

Braye, S. (2017) 'You shall not murder': Atos at the Paralympic Games

Abstract

At the London 2012 Paralympic Games a controversy arose regarding Paralympic sponsor 'Atos', the French IT company contracted at £400m, to implement the United Kingdom (UK) Government's 'Work Capability Assessment'. Atos were accused of falling short of professional codes of conduct, including declaring fit for work persons who subsequently died following removal of their benefits. The disability rights group 'Disabled People Against Cuts' held UK wide protests at Atos offices in Cardiff, Glasgow, Belfast and London. I argue that rather than responding positively to the protests, the International Paralympic Committee (IPC) is causing damage to the Disabled People's Movement (DPM). To build the argument within a theological context the Biblical story of Cain's slaying of his brother Abel is applied to help understand the relationship between the IPC and the DPM respectively.

Introduction

The first murder recorded in the Bible is Cain's slaying of his brother Abel (Genesis 4: 8). In this paper I argue that two organisations that are arguably siblings by their association with disabled people¹ are heading towards a similar fate. The International Paralympic Committee (IPC) – "Cain" – through its association with Atos, is in danger of killing off the disabled people's movement (DPM) – "Abel". Whilst the IPC and the DPM are related by their existence for the benefit of disabled people – albeit in different fields – the DPM are a cause for equality and the IPC is a cause for concern, given their liaison with Atos. Accepting the IPC as Cain and the DPM as Abel, it is helpful to consider the Apostle John's explanation of why Cain killed Abel:

And why did he murder him? Because his own actions were evil and his brother's were righteous (1 John 3:12)²

In the Old Testament book of Genesis chapter 4, the story of Adam and Eve's first two children, Cain and Abel is predominantly about the motivation of one's heart of worship towards God. Cain brought an offering to God of 'some of the fruits of the soil' (v 3), and 'Abel brought fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock' (v 4). For some

reason, God favoured 'Abel and his offering' (v 4), but did not look with favour 'on Cain and his offering' (v 5). God seemed to know that Cain's motivation was from a place of evil intent later suggesting to Cain that he should 'do what is right' to be accepted (v 6). God's concern about Cain's motivation, and what is in his heart, is tragically exposed when, full of envy, he murders his brother Abel (v 8). Adam's sin, the first sin of the human race, was against God, Cain's sin was not only against God, but also against his own flesh and blood. Abel as the first victim of his own father's original sin dies at the hands of his brother, in spite of his own favoured position with God. The first death after Adam's first sin, the so-called 'fall of man' is a murder (Ellul, 1970). Banished from the presence of God, Cain sets about extending his family through his children and building a city for his security (v 17). His security is in his own hands as he builds the city for himself, 'creating a place belonging to him' (Ellul, 1970, p. 5).

Using this Scripture as a theological lens, I now turn my attention to arguing that it is a suitable description of the IPC/Atos connection and the DPM. Paralympic Games sponsor Atos is a French IT company that was contracted at £400m, to implement the UK Government's Work Capability Assessment (WCA) on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) (Ramesh, 2012). In the run up to the London 2012 Paralympic Games a controversy arose regarding Atos who were accused by disability rights activists of falling short of professional codes of conduct, including declaring fit for work persons who subsequently died following removal of their benefits (Lakhani and Taylor, 2012). This claim featured in protests by disabled people's organisations (DPOs) within the disabled people's movement (DPM). The DPM in the UK has a rich political history dating back to the late 19th century with the British Deaf Association forming in 1890, six years before the first modern Olympic Games, and the National League of the Blind which formed as a trade union in 1899. The Disabled Drivers Association formed in 1947, 13 years before the first Paralympic Games in Rome (Campbell and Oliver, 1996; Brittain, 2010). With approximately 16 organisations in existence in the UK that were run and controlled by disabled people, the British Council of Disabled People (BCODP) was formed in 1981 and they began to lobby for full anti-discrimination legislation, publishing their first case in 1991 (Woodin, 2014).

In 1995 the Disability Discrimination Act was passed by British Parliament amidst opposition from the DPM who said that its partial concessions were not full anti-discrimination legislation (Campbell and Oliver, 1996). In 2006, BCODP changed its name to the United Kingdom Disabled People's Council (UKDPC) and now work with

over 300 DPOs as well as being a member of Disabled People's International (UKDPC 2016). One such DPO, Disabled People Against Cuts (DPAC) staged a week of direct action beginning on 29 August 2012, the day of the opening ceremony for the Paralympic Games. They held protests called the "Atos Games" at Atos offices in Cardiff, Glasgow, Belfast and London, asserting their claim that disabled people had 'died after being declared fit to work' (Lakhani and Taylor, 2012). Under the title of 'Atos Healthcare', Atos conducted assessments for the DWP for disabled people's Personal Independence Payment (PIP). In the year 2012-13 the number of people appealing the results of their assessment was 465,000 (Gentleman, 2013). In March 2014 under mounting pressure and criticism, Atos terminated its contract with the DWP, 17 months before it was due to end. The UK Government had also been under pressure to end the Atos contract and had received criticism for their handling of the entire process.

