

A Study of Disability Hate Speech

Aoi Kobayashi

Introduction

This paper examines disability hate discourse that shows hatred toward people with physical incapacity, and assumes disability as congenital or acquired disorders inherent in certain limited number of people. In order to approach the problem, I will examine two examples of such discourse in the 21st century. One examination will be done by using Mark Sherry's study on disability hate crimes, *Disability Hate Crimes: Does Anyone Really Hate Disabled People?*, whose second chapter deals with disability hate websites written in English. The other will be done by analyzing disability hate discourse in a letter written by the defendant of Sagamihara Incident in 2016, in which 19 disabled people were killed and 26 were injured in a care home in Sagamihara City. The letter, which was written as a warning notice of his murder, shows the defendant's discriminatory thoughts against disabled people.

I will consider these issues based on the queer disability study by Jasbir K. Puar, "Prognosis Time: Towards a Geopolitics of Affect, Debility and Capacity." In it, Puar considers every kind of physical incapacity as "debility," a state of less physical capacity in people's lives (Puar 162); the state ranges from both congenital and acquired physical impairments, chronic illness, to transient physical disorders including colds and injuries. By using this term, she attempts to destabilize "the seamless production of abled-bodies in relation to disability" by rethinking disability is another state of "debility" (166). I base my standpoint on her notion of "debility." Understanding disability as a continuum of physical condition deconstructs fixed notions of disabled people and destabilizes the effects of hate speech on them.

In the first section, I will examine the notion of disability by employing Puar's concept of "debility." I will introduce her study on people's lives with physical incapacity, and will consider how her concept changes the whole outlook of disability. In the second section, I will consider effects of disability hate discourse referring to Mark Sherry's study. I will reexamine Sherry's example cited from a website in order to clarify whether the discourse holds effects only within the website or not. In the third section, I will consider how the disability hate discourse made by the defendant of Sagamihara Incident functions. I will also look at a public protest in the aftermath of the murder, clarifying both negative and positive aspects of the discourse used in the protest meeting.

1. Jasbir K. Puar's Study of "Debility"

In "Prognosis Time," Jasbir K. Puar suggests dealing with every kind of physical incapacity as "debility" (Puar 162). Disability studies is an interdisciplinary academic

field which combines such fields as medical science, social welfare studies, and literary theories. Puar looks at disability from the perspective of literary theories, in particular feminist and queer theories. In this section, I will examine the notion of disability by employing her study, and will consider how her concept of “debility” influences those who are victimized by disability hate discourse.

By using the term “debility,” Puar considers that disability is a state of “debility,” a state of less physical capacity in people’s lives (166). Citing the analysis made by the medical anthropologist, Sarah Lochlann Jain, “Living in Prognosis,” Puar shows that all people can be affected by some kind of physical disorder (165). According to Puar, Jain argues that “we are all ‘living in prognosis’ ” (165), which is the time people spend after they have got physical disorders. In other words, people actually coexist with poor physical conditions throughout their lives. The notion of “debility,” which suggests that disability is a state of less physical capacity, seems persuasive when we consider that physical disorders and “prognosis” that follows are something all people are to experience.

In addition to this, Puar cites the feminist disability theorist, Rosemarie Garland-Thomson’s study: “Each one of us ineluctably acquires one or more disabilities - naming them variably as illness, disease, injury, old age, failure, dysfunction, or dependence” (Garland-Thomson 19, qtd. in Puar 166). Garland-Thomson’s observation enables Puar to conceptualize disability as a variety of physical disorders. “Debility” can include every kind of physical incapacity, whether it is lifelong or transient, or congenital or acquired. It consists of various physical disorders that people inevitably encounter throughout their lives.

