenile Left-wing Radicalism, Fringe Groups, and Anti-psychiatry in West Germany, in: Axel Schildt/Detlef Siegfried (eds.): Between Marx and Coca-Cola: Youth Cultures in Changing European Societies: 1960–1980, New York 2006, pp. 353–375.; see also Anne Klein: Governing Madness – Transforming Psychiatry. Disability History and the Formation of Cultural Knowledge in West Germany in the 1970s and 1980s, in this volume.

50 See for example Margret Kämmer/Evelin Thielitz: "Integration ist machbar, Herr Nachbar", in: Luftpumpe 5:7 (1982), pp. 9–12.

51 Anneliese Meyer/Inge Planger: Ambulante Dienste: Nicht mehr in Heimen leben, in: Luftpumpe 5:5 (1982), p. 3.

ideally close: self-determination, independence, integration, and the abolishment of special institutions was seen as mutually concordant aims.[52] In contrast to the existing German assistance services, the US-American Centres for Independent Living were marked by two specific features: they were not restricted to the less severe disabled and they were run by the affected themselves.

Even though different concepts of outpatient care existed in Germany, the Centres for Independent Living and especially Berkeley became the core of dreams of independency and autonomy. Mutual visits and lectures supported the exchange of ideas and concepts of the American Centres for Independent Living and the Association for the Promotion of Integration and other similar organisations. An activist from the German Association for the Promotion of Integration, for example, volunteered at the Centres for Independent Living in Berkeley.[53] Still, US-American activists participated at workshops or conferences by the Association for the Promotion of Integration in Germany. The concept of "Independent Living", as it was practiced in the United States, was continuously discussed by the German activists. In comparison to the situation of the disabled in Berkeley and other cities in the United States, they felt like living "in the jungle".[54] The density of the Centres for Independent Living in the United States and its counselling practice served as example for the German activists. Especially the principle of peer counselling attracted the German observers, because it was usually realised by advisers with the same kind of disability as the demander. Moreover, the US-American anti-discrimination law within the rehabilitation act of 1973, was seen as a result of the movements' activism.[55] In the light of the own experiences with de-institutionalised care and the exchange of ideas with the US-American activists, these Centres for Independent Living (*Zentren für selbstbestimmtes Leben*) were setup in Germany as well.[56] In this case, the transnational entanglements of the German Disability Movements led to a transfer of concepts. German activists adapted the ideas from their US-American counterparts.

The journeys of the German Disability activists to the United States led to further possibilities to connect internationally. In July 1986, Lothar Sandfort travelled to the United States to collect information on the Centres for Independent Living and the Independent Living Movement. The activists he met reported to Lothar Sandfort that they had begun to send wheelchairs and spare parts to Nicaragua. And parallel to

52 See for example Theresia Degener: US-Krüppel, in: Luftpumpe 5:5 (1982), pp. 8–10.
53 See Uwe Frehse: Autonom Leben, in: Luftpumpe 7:5 (1984), pp. 16–18.
54 Lothar Sandfort: Independent Living – Ein Vorbild für uns? In: Die Randschau 1:1 (1986), p. 5.
55 Ibid.; Andreas Jürgens: Anti-Diskriminierungsgesetz in den USA und bei uns, in: Randschau 1:4 (1986), pp. 14–17.
56 Anonym: "Ein neuer Weg zur Selbständigkeit und Selbstbestimmung Behinderter", in: Randschau 2:1 (1987), pp. 17–21.

that, an activist of the Christian initiative for Central America reported of her journey to Nicaragua and her encounter with the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* (ORD).[57] This led Lothar Sandfort to initiate a solidarity campaign for this Organisation by the revolutionary Disabled of Nicaragua. The German Disability Movements' journal *Die Randschau* gave an account of the situation in Nicaragua and asked for donations for a solidarity campaign.[58] Following the *Randschau,* about 100,000 people in Nicaragua were affected by a disability. The majority of them were disabled due to the military conflict, followed by the group of people, who were disabled by an earthquake and those affected by polio. Nothing was stated about mentally handicapped persons or other kinds of disabilities. The *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* was introduced as an organisation run by disabled, which aimed at similar objectives as the German movement. Though, different to other countries, the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados*' "struggle" for "social integration", which was understood as the "integration of disabled into society with the same rights and duties", did not take place in opposition to the government.[59] On the contrary, they found themselves in "unity of action with the revolutionary government, for the initiatives of the Sandinista administration, which refer to the problems of disabled people".[60] The aims of the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* were those of the government: "The objectives of the revolution – freedom, self-determination and national independence – are the objectives of the O.R.D., too."[61] The *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* was considered to be "the most distinct and most active social movement by disabled" in Nicaragua and conceived itself as "organisation for the interests and needs of people with disabilities".[62] The patron of the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* was Che Guevara, who was beheld "not only as humanist and revolutionary of Latin America, but also as 'asthmatic, who never allowed a constriction of his work due to his disability'".[63]