During the lifetime of the Atos/DWP partnership over 600,000 appeals had been lodged against them, 'costing the taxpayer £60m a year. In four out of 10 cases the original decisions are overturned' (Siddique, 2014). Official Government statistics released in August 2015 by the DWP state that 2,380 people died after being declared fit for work between December 2011 and February 2014, almost 90 people per month (Butler, 2015; DWP, 2015 p. 8). The fact that the IPC willingly retain Atos as a sponsor suggests a possible lack of understanding about disability rights issues in the UK and beyond. The DPM's criticism of the ironic relationship between the IPC and Atos will now be analysed to help clarify the similarities and distinctions between the IPC and the DPM. The intention being to strengthen my argument that the Cain and Abel story can be applied to the IPC and the DPM.

Disability rights and the IPC

In the run up to the London 2012 Paralympic Games the IPC became increasingly vocal about the ability of the Paralympics to positively impact disabled people's lives beyond sport. The London 2012 Paralympic opening ceremony featured a central section focused on disability rights. It featured a group of acting protesters holding up a series of banners spelling out the word "RIGHTS" around a copy of the naked Alison Lapper Pregnant statue (Independent, 2012). This particular statue is an iconic symbol of disability rights and defies stereotypes around pregnant disabled women. From the disabled activists' perspective it was ironic that Atos, as a Paralympic sponsor of

disabled people's fitness for sport was a troubled assessor of disabled people's fitness for work. The disabled actors who danced around the statue clearly meant to demonstrate that the success of the Paralympics was linked directly to disability rights for all disabled people across the UK.

During the year of the Rio 2016 Paralympics, the IPC remained convinced of the Games' ability to make a difference to disabled people in wider society, and this belief is evident in their 2015-2018 strategy (IPC, 2015). The extent to which these laudable aims are achievable or indeed proven, needs to be tested by the views of the disabled people the IPC claim to reach. In an exploratory study carried out prior to the equality narrative of the London 2012 Games, and before the Atos failings became widely known, 32 disabled activists had expressed their views on the Paralympic Games (Braye *et al.* 2013). Therefore, it is helpful to see how some of their comments compare to the IPC's 2015-2018 strategic plan. In each of the four examples below an extract from the IPC's strategy is followed by a disabled activist's view on the Paralympic Games:

1. To make for a more inclusive society for people with an impairment through para-sport (IPC, 2015, p. 14)

I actually feel publicizing such events is an insult when there are other disabled people fighting to gain the care they need and the respite they deserve. To be honest I think the money spent on the Paralympics would be better spent on the amazing people who juggle disability and children often alone with little or no credit and feeling socially isolated (Activist Petra cited in Braye *et al.* 2013, p. 989)

2. The Paralympic Games are the world's number one sporting event for transforming society's attitudes towards impairment (IPC, 2015, p. 14)

I'm afraid that the focus on elite Paralympians promotes an image of disabled people which is so far from the typical experiences of a disabled person that it is damaging to the public understanding of disability (Activist Colin cited in Braye *et al.* 2013, p. 988)

3. Equality – through sport, para-athletes challenge stereotypes and transform attitudes, helping to increase inclusion by breaking down social barriers and discrimination towards people with an impairment (IPC 2015, p. 14)

Paralympic athletes are just disabled people like the rest of us, no better and no different, when they realize that and see just how irrelevant the

Paralympics is to disabled people collectively then they can make a difference (Activist Ruth cited in Braye *et al.* 2013, p. 991)

4. Athletes from all five continents compete in venues full of spectators and an ever expanding global TV audience. Such worldwide reach, means that the Paralympic Games act as catalyst for greater social awareness thus contributing to the development of a more equitable society with respect and equal opportunities for all (IPC 2015, p. 18)

Seeing a disabled athlete cry as their national anthem plays whilst ignorant of other disabled people denied their most basic human rights, even life itself in many instances makes a mockery of equality, but perhaps they don't know that, not yet anyway (Activist Alan cited in Braye *et al.* 2013, p. 991)