“Debility” thus can be applied to all people’s bodies and to every kind of physical impairment throughout their lives. Every person experiences some states of less physical capacity, in one degree or another. If we accept the concept of “debility,” disability cannot be distinguished from other physical impairments. Having some disabilities is not an essential physical condition inherent in certain limited people, but one of the state of less physical capacity every person must encounter. We must note, however, that Puar’s theory assumes the notion of “abled-bodies” and its normativity without giving any clear definition of it herself (165). She uncritically accepts presupposition of “compulsory able-bodiedness” proposed by the queer disability theorist Robert McRuer. In his *Crip Theory*, this term is defined as “the system ... which in a sense produces disability,” as compulsory heterosexuality produces queerness (McRuer 2). As a result, her “debility” theory contradicts her fundamental concept that all people live with some kind of physical impairment. Yet her theory is useful as it deconstructs the notion of disability as a fixed physical condition; it suggests a continuum of physical conditions, and it ultimately nullifies essential “abled-bodies,” or makes them a transient physical state. It shows that people have to coexist with many kinds of physical disorders in their lives.

When we consider disability hate speech in the light of this “debility” theory, the target who the speech tries to attack will vanish. Since the notion of “debility” makes it impossible to distinguish “disability” from states of less physical capacity all people experience, disability hate speech will lose its target for disablism. The category of disability is nullified in the “debility” theory, and therefore the hate speech itself will become meaningless.

In short, Puar’s notion “debility” shows that the state of “debility” applies to all people’s bodies and to every kind of physical disorder they experience in their lives. It dissolves the notion of disability into a variety of physical disorders, with which every person has to coexist through their lives. If we take up this idea, disability hate speech will lose its target, and the category of “disability” will be nullified.

2. Effects of Disability Hate Discourse in Mark Sherry’s Study

In the second chapter of *Disability Hate Crimes*, Mark Sherry deals with the examples of disability hate discourse written in English. They are cited from the websites which he regards as showing obvious hatred toward disability (Sherry 31). As opposed to Puar’s notion of “debility” that nullifies the category of disability and includes all kinds of physical incapacity all people are to experience, the examples firmly discriminate against those with physical impairments, sometimes specifically naming certain kinds of disorders. Sherry analyzes each example to reveal how it injures the addressees. He points out its threatening factors such as defamatory names against people with certain kinds of impairments, and historical and social backgrounds that support the hate discourse. His study does not reveal, however, how the discourse has effects on the addressees; its aggression is not stated clearly, and the strategy to degrade people is not examined, either. Moreover, the fact that the discourse bears effects beyond the context of the website, is not elucidated as well. In order to inquire into these problems, I will reexamine one of Sherry’s analyses in this section. I take up one typical example that seems to reflect the existing disability hate the most. I will reconsider effects of the hate discourse cited in his study, and will ascertain whether the aggression and the strategy in the discourse function only within the website or not¹.

Among the examples he cites, Sherry takes up one website article entitled “Cripples, Retards, and the Other Untouchables”² as expressing “many of the common themes of disability hate” (34). The article targets people with physical impairments in general as the object of abuse, and it has many traits in common with other disability hate websites. It can be considered, therefore, as one typical form of disability hate discourse in today’s society. According to Sherry, the website places a picture of an American flag under the following text:

Useless self-pitying cripples and bothersome retarded fucks alike are all extraordinarily worthless. What is their purpose in society? Exhausting our

precious resources while annoying the fuck out of us: the hard working American public. ... All cripples are just a waste of space and energy, expending costly resources while contributing virtually nothing at all. ... Retards coast through life unknowing of the massive drain they put on society. These massive drains are nothing more then [sic] disgusting sub-human nuisances. The worst of these untouchables is the combination of the two, the crippled retard. These sad sacks of human refuse have serious defects and don't deserve to live. (qtd. in Sherry 34–35)