In the first article in the *Randschau* on the Disability Movement in Nicaragua in January 1987, donations were requested. The author, Lothar Sandfort, reflected on the objectives of aid from Germany, as the only wheelchair-workshop and the likewise first rehabilitation centre in Nicaragua was supported by the US-American activists as well as by Swedish and Dutch contributions. The *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* had asked for grants for a tailor's collective and donations in kind, for instance medical accessory. So why did parts of the German Disability Movement

57 See Lothar Sandfort: Behinderte und Nicaragua, in: Randschau 2:1 (1987), pp. 8–13.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., pp. 11f.
60 Ibid.
61 Andreas Jürgens: Behinderte in Nicaragua, in: Randschau 3:2 (1988), pp. 6–12, p. 6.
62 Lothar Sandfort: Behinderte und Nicaragua, in: Randschau 2:1 (1987), p. 11.
63 Ibid., p. 11.

get involved in the international solidarity movements and why did they establish an own campaign in Nicaragua? First, the activists were motivated by the rejection of the official development policy and the adoption of dependency theory, which accentuated the structural dependency of the peripheral countries of the south to the capitalist countries of the north. The activists of the new social movements gained hope from the social overthrow in Nicaragua.[64] Expectations for transformations in West Germany were tied to the Nicaraguan revolution in 1979. The abolishment of large land holdings in Nicaragua, for example, fanned expectations for an overthrow of capitalism. The International Solidarity Movement was accelerated by the contrast of an alleged social revolution in Nicaragua and the international political reactions. Especially, the Nicaraguan trade boycott by the American government and the trade restrictions by the German government in parallel provoked protests by a wide range of activists. A specific political context was often expressed through an outright anti-Americanism. Thus, the Disability Movement justified its engagement in the Latin American solidarity initiatives with Nicaragua's symbolic significance as "a struggle by the people for self-determination".[65] Nevertheless, there was more than that. Lothar Sandfort explained: "The support for Nicaragua is an expression for the anger at the American imperialism, which acts like the good will of a just sheriff. The powers of the United States act with almost naive directness for their interests against the constitution of a revolutionary Nicaragua."[66] Furthermore, the personal networks with the US-American Disability Movement showed that anti-Americanism primarily referred to national politics, whereas the connection to activists and new social movements was in great demand.

Second, with this stance, parts of the Disability Movement can be connected to the alternative milieu of West Germany.[67] Whereas new social movements are considered to be more comprehensive due to their political attitudes, more heterogeneous due to concepts of social and political change, the alternative milieu is politically far more shaped as left-wing with a distinct difference to majority culture and industrial society.[68]

64 Cf. Claudia Olejniczak: Dritte Welt Bewegung, in: Dieter Rucht/Roland Roth (eds.): Die sozialen Bewegungen in Deutschland seit 1945: Ein Handbuch, Frankfurt am Main/New York 2008, p. 328.

65 Lothar Sandfort: Behinderte und Nicaragua, in: Randschau 2:1 (1987), p. 9.

66 Ibid.

67 See Sven Reichardt/Detlef Siegfried: Das Alternative Milieu: Konturen einer Lebensform, in: Sven Reichardt/Detlef Siegfried (eds.): Das Alternative Milieu: Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983, Göttingen 2010, pp. 9–24; see also Dieter Rucht: Linksalternatives Milieu und Neue Soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik. Selbstverständnis und gesellschaftlicher Kontext, in: Cordia Baumann/Sebastian Gehrig/Nicolas Büchse (eds.): Linksalternatives Milieu und Neue Soziale Bewegungen, pp. 35–59.

