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

Puar understands debility as the binary opposition to capacity. Disability is an exceptionalised form of debility. The norm in the neoliberal society is capacity and everything apart from capacity is non-normative. Disability is hereby heavily pathologiesed. Debility is inscribed to certain groups like for example the LGBTQ community or black people. A white man is hereby losing his racial privilege through being gay (Puar: 151). This kind of inscribed debility and the daily struggle of everyday life is described as *slow death after L. Berlant*. It connotes? the difficulty to be seen as capable by the neoliberal world (which anyway can not be the goal). Slow death therefore describes the debilitating process of daily life this communities have to suffer due to the structural inequality in neoliberal societies.

*3. 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?*

Dignity as we understand it in today’s western society, is the maintenance of the constructed identity of the body? self, a second skin, which presents us as individualistic person, who knows how to control bodily functions and express oneself with and through the body in the respective situations. If this construct cannot be maintained for example because one loses the control of the body (ongoing diarrhea; rupturing tumours and the hereby resulting smell), also the dignity disappears. This becomes clear in the case of Deborah and her daughter, who „didn’t feel her mother had ‘any dignity’ at the end.“ (Lawton: 140) To die in dignity, the boundaries of the body have to maintain stable, or at least become stable again after disintegrate. In Gunaratnam’s text the African mother, who is grieving in a loud and for everybody noticeable manner is also breaking through the body boundaries. On the one hand through her own boundaries, because it is *common* in western society to keep the grief quiet and on the other hand, naturally tied to this she is *disturbing* the other patients, who should be able to die in dignity (without disturbing sound of grief). The western ideal of „personhood as self-controlled and privatised“ (Gunaratnam: 88) can remain through the locking away of anything d*isturbing* like smell and sound from the society. One could say, they are locked away in the side room.

This is good

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

*Differentialist racism* is, according to Balibar and Wallerstein (2009), „a racism which, at first sight, does not postulate the superiority of certain groups or peoples in relation to others but “only“ the harmfulness of abolishing frontiers, the incompatibility of life-styles and traditions“ (Gunaratnam: 87f).

As example, Gunaratnam cites an Oxford citizen who is complaining about the amplified prayers from a mosque near from his house: „People will have no choice but to have this message rammed down their throats“ (Gunaratnam: 87) – hence normalising some ways of life, and demonising others as interferning…. In Eves story, differentialist racism can explain the reaction of staff and English families to the loud grieving, which does not correspond to the western norm of how one should grieve.

*6. How is the ideal of body boundedness historically constituted (following Douglas, Bourdieu and Elias) and how is it maintained in the hospice?*

Douglas argues that the human body is a culturally elaborated and embedded product which stands in a dialectic relationship with the society. Since hygienic innovations and the rise of the individualistic Protestantism has mostly banned all kinds of bad smells out of the daily live, the society has become *deodorised.* Therefore also the individual body become *bounded.* „The social body constrains the way the physical body is perceived“ (Douglas 1970 cited as in Lawton 1998: 135). Bourdieu describes with his concept of the habitus, that the body acts as a mediator between social structures and individual action. Elias describes the privatisation of bodily functions such as spitting, urinating or defecating over the time, starting in western Europes upper classes and working its way through to the bourgeoisie and the lower classes. According to him, the body has developed from an open incomplete body to a bounded one with clearly defined boundaries.

Nice.