Comparing this text with many other disability hate websites, Sherry observes that it makes a typical argument of disability hate discourse: “disabled people are worthless and do not deserve to live.” He points out that “[t]he hate is directed at both people with physical impairments (who are labeled ‘cripples’) and those with cognitive impairments (who are labeled ‘retards’),” and that the discourse targets those who are with certain kinds of disorders by calling them by defamatory names. In relation to the American flag, he states that “references to ‘the hard working American public’” suggest having disability is “unpatriotic,” and is “a drain on the nation’s resources and a burden on everyone else.” He indicates that “[the] separation of disabled people from ‘the nation’” is “a mainstay of eugenic thought.” In addition to being called by defamatory names, they are also called “‘untouchable’ and even ‘subhuman,’” and are regarded as less than human beings. Taking all these elements into account, Sherry observes that eugenic thought or Social Darwinism “remains alive on the web today in disability hate sites” (Sherry 35).

As his analysis shows, the website is certainly an example of today’s disability hate discourse. According to criteria proposed by the constitutional scholar Jeremy Waldron, the website article falls into the category of hate speech in his study. In *The Harm in Hate Speech*, Waldron argues hate speech undermines “public good” and “dignity” for minorities in society. “Public good,” he states, is the right to live “with the assurance that there will be no need to face hostility, violence, discrimination, or exclusion by others.” On the other hand, “dignity” is people’s “basic social standing,” or “the fundamentals of basic reputation that entitle them to be treated as equals in the ordinary operations of society” (Waldron 4–5). Waldron considers that hate speech, which infringes these two human rights, is accompanied by “associating ascriptive characteristics like ethnicity, or race, or religion with conduct or attributes that should disqualify someone from being treated as a member of society in good standing” (5).

The website Sherry discusses targets people for their existing physical conditions and tries to degrade them for the ascriptive characteristics. Moreover, as Sherry observes, the text invokes persecutions of people with physical impairments in history, which Waldron considers as another influence of hate speech. Waldron reflects that it “intimate[s] a *return* to the all-too-familiar circumstances of murderous injustice”

that former victims used to experience (Waldron 103). The website that condemns physical incapacity in relation to national finance summons up former oppression such as Nazism, which persecuted people with physical disorders. Sherry's analysis and Waldron's study show that the website's disability hate discourse targets people living with physical incapacity, and threatens their lives by evoking history of persecutions of such people.

As we have seen, the text of disability hate speech menaces lives of physically impaired people on the web page. However, the discourse functions not only there but also outside the website. In order to examine its full effect, it is necessary to inquire into the influence outside the context of the original text.

On the influence of speech, Judith Butler discusses its violent mechanism in her work, *Excitable Speech*, using Louis Althusser's and J. L. Austin's studies. Introducing Althusser's study on "interpellation," the ways people are called by some name, Butler considers that they can be hurt by how they are "interpellated," "the mode of address itself," in addition to "the words by which one is addressed" (Butler 2). Through these ways of "interpellation," or "being called an injurious name," people are "derogated and demeaned," but recognized as a subject "who comes to use language to counter the offensive call" (2).

Furthermore, she draws upon the work of Austin so as to discuss effects of injurious speech by introducing the two features, "illocutionary" and "perlocutionary" speech acts (Austin 99–108; qtd. in Butler 3). "Illocutionary" speech acts are ones "that, in saying do what they say, and do it in the moment of that saying," and "perlocutionary" speech acts are ones "that produce certain effects as their consequence; by saying something, a certain effect follows" (Butler 3).

Based on this definition, Butler critically examines another determinant of linguistic violence, "total speech situation," also set out by Austin (Austin 52, qtd. in Butler 3). She questions whether the notion could delimit its totality, when we consider the illocutionary speech act. Although Austin claims the force of illocutionary speech acts is understood only when their "total speech situation" can be identified (Austin 52), Butler points out that they work "to the extent that they are given in the form of a ritual, that is, repeated in time" (Butler 3). They "maintain a sphere of operation that is not restricted to the moment of the utterance itself," and therefore, the moment "exceeds itself in past and future directions, an effect of prior and future invocations that constitute and escape the instance of utterance" (3). As she examines, the moment when the illocutionary speech is made cannot be fully captured so as to delimit its "total speech situation." In every single moment of utterance, the past invoked by the speech is reproduced each time, so we cannot precisely predict how the moment exceeds the instance of the utterance. The "total speech situation" cannot seize all those instantaneous escapes, nor the effects of the utterance ranging from past to future.