The fact that some DPOs in the UK, including DPAC, have had a long running dispute with the Government over benefit cuts and the work capability assessments, has not been raised as an issue by the IPC. The evidence suggests that the DPM and the IPC have an apparently different perspective on disability equality issues, though both claim to have the same vision. This is not widely known and further analysis is required. The IPC's current position of venturing into disability politics beyond sport, and advocating disabled people's rights, is arguably an anathema to the DPM. I have previously described this in the following way:

Organizations *for* disabled people that are run and controlled by nondisabled people have wrestled the ideology of equality and emancipation of disabled people out of the grip of disabled people; a concept which Debord (1967/1994, p. 146) calls "d'etournement," which is the "disturbing or overthrowing" of an idea. In other words, nondisabled people have become "professionals" and "experts" who have hijacked the voice of disabled people against oppression and softened or changed their ontology to one of high dependence (Braye, 2014, pp. 133-134).

The emergence of the IPC can be traced back to the first competition for wheelchair users which took place in Stoke Mandeville, UK, on 29 July 1948 with 16 ex-service personnel competing in archery. The competition coincided with the opening ceremony of the 1948 London Olympic Games and was repeated in 1952 with the inclusion of ex-service personnel from Holland; from this, the International Stoke Mandeville Games were founded. The initial competition in 1948 was a continuation of rehabilitation for wheelchair users only, which evolved into the Paralympic Games which we see today.

On 22 September 1989 the IPC was founded in Dusseldorf, Germany to act as the global governing body of the Paralympics (IPC, 2016). The Paralympic Games does not include deaf people, who prefer a Deaflympics which is recognized by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). In July 2017 Samsun, Turkey will host the 23rd Deaflympics with 21 sports (Deaflympics, 2017). The inclusion of athletes with an intellectual impairment has been problematic for the IPC since the 2000 Sydney Paralympics. The Spanish basketball team had cheated to win the gold medal by fielding only two disabled athletes. As a consequence, the IPC banned competition for all intellectually impaired athletes, and began a very slow process of reintroducing them into the Paralympics with the ban eventually being lifted in 2009. The DPM, however, has grown into an organization that promotes the rights of all disabled people regardless of their impairment, whether it be physical, intellectual or sensory.

Free speech has been a cornerstone of early social movements, as is using the media to promote contentious ideas, and DPAC's "Atos Games" protests gave a voice to ordinary disabled people, as well as the DPM, and made good use of the media surrounding the Paralympics. The protest achieved its aim by using the high media profile of the Paralympics to put pressure on the UK Government and its connection with Atos. As a consequence, the DPM's challenge to the UK Government also brought pressure to bear on Atos. The IPC do provide sports competition for disabled athletes rather than a voice for all disabled people. They work with governments rather than protesting against them, and they manage a media portrayal of the Paralympic Games spectacle and its athletes. Indeed it is rare for disabled athletes to speak out against problems within the Paralympic Games, such as the classification system for competition, or wider disability issues. The IPC do not protest against any governments' policies, and indeed the understanding of Atos, particularly around the 2012 Games, highlights the differences that exist between the IPC and DPM – in the UK at least. Examining these differences through a theological lens is useful as the DPM has much in common with Christianity's demonstration of how to remain unswervingly committed to one's original objective.

You shall not murder

To apply a theological context to this discussion I must first deconstruct the two organisations under examination. The DPM and the IPC both claim to be 'movements'

campaigning for the rights of disabled people in society. A brief explanation of what constitutes a “social movement” helps determine the extent to which these claims can be justified. According to Jasper (2014, p. 16), social movements began by bringing together ‘parliament and the street’ where adherents can exert pressure on elected political officials. By this definition the DPM are a movement, however, despite the IPC belief that there is a ‘Paralympic movement’ it is in reality an important international sports organisation rather than a social movement. If the IPC were legitimately part of the disability rights movement – a claim implicit in their 2015-2018 strategy and general narrative – they would be working in collaboration with the DPM towards the common goal of disability equality. Where the IPC and the DPM may have had common ground in their origins was as factions operating outside of mainstream society. The IPC represents a faction of sport and the DPM a faction of politics. A faction breaks away from something mainstream, usually because the dominant structure is exclusive, and inclusivity is not forthcoming at an acceptable pace. The IPC is indicative of a general breakaway from mainstream sport where the inclusion of disabled people has been poor at all levels; bearing in mind that the Paralympics itself is a segregated event where only disabled people compete. Factions operating outside of mainstream society are described thus:

Factions form around ideological or strategic disagreements, although they also arise out of emotional bonds, some of which may have existed before the group even formed (Jasper, 2014, p. 136).