68 See ibid., pp. 36–43.

Especially autonomous ways of life should not be experienced in an undefined future, but immediately. This explains the exchange of concepts on Independent Living, which promised a self-organised and prompt improvement in the living conditions. The cohesiveness and attraction of the alternative milieu was obtained through its reference to authenticity that implied, amongst others, the "first person politics", self-fulfilment in the collective and autonomy.[69] Thus, references to supposedly authentic life forms were evident: non-white ethnic groups served as projection screen for the wishes of the milieu affiliated and their conceptions of society.[70] This might be another explanation for the commitment in campaigns of the Disability Movement on Nicaraguan disability organisations. "The commitment to Nicaragua", as the historian Christian Helm puts it, "represented a replacement for protest against West German society and politics".[71]

However, enthusiasm of the German activists for the Nicaraguan people with disabilities lessened as certain problems became obvious. In February 1988, a delegation of the German disability activists travelled to Nicaragua. A detailed travel report was published in the *Randschau.*[72] The author, Andreas Jürgens, accentuated the extensive achievements in the disability policy and aid for disabled persons in Nicaragua since the revolution of 1979. Indeed, he stressed the set-up of institutions like the rehabilitation centre, a prosthesis- and wheel-chair-workshop or an educational centre for the blind, which was carried out mainly by the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* in self-help and self-organisation, but with financial and material backup by international disability movements and organisations. Yet, concern was caused, because

> the foreign support will import just the kind of dependency that the ORD controverts – anyhow this is the case, if mainly rehabilitation centres and other special institutions are supported, instead of self-help-projects by disabled. The challenge of the ORD and the disability movements in other countries must be the reasonable support, which accords the common perceptions of a self-determined life of disabled.[73]

69 See Sven Reichardt: Authentizität und Gemeinschaft: Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren, Berlin 2014, pp. 60–65.

70 See Reichardt/Detlef Siegfried: Das Alternative Milieu: Konturen einer Lebensform, in: Sven Reichardt/Detlef Siegfried (eds.): Das Alternative Milieu: Antibürgerlicher Lebensstil und linke Politik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Europa 1968–1983, Göttingen 2010, p. 18.

71 Christian Helm: Blooming Solidarity: Sandinista Nicaragua and the West German Solidarity Movement in the 1980s, in: European Review of History 21:4 (2014), pp. 597–615, p. 610.

72 Andreas Jürgens: Behinderte in Nicaragua, in: Randschau 3:2 (1988), pp. 6–12.

73 Ibid., p. 12.

On the one hand, support for newly build special institutions was challenged by the German disability activists, as segregation was expected to be the consequence. On the other hand, the transfer of the idea of anti-institutionalism of the German Disability Movement was emphasised as a problem:

> Finally, calls for help from Nicaragua for a special school must be refused, because they are not in accordance with the common perceptions of a self-determined life. But how to deal with the financial support for a self-help-organisation […], which agrees on the development of sheltered workshops and cannot find any tendencies for segregation in it? Especially, when it maintains the claims for more mobility, for greater say at the same time? When is the line crossed, when the at all hands known know-it-all German – with clear conscience, surely – breaks through?[74]

The critique became more distinct than before, but was not mentioned explicitly. For example, Andreas Jürgens denoted in his travel report a careful criticism, when he wrote that the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* "tries […] to involve also 'civil disabled'". The hierarchy of different causes of disability, which was caused by the hegemony of the war veterans, was an important motivation and counterpoint for the Disability Movement. At the same time, the German activists expressed a certain admiration for the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* and the Nicaraguan disability policy. The visited centre for the blind, for example, had "on the one hand […] blind and visually impaired teachers too, whereas we met just non-disabled specialised personnel in other institutions. On the other hand, the war disabled do not predominate here, but rather disabled people from birth or due to disease."[75]

The German Disability Movement's problem concerned the organisation, collection and distribution of the donations. For this purpose, they built an association, called the Community for the International Solidarity of the Disabled (*Gesellschaft internationale Solidarität Behinderter, GISBe*), which was officially registered. It was not only concentrated on Nicaragua, but should also enable encounters and exchange with disabled persons in other countries. In this situation, also the participation in the political party, *Die Grünen*, turned out to be an important knot in the infrastructure of the movement: in the early 1980s federal joint initiatives were established within the party. They mainly assembled activists of the movements and should carry the movements' concerns into the party. As a consequence, disability activists also established a federal joint initiative on disability policy within the *Grünen*. Out of this position, they could influence the parties programme on disability policy. In addition, the federal joint