The website “Cripples, Retards, and the Other Untouchables” functions as disability hate discourse within the web page, within its “total speech situation” that gives viewers a context of the history of persecutions of people with physical impairments. Beyond this framework, however, the text could exert influence on those who are addressed as “cripples” or “retards” if we reflect on illocutionary speech acts. The declarative sentences, the sentence structure that Austin considers as the one having illocutionary force in his study, hurt people by themselves, participating in the occurrence “in saying” the words (Austin 108, 122–124). The two sentences, “Useless self-pitying cripples and bothersome retarded fucks alike are all extraordinarily worthless,” and “All cripples are just a waste of space and energy,” can convey hatred toward physical impairments by the sentences themselves, even if they are not given the overall context of the website. The defamatory names, “cripples” and “retarded fucks,” degrade the addressees at the moment of the utterance, by ways of “interpellation”; they interpellate the targets by the names that have been repeated as a ritual in order to call them with discriminatory intent. In Butler’s term, this “condensed historicity” (Butler 3), which escapes from and stretches over the moment of the utterance instantly transforms victims to disdainful subjects.

Besides this, the two sentences above connect injurious names with assertive predicates respectively, “are all extraordinarily worthless,” and “are just a waste of space and energy.” They are declared as if these were universal facts, without leaving room for counterarguments from the addressees. Even if they are not sentences made by a person/people in power, as Austin considers in his study, these declarative sentences can circulate among people as they contain defamatory names that have historical context. They cause, therefore, aggression against the targets by the sentence structure. Thus the sentences are illocutionary speech acts that “in saying do what they say,” even if they are taken out of the context of the website article where they were originally placed. Rather, they have destructive force on the addressees by themselves; regardless of the situation, at the moment they are uttered, they reduce victims to subjects called by defamatory names, and deprive them of their humanity.

The website article “Cripples, Retards, and the Other Untouchables” has effects beyond its original context. The text degrades people with certain kinds of physical incapacity, and invokes the history of persecutions of physically impaired people. In addition, declarative sentences in the text are illocutionary speech acts that hurt the addressees by the statements themselves, regardless of the context of utterances. The defamatory names and the sentence structure have destructive effects on the victims for condensed discriminatory historicity in the discourse that does not leave them room for counterarguments. At the moment they are made, the sentences demean the addressees to disdainful subjects, and deny their being proper human beings.

3. Sagamihara Incident and the Problem of Physical Categorization

On July 26, 2016, Satoshi Uematsu killed 19 disabled people and injured 26 in the care home in Sagamihara City where he had worked for about three years. According to media coverage, he had notified Lower House Speaker of his murder plan in a letter beforehand, which shows his antidisability stance (Peckitt). After this murder, people with physical disorders and their supporters united and raised their voices in order to denounce the actual act of violence that reflected the disability hate discourse in the letter. In this section, I will look into the effects of the disability hate discourse made by the defendant of Sagamihara Incident. After that, I will examine the discourse of a protest meeting against Sagamihara Incident. I will look at how people are categorized according to individual physical state in the process of their uniting against the hate discourse, and will clarify both negative and positive aspects of their unity.

Before committing the murder, the defendant Uematsu had described his discriminatory thought against those with physical incapacity in his letter. The letter that notifies his murder plan, originally in Japanese, is translated in English as follows:

I can wipe out a total of 470 disabled individuals. I am fully aware that my remark is eccentric. However, thinking about the tired faces of guardians, the dull eyes of caregivers working at the facility, I am not able to contain myself, and so I decided to take action today for the sake of Japan and the world ... I envision a world where a person with multiple disabilities can be euthanized, with an agreement from the guardians, when it is difficult for the person to carry out household and social activities. I believe there is still no answer about the way of life for individuals with multiple disabilities. The disabled can only create misery. (qtd. in Peckitt)

Compared with the website quoted in Sherry's study, this letter has few declarative sentences and shows Uematsu's puzzlement toward people with multiple physical impairments. While he claims he can kill a number of those with physical incapacity, he is "fully aware that [his] remark is eccentric." The ensuing sentence that states the reason why he would commit murder does not mark his strong hatred toward disabled people but his concerns for their supporters' and caregivers' fatigue over taking care of them³.