Jasper also says that factions and the people within them are wrapped up stating: ‘Choices about what we do become choices about “who we are”’ (2014, p. 136). Whilst disabled people, as a minority, are involved in the IPC decision-making processes, the Games and media outlets, disabled activists Campbell and Oliver (1996) argued that disabled people are not a homogenous group acting as one movement with common aims. For instance, the IPC’s choice of Atos as a sponsor is, I argue, far removed from the ideology of the DPM. Jesus said:

The teachers of the law and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat. So you must obey them and do everything they tell you. But do not do what they do, for they do not practice what they preach. They tie up heavy loads and put them on men’s shoulders, but they themselves are not willing to lift a finger to move them (Matthew 23:2-4).

Here Jesus stood against the law-keeping route to salvation and social acceptance, as well as the hierarchical structure of first century Judaism and organized religion. By Jasper's (2014) definition above, Jesus clearly began his ministry as a faction, unmoved by opposition and holding unswervingly to the task at hand; preaching the good news; teaching people; appointing leaders; surrendering to the cross; rising from the dead; and, sending his message worldwide. Choosing to follow Christ was, and is, a choice to opt out of and oppose society, and face its wrath. This no-compromise stance was clearly not lost on the early church leaders with Irenaeus (c.180/2014), Bishop of Lyons, writing:

Since the apostles, like a rich man [depositing his money] in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth: so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers (p. 209).

The increasing popularity of the Paralympic Games means that it has become more mainstream than factious. This mainstreaming trajectory of the IPC has arguably shown that they are content for its factious origins to be deconstructed. Evidence tends to suggest that they have tolerated a gradual development of the Paralympic Games alongside the stereotypical media reporting that accompanies disability. As such, there is an apparent compromise on language and coverage styles of disabled athletes as long as there is coverage of some kind. The ethical practices of sponsors appears not to have been a consideration, and this is proven by their relationship with Atos. As Jeremiah 3:1 says, 'But you have lived as a prostitute with many lovers'. It could be argued that the IPC and its athletes have prostituted themselves to the point where they are willing to be patronized and stereotyped in any way as long as they have an increasing profile across all media. They continue to believe that they have a positive reach beyond sport into the everyday lives of ordinary disabled people.

In the UK, disability sports organisations (DSOs) feed their athletes in to the British Paralympic Association (BPA) and these organisations are also sites of exclusion for disabled people. On 2 June 2016 an article by John Pring on the Disability News Service (DNS) website reported on the findings from a survey which established the numbers of disabled people working in 11 DSOs. Among these DSOs only 27 employees out of 163 (16.6%) identified as disabled (Pring, 2016). Two of the DSOs

surveyed were the BPA and the English Federation of Disability sport (EFDS). Among the nine board members of the BPA only one is a disabled person, and only three of its 33 paid staff identify as disabled. The BPA arguably has the largest pool of disabled people from which to recruit board members and employees. At the London 2012 Paralympic Games there were 288 British Paralympic athletes and there are over a thousand retired British Paralympians (BBC, 2012). Furthermore, thousands of English athletes of all levels have passed through the EFDS local, regional and national events and are known, by name and address, to the organisation. The EFDS, which was founded, and is funded and actively supported by Sport England, has only three disabled people on its board of 10, and only six full-time disabled staff out of 25. Whilst not questioning the commitment of the nondisabled people in these organisations, or indeed even knowing their views towards disabled people, it is important to note that representation has been a key point of contention for the DPM since its inception (Barnes, 1991; Oliver, 1996). Considering the strong connection between the IPC and national Paralympic associations such as the BPA, the under representation of disabled people may be one reason for the IPC's compromises on equality issues. The IPC and its so-called "Paralympic movement" is run and controlled by non-disabled people. By contrast, the DPM is made up of organisations controlled and run by disabled people; the DPM is a collective of DPOs with a common aim. Despite the high media profile of the Paralympics, its function appears to have no validity with the DPM which desires publicity for its cause rather than itself. The decision to become a disabled activist is to join a movement that is permanently in a struggle against the dominant ideology of a disablist world. In this sense the DPM has much in common with Christianity's unswerving commitment to its original objective. It is perhaps understandable why the UK based DPM would take issue with the IPC/Atos connection and the increasing high profile of the Paralympics, particularly during London 2012.

