

UDK 364-056.24(410)

BBK C993(4Вел)

GSNTI 14.09.29

Code VAK 13.00.03

I. A. Filatova

Ekaterinburg, Russia

N. P. Dronishinets

Novouralsk, Russia

HISTORICAL AND CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL POLICY WITH REGARD TO PERSONS WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES IN GREAT BRITAIN (A review of the book: *Jackson R. Who Cares? The impact of ideology, regulation and marketisation on the quality of life of people with an intellectual disability*. Published by The Centre for Welfare Reform. 2015. 52 pp. Part 1)

Abstract. In 2015, the book by R. Jackson *Who cares? The Impact of Ideology, Regulation and Marketisation on the Quality of Life of People with an Intellectual Disability* was published in Great Britain. The book was published by an independent scientific-research network structure *Centre for Welfare Reform*. The main aim of the Centre is to facilitate social support for the citizens, families and communities. The author of the book, R. Jackson, has a PhD in Education and is a visiting Research Fellow at the University of Hertfordshire. He has experience of teaching at Aberdeen College of Education and King Alfred's College (now the University of Winchester). He was Principal of a residential special school and farm training centre in Aberdeen.

The urgency of the given review of an independent scientific publication is determined by the inadequate number of works in our home scientific literature devoted to detailed analysis of the current state of social care and education of persons with disabilities, including intellectual ones, in Great Britain.

The foreign experience presented in the article may be useful for our domestic specialists dealing with the issues of socialization, labor rehabilitation and education of persons with disorders of intellectual development. Drawing on the conception of normalization and the principle of variability, R. Jackson highlights in his research the questions of protection of natural

and legal rights of persons with intellectual disability, development of the system of social care for such people in Great Britain, expresses a critical assessment of the existing problems in this field and offers possible solutions.

Part 1 of the book briefly outlines the results of a historical and cross-cultural analysis of the social policy in relation to persons with intellectual disabilities in Great Britain.

Keywords: persons with intellectual disabilities; social assistance; social policy; historical analysis; cross-cultural analysis.

About the author: Dronishinets Nikolay Pavlovich, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor.

Place of employment: Head of Department of Philosophy, Novouralsk Technological Institute, National Research Nuclear University “MEPhI”, Novouralsk, Russia.

E-mail: dronishinets1@yandex.ru.

About the author: Filatova Irina Aleksandrovna, Candidate of Pedagogy, Associate Professor.

Place of employment: Director of Institute of Special Education, Ural State Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

E-mail: filatova@uspu.me.

Numerous publications of R. Jackson, one of leading modern scholars of Great Britain in the field of education of persons with disabilities, deal with the issues of professional training of persons with intellectual disabilities under the conditions of modern school education and interaction with their families (*Bound to Care*, 1996 [2]); social security of adults with intellectual disabilities (*Advocacy and Learning Disability*, 2002 [1]); implementation of the interdisciplinary approach to the model of social pedagogy in the system of social assistance for such people and popularization of the Camphill movement (*Holistic Special Education:*

principles and practice, 2006 [8], *Discovering Camphill: new perspectives, research and developments*, 2011 [6]); and inclusion of persons with intellectual disabilities [3; 11; 4; 9].

In his research, the author defines the priority goals targeted at ensuring the rights of the people with disabilities, including the persons with intellectual disabilities:

- guarantee of their legislative rights;
- reconsideration of the terminological apparatus, which consists in rejection of the “narrow” definition of the notions, such as, for example, “inclusion” and “care”;

- implementation of the “variability principle” in the systems of education, health care and social assistance;
- reform of the structure of charitable organizations;
- social recognition of the important role of the family in the support for such persons;
- design and implementation of educational programs for persons with intellectual disabilities based on the socio-pedagogical model;
- change of the current tendency to merge the systems of social care and health sectors, and preservation of the independent system of social care for such people;
- support for independent scientific research in the spheres of education, health care and social services;
- creation of a network of information-counseling services for people with intellectual disabilities which would be independent and not connected with state and local authorities either administratively or financially, etc.

The book under review represents a critical analysis of the social policy of Great Britain with regard to persons with intellectual disabilities over several recent decades [14]. In his independent investigation, the author focuses on the real state and problems of ideology, management, marketing, technologies and financing the system of provision of social care for persons

with intellectual disabilities. The researcher warns that the society, unthinkingly, is slipping into the same institutional practices that were common at the beginning of the twentieth century, although now in a more modern guise [13, p. 7]. R. Jackson sees the main causes of this phenomenon in the simplified interpretation of the conception of normalization and the notion of “inclusion” by some scholars and politicians, orientation of many strategies of social care toward safeguarding the rights of the people with disabilities in general clearly disregarding the interests of the persons with intellectual disabilities, and the crisis in financing the system of social care.