Reflecting such confusion and awareness of eccentricity, the subsequent part of the letter is written in the conditional and subjunctive moods, which does not seem to convey assertive thoughts. Uematsu argues for "a world where a person with multiple disabilities can be euthanized," and he thinks it can be done only when his/her carers agree to it, by taking the person's activity at home and in society into consideration. This is a decision that cannot be made by a third party, so it must necessarily become arbitrary. Finally, the text states that the way of life for people with multiple physical impairments is not established yet, and concludes they "can only create misery." It does not take into account of physically impaired people's individuality and assumes

they are misfortunes for themselves and for those around them. However, this is told as Uematsu's belief, and not as a fixed statement. As we have seen, although the letter certainly degrades their ways of lives, his perplexity appears at every turn; in the sentences, there is no obvious hatred toward his victims. Rather, the sentences show his bewilderment about how to deal with people especially with multiple physical disorders.

The letter nevertheless can be regarded as disability hate discourse. It is because what Uematsu says summons up the persecutions in the past such as mass murder through Aktion T4 led by Nazism, if we refer to Austin's "total speech situation." The hate discourse does not employ declarative sentences that hurt the disabled people by themselves; there is no defamatory names that reduce them to degraded subjects, nor assertive predicates that deprive them of their humanity. Although we cannot totally deny the discourse's threatening power, it cannot be identified as an illocutionary speech act, which instantaneously injures the victims in saying the words, either. While the discourse may have some effects when it is taken out of the original context, there is no statement that instantly harms the victims. Thus, the disability hate discourse in the defendant's letter does not have sentences with destructive force if we follow Austin's study. Nonetheless, its insinuating utterance bewilders readers and makes the disabled people worried about their lives. There is no knowing whether the discourse may win favorable responses from outsiders who have the same confusion as Uematsu does.

As an immediate reaction toward the incident, Shinichiro Kumagaya, the doctor and medical researcher with a physical impairment related to cerebral palsy, called on people to unite and raise their voices together. They held a memorial ceremony for the victims at Research Center for Advanced Science and Technology in the University of Tokyo on August 6, 2016. According to his essay, people in various physical states assembled there; they listened to various opinions without denouncing each other, as he asked the participants (Kumagaya 67). He states that recognizing various opinions leads people to come together beyond their different standpoints, and promises the future where all people's lives will be protected from disability hate discourse and actual acts of violence based on it (67). Complex problems emerge, however, in the introductory part of the memorial ceremony, when Kumagaya calls out to people/participants according to their individual physical condition. While he tells the ceremony was held to unite them regardless of their individual physical condition, his speech categorizes people by it:

No one should be excluded from the community, including people with disabilities, drug addiction, mental illness, their supporters, and their families. ... More than 300 people participated in the ceremony, such as those with physical disabilities, mental disabilities, drug addiction, mental illness, as well as families with disabled members, care workers, psychiatrists, caregivers,

and people in general. (Kumagaya 66, my translations)

If we refer to Butler's analysis using Althusser's study on "interpellation," the categorization according to individual physical state can be an effective objection against Uematsu's disability hate discourse. By categorizing the participants into each physical disorder, the text recognizes them as subjects "who [come] to use language to counter the offensive call" (Butler 2), and who can stand against the hate discourse that tries to threaten their lives. Yet, on the other hand, the categorization differentiates them from others who are not called by their physical states, and also divides them into smaller groups labeled with names of specific kinds of physical disorders.