The growing fame around the London 2012 Paralympic Games gave Atos credibility and, by doing so, handed the UK Government more power to continue penalizing its most vulnerable citizens through the DWP's ill-fated fitness-for-work scheme. Whilst the DPM has previously ignored the Paralympics as irrelevant compared to more pressing equality issues, the Atos connection forced their hand, leading to the UK wide protests. The IPC's flexibility, and arguably compromise, in securing sponsors and status is probably epitomized most aptly by its willingness to retain its relationship with Atos (Braye *et al.* 2015). It now has an influential and

powerful place in the world of sport and has an effect on society's view of disabled people, though arguably not always in the positive way that it believes. Another issue facing the DPM is the continued relationship between IPC and Atos, despite Atos terminating its contract with the DWP. This relationship suggests that the IPC see the DPM as particularly unimportant in the UK and probably elsewhere in the world. They have the potential to portray disabled activists and their organisations as negative complainers, whilst simultaneously portraying the Paralympics as the positive arm of disability rights. The function of the IPC is to maintain its own position in sport and society by claiming that it has a far-reaching and positive impact on all disabled people in society. The DPM compromises little and continues to speak out against all forms of discrimination of disabled people across the whole strata of society (Barnes and Mercer, 2011; Oliver and Barnes, 2012; Swain *et al.* 2014). This factious stance may have negated the DPM's influence on mainstream politics and wider society (Oliver and Barnes, 2012). Similarly, Christianity's generally firm stance on Biblical principles renders it factious to much of society.

Judging from the findings by Braye *et al.* (2013), the IPC is not the radical society changer that it would like to be, and the athletes within the structure cannot really be political activists if they wish to remain Paralympians. Take, for instance, Bethy Woodward, a British athlete who competed in the T37 cerebral palsy (CP) classification at the London 2012 Games and won a silver medal in the 200 metres sprint. After 2012 the T37 category began to include athletes with 'cerebral palsy like symptoms' who began to beat CP athletes at international level by significant margins (Hervey, 2016). This caused Woodward to withdraw from the Rio 2016 team and speak out against the unfair classification system. The response by the BPA, that Woodward was not selected as she was not good enough suggests that the BPA can be quick to turn its back on its stars if they criticise the IPC. Successful Paralympians who say the right things, and do not criticise the IPC, are allowed to become role models who do not speak out about real disability issues beyond sport. The increasing media profile of the Games is creating a platform from which athletes could express their views if they so wished. Their function as role models for disabled people interested in sport is legitimate though whether this has currency with other disabled people remains in doubt (Braye *et al.* 2013).

Paralympic athletes ought to make good activists because the attributes of a hard working athlete would suggest a fighting spirit among them, but there appear to

be no Paralympic disabled activists speaking out at present. Christians ought to make very good activists; compelled by the suffering of others, rather than their own ends. A scripture that has encouraged and challenged me as a Christian, disabled person and activist is:

Do not curse the deaf or put a stumbling-block in front of the blind, but fear your God. I am the Lord (Leviticus 19:14).

For disabled activists, disabled people are one single group with no distinction between individuals' impairments. My own view is that although I have a physical impairment, I stand as a brother in relation to a person who is born with, Down syndrome or someone who is deaf or blind. We stand together in a society that disables us both. In this sense I have a familial responsibility from which I cannot escape, and a fear of God that compels me to:

Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute. Speak up and judge fairly; defend the rights of the poor and needy (Proverbs 31: 8, 9)

If this scripture was prefixed with 'you must', then we would be at the very heart of what is in the mind of disabled activists and those in the DPM. In the quest for basic human rights for disabled people the DPM would argue that no form of discrimination is to be left unchallenged. This makes complete sense, in that one cannot have partial human rights. This is a contradiction by definition. Either one has, or does not have, human rights. For instance, immediately following the London 2012 Paralympic Games, student Nadia Ahmed (2012) published a damning indictment of the Paralympic legacy as she was unable to find wheelchair accessible accommodation for herself in Tower Hamlets, a London borough close to where the Paralympic Games were held.

