1. **What is debility and how is it different from disability according to Puar? How does Puar understand “slow death” in neoliberalism?**

Slow death is according to Puar the ongoingness of structural inequalities that disable certain populations…caused by the binarity of capacity and debility or able and disabled bodies. One example is This is enforced by the neoliberal healthcare system in the US based on financial profit. I tis important to note that i tis not a death as such but a slow exposure or wearing out in the continuous attempt in getting by or Living on (p.152). Debility is in neoliberalism positioned in contract to bodily capacity. no

1. **How does the focus on debility, capacity and internet technologies inform Puar’s critical (re)interpretation of Clementi’s suicide and Savage’s It gets better campaign? (for more empirical detail you might read the expanded version of the article in Puar 2017, pp. 1-12)**

Puar argues that internet has become a way that current generations live their affectionate lives or become neoliberal subjects (p.151). Rather than pointing out the difference between Clementi and his bullies through sexual identity, as it is being done in the public discourse, she invites us to see the similarities between all three students through the lens of internet use. The neoliberal binarity of capacity vs. debility divides actors into either group. According to Puar, Savage’s it gets better campaign insists on queer people being on the side of capacity. Similarly, queer theory and (white) gay subjects are becoming part of the imperative to be capable and productive just like any other debility will eventually attempt. That way the binarity is feeding capitalism and neoliberalism. Puar suggests an intersectional approach instead proposes to step out of the binarity. (p.153) she suggests to view C’s suicide in terms of slow death, not one off bullying…

1. **How is dignified dying understood in Lawton and Gunaratnam and how is this Western ideal threatened by the power of noise in Gunaratnam's text and smell in Lawton's text?**

Lawton writes that although palliative or hospice care should help to relieve distressing symptoms, it actually designed to remove the bodies of particular patients[describe who – those without bodily control … ] and cover them or make them invisible. Gunaratnam characterises idealised dying as toned down and quiet through institutionalised cared (such as hospices), while this understanding of dignified dying is culturally specific to the contemporary „western“ upper class world.

Lawton uses Douglas‘ definition of pollution behaviour as a deviation from cherished classifications to explain how smells that cannot be contained from attacking senses reverse the perfect world artificially constructed due to individualism. She describes how historically, subject were trained to control the bodily functions were gradually privatised and removed from public space.Continence is a constituting part of one’s individuality, an important achievemnt on the way to maturity. Incontinence of patients is therefore attacking the core values of the individualist society. What about noise in mourning?

1. **What are elements of a ‘differentialist racism’ (Balibar and Wallerstein) in Eve's exchange with Gunaratnam?**

Even though the nurse Eve claims this what? is not due to her being a white Brit and that she is mostly concerned about the comfort of the other families, she keeps mentioning „we do it like this, they do it differently“ and she deems those two ways of coping with death as incompatible (however noise and silence are incompatible, Gunaratnam also states that quiet gief does not necessarily have to mean silence). So where the racism

1. **How does a body become “unbounded” and how does this relate to selfhood and identity of the patients, family members and carers in Lawton’s study? To what extent it is a reversible process?**
2. **How is the ideal of body boundedness historically constituted (following Douglas, Bourdieu and Elias) and how is it maintained in the hospice?**

Elias describes the process of bodily taboos and regulations that took centuries to evolve and form together with the formation of western individualism. In this process, the originally public acts, such as defecation, were according to him removed form public space first in upper clases of the society and graduál emanated to the middle and lower classes as well.

1. **How might we understand the disturbance of bodily boundaries by smell or sound as a gift, an act of bodily hospitality?**

Lawton mentions that in other cultures, bodily fluids can be passed onto another person as a form of bonding ritual. Guanaratnam talks about Eve possibly benefiting from the irregularity and the compromise. She uses Derrida’s term of absolute responsibility of a simultaneous diision and binding between unconditional and conditional hospotality (p.89).

This feels very rushed and does not take care to explicate the concept for someone who does not know them. Only 4 questions necessary, but more detail and care needed here! Use spell check