Concerning categorization according to people's attributes, Butler discusses in *Gender Trouble* how identifying oneself with certain sexuality results in presupposing the opposite compulsory category. By examining previous studies by Monique Wittig⁴, Butler considers that sexual categorization of "lesbian" reinforces the opposite sexual form. Lesbianism presupposes compulsory heterosexuality from which it is excluded, and even "require[s]" the oppressive force in order to exist as counterforce against it (Butler, *Gender Trouble* 163). Being a lesbian cannot be formed without assuming heterosexual other, consolidating compulsory heterosexuality that marginalizes lesbian identity. To respond to this paradoxical counteraction, Butler suggests we understand lesbian sexuality "not only as a contestation of the category of 'sex,' of 'woman,' of 'natural bodies,'" which seem to accept sexual norms assigned to their bodies, "but also of 'lesbian,'" which is the countering category itself (162).

This notion of sexuality that keeps questioning one's own category would give us a foothold to clarify problems and search for possibilities in our study of Kumagaya's essay that refers to people according to their physical states. As we have seen, the physical categorization differentiates the participants with physical incapacity from others, and divides them into smaller groups labeled with specific disorders. The very act of categorizing people according to their physical states results in presupposing the opposite compulsory category. Kumagaya's description employs the categories of physical disorders in order to show physical diversity in the unity. Yet, at the same time, it latently shares the ways of categorization of abled bodies vs. disabled bodies used in Uematsu's disability hate discourse against which people should protest. To exist as counterforce against the hate discourse, Kumagaya calls out to a variety of people for solidarity, but it paradoxically requires the oppressive force of the hate discourse. Consequently, it reinforces the discourse that threatens lives of people with physical impairments on one hand.

However, applying Butler's suggestion to the case of people's physicality, the categorization can be a place where people examine their own category by rethinking the ways to understand physical incapacity. Just as disability hate discourse loses its target when we take Puar's notion of "debility" into account, the categorization

through people's unity cannot completely integrate them into certain specific physical states. Since all of them are to experience some kind of physical incapacity in their lives, they cannot be categorized into specific impairments according to their present physical conditions. By noticing this self-contradiction of the categorization, people can then turn the categories into the starting point toward understanding physical disorders not as fixed physical states but as a continuum of physical conditions changing throughout their lives. While classifying people into individual physical state, the categorization based on people's physical states leads them to find its paradox and search for fluid physical conditions that cannot be fully integrated during their lifetime. Questioning the ways people categorize themselves according to their present physical states guides them to new ground that is not targeted by disability hate discourse. By thus resisting physical categorization, they can include people with various kinds of physicality in their unity throughout their lives.

The disability hate discourse in Sagamihara Incident, which is written in conditional and subjunctive moods, does not have sentences with destructive force in Austin's study, yet its insinuating utterance puts the targeted people's lives at risk. Against the actual act of violence that reflected the hate discourse, people united and raised their voices together. The ways they are labeled with individual physical state, however, result in not only classifying them into smaller groups, but presupposing the oppressive force of the disability hate discourse against which they should protest, in order to exist as its counterforce. Yet, at the same time, the categorization can make them notice its self-contradiction and lead them to search for fluid notion of physical states, to understand physical disorders as a continuum of physical conditions that cannot be fully integrated during their lifetime. It leads people to include those with various kinds of physicality in their unity that is not targeted by disability hate discourse.

Conclusion

In this paper, I considered disability hate discourse, examining Jasbir K. Puar's "debility" that suggests understanding disability as a continuum of physical conditions. Her theory resolves the notion of disability into various physical disorders, with which every person has to coexist in the course of their lives. Disability hate discourse loses its target.

In the later sections, I examined two cases of disability hate discourse in today's society. Disability hate website quoted in Mark Sherry's study has effects not only within the web page but beyond the original context. Declarative sentences in the text are illocutionary speech acts that hurt the disabled people by the statements themselves. At the moment they are uttered, the sentences reduce the victims to the subjects called by defamatory names, and deprive them of their humanity.