With this in mind, Paralympic sponsor Atos' connection with the WCA of disabled people, some of whom are the most vulnerable in society, and the subsequent hardship of many among the 600,000 who appealed decisions that went against them, is an enormous stumbling block. A Christian approach would be to ask what should be done to assist disabled people in receipt of benefits. The UK Government's approach has been to ask what can be taken from them, reinforcing the notion that benefits, in the UK at least, are a privilege rather than a right. The

media and film industry's stereotypical disabling imagery sets disabled people unhelpfully outside the rest of society as being 'something less or more than simply human' (Oliver and Barnes, 2012, p. 103). The two polar opposites of 'plucky, brave, courageous' versus 'victims, sufferers or unfortunate' in media images discussed by Barnes in 1994 are still prevalent today (Donnelly, 2016). The new danger for the DPM is the potential for the IPC's 'Paralympic movement' to negatively target the views and actions of the DPM. For instance, as stated in the introduction, Lakhani and Taylor (2012, p. 6) reported in *The Independent* UK newspaper that DPAC claimed that some disabled people had 'died after being declared fit to work'. One of the consequences of the DWP's sanctioning of Atos practices was that the DPM felt compelled to act. Conversely the IPC initially seemed unaware of any wrongdoing by Atos, and later went further by defending Atos and simultaneously criticizing the DPM; Sir Philip Craven (IPC President, and a disabled person) stated in *The Guardian* online:

All I can say is that we have a record over the last 60 or 65 years of being a fighter for the right causes. That's what we will continue to do. But where they [disability rights campaigners] seem to be very upset with this particular part of that company's organization, our experience within the Paralympic movement with Atos are very positive (Gibson, 2012).

It is now clear that the IPC and the DPM really are in opposition, whilst being simultaneously connected by disability. The public clash over Atos exposed the ideology of both and in the same article in *The Guardian* (2012), Craven encouraged journalists to drop the word 'disability' from their reporting, claiming that the Paralympics has nothing to do with disability and is just sport. This approach denies the reality that 'society disables people with impairments' including Paralympic athletes (Oliver and Barnes, 2012, p. 164). It is from ignorance and contempt that the IPC ignored the claim of disabled people's deaths resulting from Atos' assessments. The argument that the IPC is ignorant of disability issues beyond sport is arguably best supported by the incident of the state sponsored Russian doping scandal that led to the IPC banning the entire Russian team from the Rio 2016 Paralympics. The IPC were incensed by the Russian state's sponsoring of cheating, but by contrast appeared unaware of the UK Government's sponsoring of the squeeze on disabled people's benefits. The upbeat and positive narrative surrounding the Paralympic Games is

arguably easier for wider society to appreciate and support rather than, what appears to be, a complaining group of nameless disabled people whose organisations are largely unknown.

The distinction between the IPC and the DPM is perhaps most clearly understood if we simplify their intended goals. The IPC have strong social capital in the sports world and the worship of sport and the liturgy within it means that their social capital has spilled over into mainstream society (Harvey, 2014). By all appearances and dialogue, the IPC is content with its current status and is seeking to increase its global media reach. The Paralympic brand has 'made it'. The simplified intention of the IPC in one word is "acceptance", which they have achieved and will work to retain. The same process when applied to the DPM demonstrates that they, by comparison, have weak social capital, particularly in the media, are discontented with the status of their cause and are working hard to change that fact. The simplified intention of the DPM in one word is also "acceptance". Their belief is that society can make a difference to its fellow disabled citizens and that some adjustments are still needed, the following scripture helpfully explains this stance:

Our desire is not that others might be relieved while you are hard pressed, but that there might be equality. At the present time your plenty will supply what they need, so that in turn their plenty will supply what you need. Then there will be equality, as it is written: "He who gathered much did not have too much and he who gathered little did not have too little" (2 Corinthians 8:13-15).

The notion that equality comes from the powerful to the powerless, in the context of disability issues, suggests that disabled people need 'providing for'. However, disabled people can and do contribute to society, particularly in the decision making processes that affect their lives. The term 'disability' has such negative connotations that 'acceptance' of it is a pill too large for some to swallow. Evidence suggests that the IPC has successfully sugar coated disability by focusing on positive stereotypes, such as courageous and brave in the face of a supposed adversity (Peers, 2012a; Purdue and Howe, 2012). This is contrasted by disabled activists' use of the mocking term 'super-crip' (Barnes and Mercer, 2011, p. 193). Overly positive stereotyping presents the spectacle of the Paralympic Games as a modern day freak show and the result is aptly described by ex-Paralympian Danielle Peers as 'enfreakment' (Peers, 2012b, p. 308). It is clear that the Paralympic Games has its own peculiar liturgy, an upbeat

positive media narrative which is simultaneously resisted by disabled activists and embraced by Paralympians. Paralympic athletes are predominantly young disabled people who appear to laugh at adversity as well as themselves and not complain – the antithesis of the average disabled activist (Braye, *et al.* 2013). This contrast is likely to remain as an ongoing problem for the disability activist brand of the DPM which is almost completely overshadowed by the brand that is the Paralympic Games under the auspices of the IPC. As I have argued there is potential for one to kill the other.

Conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to argue that whilst IPC/Cain and DPM/Abel are related by their connection with disabled people, they remain opposed to one another. The DPM's position as the prime movement for disability equality across the whole strata of society is at risk from the IPC's claims that the Paralympic Games positively impacts disabled people beyond sport. The IPC's positive view of their relationship with Atos highlights the differing ideologies between themselves and the DPM. Reflecting on my opening argument that IPC/Cain may kill DPM/Abel:

And why did he murder him? Because his own actions were evil and his brother's were righteous (1 John 3:12).

Cain's offering of 'some of the fruits of the soil', was of little cost to him, whereas Abel's was a sacrifice of 'some of the firstborn of his flock' (Genesis 4:3, 4). There is no difference to God in the value of their offering, but rather the heart and motivation behind them. The IPC's willingness to compromise on how disabled people are viewed by the media, or treated in UK society, is for the purposes of extending their longevity, power and reach. This is like the security that Cain sought in building his city and the longevity he sought in extending his family (Ellul, 1970; Genesis 4:17). The DPM, by contrast, represent a robust Biblical righteousness in their refusal to compromise for the appearance of success. In regard to Abel's shed blood God said to Cain:

What have you done? Listen! Your brother's blood cries out to me from the ground...the ground which opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand (Genesis 4:10, 11).

The 2,380 disabled people that died after being declared fit for work by IPC sponsor Atos between December 2011 and February 2014 also cry out. They are an official Government statistic that cannot be ignored (Butler, 2015: DWP, 2015 p.8). That cry is suppressed by an overly positive view of disabled people expressed in the UK media and supported by the IPC. IPC/Cain muffles the cry of DPM/Abel.

The IPC's claim during the 2012 Paralympic Games opening ceremony, that rights for disabled people had been achieved is, I argue, deeply unethical and largely contrary to the Christian notion of championing the cause of the oppressed and marginalized. Moreover, to continue to claim that the Paralympics promotes equality for all disabled people in wider society is arguably evil. It is evil because it is killing off the DPM's righteous stance of doing the right thing, which is fighting for the most vulnerable people in society. The IPC's privileged position in UK society, including Government connections, is perhaps best proven by the number of BPA athletes and administrators being recognized in the UK's honours system with 57 awards being made in 2016. This position and recognition is not experienced by the DPM, and as the IPC becomes increasingly influential, the killing of the DPM's influence will arguably lead to further deaths of disabled people.

Notes

1. Wherever I use the term 'disabled', I do so in agreement with Paralympian Danielle Peers, ". . .to signal the active construction of disability. . ." (Peers, 2009, p. 663). Whilst some authors prefer the person-first term 'persons with disabilities', I define myself as a 'disabled person' and prefer the term 'disabled people'. I use this term to describe my fellow humans, who, like me, experience the socially constructed oppression of disability on a daily basis. It is the preferred term of the disabled people's movement in the UK, of which I have been a part since 1985, and academic disability studies writers in the UK.
2. All Bible references in this essay are from the 1989 edition of the New International Version (NIV).

References

- Ahmed, N. (2012). Paralympics 2012 legacy: accessible housing and disability equality or inequality? *Disability & Society*, 28(1), 129-133.
- Barnes, C. and Mercer, G. (2011). *Exploring disability: a sociological introduction*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- BBC (2012). Paralympics GB: who will compete for Great Britain in London? Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/disability-sport/18306674> [Accessed June 2016].
- Braye, S. (2014). Meet my exes: Theological reflections on disability and Paralympic sport - a continuum of ephemeral deaths and eternal resurrection'. *Journal of Disability and Religion*, 18(2), 127-141.
- Braye, S., Dixon, K. and Gibbons, T. (2013). 'A mockery of equality': an exploratory investigation into disabled activists' views of the Paralympic Games. *Disability & Society*, 28(7), 984-996.
- Braye, S., Dixon, K., and Gibbons, T. (2015). The 2012 Paralympics and perceptions of disability in the UK. In K. Dixon and T. Gibbons (Eds.), *The impact of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: diminishing contrasts, increasing varieties* (pp.15-34). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Pivot.
- Brittain, I. (2010). *The Paralympic Games explained*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Butler, P. (2015). Thousands have died after being found fit for work, DWP figures show. *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/aug/27/thousands-died-after-fit-for-work-assessment-dwp-figures> [Accessed 12 January 2017].
- Campbell, J., and M. Oliver. (1996). *Disability politics, understanding our past, changing our future*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Deaflympics (2016). Samsun 2017. Available at: <https://www.deaflympics.com/games.asp?2017-s> [Accessed 31 August 2016].
- Debord, G. (1994). *The society of the spectacle*. New York, NY: Zone Books. (Original work published 1967).
- Donnelly, C.E. (2016). Re-visioning negative archetypes of disability and deformity in fantasy: wicked, maleficent, and game of thrones. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 36(4), 7.
- DWP (August 2015). Mortality statistics: employment and support allowance, incapacity benefit or severe disablement allowance. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/459106/mortality-statistics-esa-ib-sda.pdf [Accessed 12 January 2017].
- Ellul, J. (1970). *The meaning of the city*. Translated by Pardee, D. Eugene. OR, USA: Eerdmans.
- Independent (2012). Trending at the Paralympics, *The Independent*, 31 August, 28-29.
- International Paralympic Committee (2016). Paralympics – history of the movement, Available at: <https://www.paralympic.org/the-ipc/history-of-the-movement> [Accessed: 7 September 2016].