74 Udo Sierck: Noch'n Verein?: Noch'n Verein! GISBe e.V., in: Randschau 3:3 (1988), pp. 14–15, p. 14.

75 Andreas Jürgens: Behinderte in Nicaragua, in: Randschau 3:2 (1988), p. 10.

initiative established in 1987 a one-man Disability Department at the faction of the party in the German Federal Parliament.[76] In doing so, structures consolidated and professionalised, and the access to resources as well as the influence grew. With the help of the capital of the faction, Lothar Sandfort organised, for example, a course of lectures in the context of the election campaign for the European Parliament. Besides the German delegates, two participants from the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* in Nicaragua and, furthermore, two agents of the American Independent Living Movement from Berkeley contributed lectures. The aim of the tour was to demonstrate the "reference of European politics to the oppression of such many peoples in the whole world" in connection to the situations of disabled persons.[77]

Still, the activists engaged in international solidarity searched for an appropriate project to fund. The support for the *Organización Revolucionarios Dehabilitados* in Nicaragua consisted in donations in kind such as bed-linen for the rehabilitation centre, a tactile globe for the blind rehabilitation centre, and buttons and spare parts for the tailors' collective in Managua. With help of the Community for the International Solidarity of the Disabled, the activists hoped to collect enough money to support a bigger project.

> Already during our stay in Nicaragua we had proposed to you the production of paper. Yet, due to our explorations, the realisation would be technically extensive. The installation of a workshop for electronics, as the ORD plans in Leon, would be easier. Possibly, our friends there could compile a list of the required equipment. We think that a reliable financial perspective can be set up until next spring.[78]

Whether this announced support was realised or not, is not ascertainable from the movements' periodicals. In early 1989, the reports on the international solidarity-activities interrupted as suddenly as they came up in 1987. Another trip to Nicaragua by the German activists followed after the visit of the Nicaraguan activists in Germany.[79] This time no travel report was published. We do not know why the international

76 See the journal to the federal joint initiatives meeting, 20–22 February 1987, in: Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis der Heinrich-Böll Stiftung Berlin (AGG): Archival Inventory B.II.1, No. 4634.

77 Letter by Lothar Sandfort to "Fredy, Fernando and the friends of the ORD in Nicaragua", undated, Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis der Heinrich-Böll Stiftung Berlin: Archival Inventory B.II.1, No. 4647. The letter dates probably in late 1988. See also the announcement of the course of lectures in April 1989: *Aqui no se rinde nadie*! (Hier gibt keiner auf), in: Randschau 4:1 (1989), p. 24.

78 Letter by Lothar Sandfort to "Fredy, Fernando and the friends", in: Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis der Heinrich-Böll Stiftung Berlin: Archival Inventory B.II.1, No. 4647.

79 See the journal to the federal joint initiatives meeting, 8–9 July 1989, Archiv Grünes Gedächtnis der Heinrich-Böll Stiftung Berlin: Archival Inventory B.II.1, No. 4634.

solidarity-activity ceased to exist. One reason might be the relatively small size of the German Disability Movement. Just a few activists ran the periodicals and other campaigns. Lothar Sandfort, as one of the most active protagonists, kept contact to the Nicaraguan activists. At the same time, he worked for the Disability Department of the party *Die Grünen*. Subsequently, the existence of other foci of the movement at the end of the 1980s subtracted work capacities.

Another reason for the interrupting interest in the Nicaraguan disability policy and for the downturn of the focus on Nicaragua by the international-solidarity movement was, ultimately, the success of the anti-Sandinista alliance in the parliamentary election in February 1990.[80] The peak of the concentration on Latin America between 1983 and 1989 came to an end.

Two examples of transnational foci of the Disability Movement were presented, although further instances could be mentioned – for instance the transnationalisation of disability in the context of human and civil rights.[81] The conceptualisation of Independent Living and the transnationalisation of solidarity campaigns showed different affiliations of the Disability Movement. The disability activists referred to a specific conflict on self-advocacy and self-determination that became relevant in different countries and contexts. At the same time, the transnational entanglements of the German disability activists are not appropriately understandable without contextualisation within an alternative milieu that sets a sense of mutual understanding and shared identity. Disability Movement was imbedded in regional, local and transnational movement politics, which might be one of the most significant paradigms of new social movements.