On the other hand, the disability hate discourse in Sagamihara Incident does not

have sentences with destructive force if we follow J. L. Austin's study. Its insinuating utterance, however, still threatens the disabled people's lives. People protested against the murder that reflected the hate discourse soon after the incident. The ways they objected, however, not only separate them into smaller groups, but presuppose the oppressive force of the disability hate discourse. Yet, it can also make them notice its self-contradiction, and lead them to search for fluid notion that physical conditions cannot be fully categorized during people's lifetime.

Notes

1. In the second chapter of *Disability Hate Crimes*, Sherry deals with many kinds of disability hate discourse that targets people not only with physical disorders in general but with specific impairments. Website articles that attack people with physical disorders in general call them by defamatory names. Some of the articles regard the targeted people as less than human beings (Anger Central, qtd. in Sherry 39), deny their existence or even urge readers to kill them (Hellen C, qtd. in Sherry 38), and oppose to their right of reproduction (d_i_s_s_i_d_e_n_t, qtd. in Sherry 38). These are the basic claims of disability hate discourse, which can also be found in the article I quoted in this paper. The URLs of the websites I cited above are as follows. I searched for the original sources on the Web September 28, 2018, but all of them could not be found. Therefore, I refer to Sherry's citation in this paper:

Anger Central. *I Hate Retards!* 2002. Web.

<<http://www.angry.net/groups/r/retards.htm>>

d_i_s_s_i_d_e_n_t. *I Hate Retards.* 2003. Web.

<http://www.geocities.com/d_i_s_s_i_d_e_n_t/ihateretards.html>

Hellen C. *Retards in School.* 2004. Web.

<<http://hellncphs.20m.com/Retardsinschool.html>>

2. The author of this website article represents him/herself as "Jesus Christ." I searched for the original source on the Web from August 2017 to September 2018, but it could not be found. Therefore, I requote Sherry's citation in this paper:

Jesus Christ. *Cripples, Retards, and the Other Untouchables.* Ubersite. 17 February 2004. Web.

<<http://www.ubersite.com/m/25797>>

3. Puar's "debility" does not seem to respond to these temporary but unavoidable physical differences between people with and without physical incapacity. Although Puar suggests a notion of "conviviality" (Puar 168-169), a place where people with various kinds of attributes encounter and recognize their diversity at the end of her study, she does not show how the notion can deal with problems surrounding supporters and caregivers who help those with less physical

capacity.

4. Wittig's studies Butler mainly refers to are as follows:

Wittig, Monique. *Les Guérillères*. Trans. David LeVay. New York: Avon, 1973.

———. *The Lesbian Body*. Trans. Peter Owen. New York: Avon, 1976.

Works Cited

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Lenin and Philosophy*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1971. 170–186.

Anger Central. *I Hate Retards!* 2002. Web.

<<http://www.angry.net/groups/r/retards.htm>>

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

———. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 1990. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. *Staring: How We Look*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Jain, Sarah Lochlann. "Living in Prognosis: Toward an Elegiac Politics." *Representation* 98. 1 (2007): 77–92.

Kumagaya, Shinichiro. "Jikenno Atode (After the Case)." *Gendaishiso* 44. 19 (2016): 63–69.

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

Peckitt, Michael. *Disability Hate Crime & The Sagamihara Victims*. Accessible Japan. Web. 23 May 2017.

<<https://www.accessible-japan.com/disability-hate-crime-sagamihara-victims/>>

Puar, Jasbir K. "Prognosis Time: Towards a Geopolitics of Affect, Debility and Capacity." *Women & Performance: a Journal of Feminist Theory* 19.2 (2009): 161–172.

Sherry, Mark. *Disability Hate Crimes: Does Anyone Really Hate Disabled People?*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.

Waldron, Jeremy. *The Harm in Hate Speech*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2012.