The author writes that these tendencies in the sphere of social policy are very similar to those of the Victorian era (1837-1901), during which social and economic problems led to the “heartless” policy in relation to people with intellectual disabilities. At that time, the society came across the situation when a minor category of people with intellectual disabilities had very limited rights in comparison with other, more numerous groups of people with disabilities (for example, people with physical disabilities). Drawing a parallel with the modern times, R. Jackson emphasizes that in spite of the government support for inclusion of persons with disabilities, it is often not well-

considered because it does not take into account the deep differences existing within this category of persons.

The book contains the results of a cross-cultural and historical analysis of the process of formation of the social opinion about the persons with intellectual disabilities. The author notes that in “simple” rural societies people were more tolerant and sympathetic to those with an intellectual disability. The intellectual and social skills required to cope in such a society were significantly less demanding than those needed to survive in a modern industrial society. The researcher comes to the conclusion that there used to be less discrimination toward persons with intellectual disabilities in the then society.

To prove this assumption, the author provides the data of anthropological and historical investigations which show that in many social cultures, the person with intellectual disabilities was regarded as a cause of social discomfort and as an economical burden for his family (Edgerton, 1968). At the same time, the author gives examples of African tribes and “primitive” communities practicing collective responsibility of the whole clan for “misbehavior” of persons with intellectual disabilities. Therefore, clan members were assigned to supervise those with an intellectual disability in order to keep them out of

trouble. In extreme cases, they were confined to the house. These two ‘primitive’ responses, supervision and confinement to the house, bear a striking similarity to those subsequently adopted in more ‘advanced’ societies – sheltered provision and institutionalization, the author reports.

R. Jackson writes that in contrast to many “primitive” societies, Victorian Britain “did not have any feeling of responsibility” in relation to persons with intellectual disabilities. On the contrary, they were seen as a parasitic and predatory population responsible for most of the social ills that ravaged the cities – poverty, crime, alcoholism, drug addiction, vagrancy and prostitution. The mere fact of existence of such people was interpreted as a threat to social order and genetic purity of the race. Absence of sympathy for persons with intellectual disabilities might be understood from the position of the dominant philosophical, religious and scientific and popular views of that time.

The scholar analyzes Darwin's evolutionary theory and Spencer's social Darwinism and comes to the conclusion that they ideologically corroborated the social opinion about the biological “maladjustment” of people with intellectual disabilities. To illustrate his conclusion, he refers to the Malthusian doctrine about the optimal number of population for each society

which made many people believe that “high” reproductive capacity of persons with intellectual disabilities may present a threat to the stability and well-being of the nation. The author dwells on the utilitarian principle of “self-help” by J. Bentham popularized by S. Smiles (“Heaven helps those who help themselves”), which places the responsibility for one’s life upon the person himself and absolves the state from it. Thus, persons with intellectual disabilities who were treated as unable to help themselves received little sympathy in the Victorian society, R. Jackson concludes.

He states with regret: “As often happens when a society is confronted by uncertainty, tension and conflict, the ‘scapegoat principle’ is invoked. The kind of proposals advanced by British scientists and social reformers to counter the ‘menace’ of the people with an intellectual disability - segregation, castration, sterilisation and euthanasia - bear a depressing similarity in intent and character to the measures taken against another minority group - the Jews in Nazi Germany. The close identification of the eugenics movement with these proposals for a final solution may help to explain why any suggestion today to establish or support separate residential provision for people with an intellectual disability generates such a strongly negative and emotive response” (6, p.12).

Then, on the example of the Camphill communities, which function in more than 27 countries of the world, the author of the book analyzes the evolution of the conception of normalization. At first, this conception argued the necessity to create the model of life of persons with intellectual disabilities which would be as close to the real conditions of life in society as possible. In his study of the Camphill movement, W. Wolfensberger extended this conception by stating that this approach was too narrow and did not take into account the human properties and the person’s life experience. He introduced the principle of the social role valorization, which was considered by him as a philosophy (but not a technology) representing a system of values and beliefs which should help guide, not dictate thought and action.