Conclusion

The German Disability Movement had a local, regional, and partly national reference framework. In their emancipatory concepts, they could draw adjacency to other movements. A change within the German Disability Movement around the years 1980/81 became obvious. Whereas "euphoria of emancipation"[82] drew the action campaign

80 See Claudia Olejniczak: Dritte Welt Bewegung, in: Dieter Rucht/Roland Roth (eds.): Die sozialen Bewegungen in Deutschland seit 1945: Ein Handbuch, Frankfurt am Main/New York 2008, p. 328; Claudia Olejniczak: Die Dritte-Welt-Bewegung in Deutschland: Konzeptionelle und organisatorische Strukturmerkmale einer neuen sozialen Bewegung, Darmstadt 1999, pp. 138–194.

81 See for example Paul van Trigt: A Blind Spot of a Guiding Country? Human Rights and Dutch Disability Groups Since 1981, in this volume.

82 Lothar Sandfort: Und sie bewegt sich doch!: Entwicklung der Behindertenbewegung und der Luftpumpe, in: Luftpumpe 6:5 (1983), pp. 3–8, p. 3.

still in 1981, protests and strategies were professionalised afterwards, claims were differentiated and became more pragmatically and problem-oriented. The historian Detlef Siegfried stated that the long duration of the movements imposed pressure upon them to be more pragmatic.[83] Thus, the grassroots concepts of participation changed and developed from an aspired overcoming of the system to the participance in the system. Especially, this is obvious noticing the commitment of Disability Movements' activists in the German party *Die Grünen*.

Furthermore, the case study shows the context of the Disability Movement in the movement sector, in an entanglement between many new social movement concepts and activities. This may derive from its setting in an alternative milieu, which provided a set of habitual implications, ideological agreements and set a sense of common identity.[84] The advanced principles of the different movements, as self-help and self-determination drew attention on a revaluation of the self.[85] In the Disability Movement as well as in the Women's Movement, subjectivity played an important role.

Finally, different kinds of transnational entanglements can also be observed. The course on "coping with the environment" referred to strategies of the American Civil Rights Movement. Furthermore, more extensive entanglements were presented in mutual exchanges between the US-American Disability Movement and the West German activists concerning Independent Living as well as in the Disability Movements' campaigning for revolutionary Nicaraguan disability organisations. The intensity of transnational entanglements rose, as the professionalisation and collaboration of different movement organisations grew. The over-all aim for emancipation and the Disability Movements' call for integration overlapped with the claims of the Nicaraguan organisation. But as we have seen, this might have led to problems in interpretations of these concepts. Questions on the support for the Nicaraguan rehabilitation centres were not clearly expressed, but led to a certain unease of the German activists. Actually, the German Disability Movement opposed these special institutions.

83 Detlef Siegfried: Superkultur: Authentizität und politische Moral in linken Subkulturen der frühen siebziger Jahre, in: Habbo Knoch (ed.): Bürgersinn mit Weltgefühl: Politische Moral und solidarischer Protest in den sechziger und siebziger Jahren, Göttingen 2007, pp. 251–268, p. 268; Detlef Siegfried: Die Entpolitisierung des Privaten. Subjektkonstruktionen im alternativen Milieu, in: Norbert Frei/Dietmar Süß (eds.): Privatisierung. Idee und Praxis seit den 1970er Jahren, Göttingen 2012, pp. 124–139.

84 See Sven Reichardt: Authentizität und Gemeinschaft: Linksalternatives Leben in den siebziger und frühen achtziger Jahren, Berlin 2014.

85 See Detlef Siegfried: Die Entpolitisierung des Privaten. Subjektkonstruktionen im alternativen Milieu, in: Norbert Frei/Dietmar Süß (eds.): Privatisierung. Idee und Praxis seit den 1970er Jahren, Göttingen 2012, pp. 124–139.

In fact, the entanglements, adoptions and exchanges that can be observed between different movements and across borders, the sense of joint problems, and the similar strategies to solve those problems, sets the West German disability activists in the context of new social movements and – in part – of an alternative milieu.

Jan Stoll has written his doctoral thesis as part of the collaborative research project *Geschichte von Menschen mit Behinderung in Deutschland nach 1945* (History of people with disability in Germany since 1945) at the University of Kiel. His thesis is on the self-organisation of people with disabilities in West Germany from 1945 to the late 1980s.