- International Paralympic Committee (2015). Strategic Plan 2015-2018. Available at: https://www.paralympic.org/sites/default/files/document/150619133600866_2015_06+IPC+Strategic+Plan+2015-2018_Digital.pdf [Accessed 16 November 2016].
- Iranaeus (2014). *Against Heresies*, Book III, chapter 4. USA: Beloved Publishing. (Original work published c.180)
- Gentleman, A. (2013). 'Why I blew the whistle on Atos fitness-for-work test.' *The Guardian*, 31 July 2013. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2013/jul/31/atos-fitness-work-test-greg-wood> [Accessed: 30 August 2016].
- Gibson, O. (2012). Drop the word "Disabled" from games coverage, demands Paralympics committee president. *The Guardian*, 2012, <http://www.theguardian.com/sport/2012/aug/26/paralympics-philip-craven-disabled-disability>, [Accessed: 18 January 2017].
- Harvey, L. (2014). *A brief theology of sport*. London, UK: SCM Press.
- Hervey, L. (2016). British Paralympic athlete Bethy Woodward says she quit sport over classification concerns, Sky Sports News, 4 September 2016. Available at: <http://www.skysports.com/olympics/news/15262/10563942/british-paralympic-athlete-bethy-woodward-quits-sport-over-classification-concerns> [Accessed: 14 September 2016].
- Jasper, J.M. (2014). *Protest: a cultural Introduction to social movements*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Lakhani, N. and Taylor, J. (2012). Games sponsor targeted by disabled groups in benefits row. *The Independent*, 30 August, p.6.
- Oliver, M. (1996). *Understanding disability: from theory to practice*. London, UK: MacMillan Press.
- Oliver, M. and Barnes, C. (2012). *The new politics of disablement*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peers, D. (2009). (Dis)empowering Paralympic histories: Absent athletes and disabling discourses. *Disability & Society*, 24(5), 653–665.
- Peers, D. (2012a). Interrogating disability: the (de)composition of a recovering Paralympian, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 4(2), 175-188. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2012.685101>
- Peers, D. (2012b). Patients, athletes, freaks: Paralympism and the reproduction of disability, *Journal of Sport and Social Sciences*, 36(3), 295-316.

- Pring, J. (2016). 'Paralympic movement still run by non-disabled people, survey shows'. Disability News Service. Available at: <http://www.disabilitynewsservice.com/paralympic-movement-still-run-by-non-disabled-people-survey-shows/> [Accessed June 30 2016].
- Purdue, D.E.J. and Howe, P.D. (2012). See the sport, not the disability: exploring the Paralympic paradox, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 4(2), 189-205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2012.685102>
- Ramesh, R. (2012). Atos wins £400m deals to carry out disability benefit tests. *The Guardian*, 2 August 2012. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2012/aug/02/atos-disability-benefit-tests>, [Accessed: 14 December 2012].
- Siddique, H. (2014). Atos quits £500m work capability assessment contract early. *The Guardian*, 27 March 2014. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/mar/27/atos-quit-work-capability-assessment-contract-early> [Accessed: 30 August 2016].
- Swain, J., French, C., Barnes, C., and Thomas, C. (Eds.), (2014). *Disabling barriers – enabling environments*. London, UK: Sage.
- United Kingdom Disabled People's Council (2016). UKDPC What we do. Available at: <http://www.ukdpc.net/site/about-us> [Accessed: 7 September 2016].
- Woodin, S. (2014). Care: controlling and personalising services. In J. Swain, S. French, C. Barnes and C. Thomas (Eds.), *Disabling barriers – enabling environments* (pp.247-254). London, UK: Sage,