B. Blatt who was deeply influenced by Camphill in his thinking and writing he saw it as a model form of residential provision. R. Turnbull, former President of the American Association on Mental Retardation, commended the inclusive character of life in Camphill communities. R. Jackson wonders what it is that Wolfensberger, Blatt and Turnbull saw in this kind of community? Answering this question, R. Jackson gives a detailed analysis of the concept of “community”. The author interprets the concept “community” in the context of

“care in the community”: there exists among residents a clear sense of, and loyalty to, their ‘community’; residents know one another; residents feel a sense of obligation to one another; there are networks for mutual support; and a wide range of beliefs and values are shared by all residents.

The scholar underlines that in discussing community it is important to note that the immediate social environment for most urban families is best considered not as the local geographical area in which they live (for example, Camphill), but rather a network of social relationships between the family of a person with intellectual disabilities and society. The modern “real” social networks are becoming less locality bound given that an increasing amount of social interaction takes place through high speed communication (e.g. e-mail, Facebook, Twitter). What is significant about this form of social interaction is that it disadvantages people with intellectual disabilities not simply because of the cost of expensive equipment and the recurrent need to update it but because of the skills needed to operate increasingly technically sophisticated equipment (e.g. iPhones, iPads, etc). The author states that in the face of these changes, community recedes in its meaning to the individual and also declines as a significant means for the organization of social life.

As a conclusion of historical and cross-cultural analysis of the attitude of society to persons with intellectual disabilities, the author expresses concern about the spread of the utilitarian philosophy of mercantilism (mercantile ethics). This promotes the interpretation of education, health service and social care simply as an economic process, depersonalization of people with intellectual disabilities and devaluation of the role of professionals in the sphere of social care. R. Jackson writes: “Going back to the Victorian values in the second decade of the 21st century is cruel and ironic, because it was the use of these values that in the long run led to the inhuman and heartless treatment of persons with an intellectual disability in the late 19th century”.

References

1. Gray, B. *Advocacy and Learning Disability* / B. Gray, R. Jackson (eds.). — London ; New York : Jessica Kingsley Publ., 2002.
2. Jackson, R. *Bound to Care: An Anthology* / R. Jackson. — Cheshire : Rescare, 1996.
3. Jackson, R. *Challenges of residential and community care: ‘the times they are a-changin’* / R. Jackson // *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. — 2011. — Vol. 55, part 9. — Sept. P. 933—944.
4. Jackson, R. *Community Care and Inclusion for People with an Intellectual Disability* / R. Jackson, M. Lyons (eds.). — Edinburgh : Floris Books, 2016.
5. Jackson, R. *Current challenges to the quality of social care services for people with intellectual disabilities in the UK* / R. Jackson // *Research, policy and planning*. — 2010. — № 28 (1). — P. 17—27.
6. Jackson, R. *Discovering Camphill: New perspectives, research and developments* /

- R. Jackson (ed.). — Edinburgh : Floris Books, 2011.
7. Jackson, R. Does advocacy have a future? / R. Jackson // *Journal on developmental disabilities/le journal sur les handicaps du développement*. — 2005. — № 12 (1). — P. 19—30.
8. Jackson, R. *Holistic Special Education. Camphill Principles and Practice* / R. Jackson (ed.). — Edinburgh : Floris Books, 2006.
9. Jackson, R. Politics and intellectual disability in England: an historical perspective / R. Jackson // *Intern. Journ. of Developmental Disabilities*. — 2017. — Vol. 63, Iss. 1. — P. 52—58.
10. Jackson, R. The Austrian Provenance of the Worldwide Camphill Movement / R. Jackson // *Journ. of Austrian studies*. — 2013. — № 46 (4). — P. 23—40.
11. Jackson, R. The empty rhetoric of inclusion / R. Jackson // *Learning Disability Today*. — 2015. — № 15 (3), May/June. — P. 22—24.
12. Jackson, R. The impact of ideology on provision of services for people with a learning disability / R. Jackson, H. Irvine // *Intern. Journ. of developmental disabilities*. — 2013. — № 59 (1). — P. 20—34.
13. Jackson, R. Who Cares? The impact of ideology, regulation and marketisation on the quality of life of people with an intellectual disability / R. Jackson. — The Centre for Welfare Reform, 2015. — 52 p.
14. Walmsley, J. A Response to Robin Jackson [Electronic resource] / J. Walmsley. — The Centre for Welfare Reform, 2015. Mode of access: <http://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/library/by-az/a-response-to-robin-jackson.html>.