CANADIAN JOURNAL OF
Disability Studies
Published by the Canadian Disability Studies Association | Association canadienne d'études sur le handicap

Canadian Journal of Disability Studies

Published by the Canadian Disability Studies Association
Association canadienne d'études sur le handicap

Hosted by The University of Waterloo

www.cjds.uwaterloo.ca

Trickster, Troublemaker, Provo-Q-ateur: Q Critiques Disability Representation in *Star Trek: The Next Generation*

Trickster, fauteur de troubles, provo-Q-ateur : Q critique la représentation du handicap dans Star Trek : The Next Generation

Sam Brierley
Arizona State University
sbrierley@asu.edu

Abstract

This article reads the provocative character Q of Star Trek: The Next Generation (TNG) as a trickster who "crips" ableist norms. Drawing on feminist disability studies and crip theory, it shows how the series decenters able-bodiedness by framing disability as an ordinary condition of embodiment. It demonstrates how TNG plays out the entanglements of disability, gender, and sexuality: Q critiques the performativity of heteromasculinity and highlights the feminization of disability in in the episode "Deja Q"; his provocations in the episode "Hide and Q" reveal how ableism and heteronormativity police masculine legitimacy. Finally, using Mitchell and Snyder's account of "narrative prosthesis," the article argues that "Deja Q" critiques disability representations in fiction through Q's adherence to—and ultimate upending of—the traditional narrative resolution of disability erasure. Overall, Q's trickster work within TNG's utopian sci-fi frame productively unsettles social norms around disability and makes visible the cultural scripts that attach moral value to able-bodiedness, inviting their revision.

Cet article analyse le personnage provocateur Q de *Star Trek : The Next Generation* (TNG) comme un trickster qui rend « *crip* » les normes capacitistes. En mobilisant les études féministes sur le handicap et la théorie *crip*, il montre que la série décentre la norme du corps sans handicap en le présentant comme une variation ordinaire de l'existence. L'analyse met en lumière l'intrication du handicap, du genre et de la sexualité. Q critique la performativité de l'hétéromasculinité et met en lumière la féminisation du handicap dans l'épisode « Déjà Q ». Ses provocations dans l'épisode « Dans la peau de Q » révèlent que le capacitisme et l'hétéronormativité régulent la légitimité masculine. En s'appuyant sur la

notion de « prothèse narrative » développée par Mitchell et Snyder, l’article soutient que « Déjà Q » propose une critique des représentations du handicap dans la fiction à travers l’adhésion de Q au dénouement narratif traditionnel qu’est l’effacement du handicap, puis le renversement de ce dénouement par Q. Dans l’ensemble, le travail de trickster accompli par Q dans le cadre utopique de la science-fiction de TNG déstabilise de manière significative les normes sociales entourant le handicap et rend visibles les narratifs culturels qui associent une valeur morale au corps sans handicap, ouvrant la voie à leur révision.

Keywords:

disability, Star Trek: The Next Generation, Q, norms, crip, gender and sexuality, narrative endings, trickster

Mots-clés

Handicap, *Star Trek : The Next Generation*, Q, normes, *crip*, genre et sexualité, fins narratives, trickster

Introduction

By design, provocateurs unsettle societal norms and prompt audiences to rethink cultural narratives about identity and difference. In science fiction such as Star Trek: The Next Generation (TNG), this provocation often centers around disability representation. As scholars note, "science fiction is a particularly potent site" for exploring disability; some argue that disability "is absolutely central to the genre," and it is "plausible that the genre of science fiction is as obsessed with disability as it is with space travel and alien contact."[1] I argue that Q, the omnipotent provocateur of the series, enables TNG to probe disability representation by ‘cripping’ ableist norms, beliefs, and behaviors.

This article draws on Feminist Disability Studies, which treats disability as socially constructed, similar to gender and sexuality. Rosemarie Garland-Thomson writes that this approach means “understanding the body as a cultural text that is interpreted, inscribed with meaning—indeed made—within social relations. Such a perspective advocates political equity by denaturalizing disability’s assumed inferiority, by casting it as difference rather than lack.”[2] Language plays a significant role in disability as a social construction; labels and diction reflect “both the cultural work and the limits of language.”[3] Accordingly, when I use scare quotes around ‘disability’ or call a character ‘disabled,’ it is not a lazy work-around for using a complicated word. Rather, the quotation marks signal the arbitrary nature of a societal construct projected onto ostensibly neutral bodies and critique “disability’s assumed inferiority” in bodies that are not “lack[ing],” but simply “different.” Further, I follow Robert McRuer’s lead in his usage of “crip”: “‘To crip,’ like ‘to queer,’ gets

at processes that unsettle and make strange or twisted”; “‘To crip,’ as a critical process, entails recognizing how certain bodily and mental experiences have been made pathological, deviant, or perverse and how such experiences have subsequently been marginalized or invisibilized.”[4] Practically, to crip is to queer—to skew, disrupt, and re-perceive. I extend this usage to bodies, machines, and systems: to make them stop ‘being able to’ long enough to expose and reimagine ableist logics. In this article, I explore the ways in which Q ‘crips’ disability representation.

Viewers and scholars alike define Q primarily by ability: Q’s “unlimited force” as “an all-powerful being,” “the omnipotent, omniscient joker,” a “super-being,” “a member of a godlike alien race,” “a sarcastic and omniscient being who can manipulate the space-time continuum with the snap of a finger.”[5] Even the last description, though it includes sarcasm, still frames personality through power. Yet Q’s encounters with the Enterprise are marked less by his omnipotence than by his chaos, humor, and moral testing of the crew, which makes this fixation on ability revealing. If the normalized able-bodiedness of 20th- and 21st-century Western culture is modeled by characters like William Riker, and ‘disability’ is modeled by characters like Geordi La Forge, then I propose a third category: Q as representative of super-ability.

The aim is not to intensify disability’s alterity but to devalue the over-credited worth of ability. Introducing super-ability destabilizes the ability/disability binary: ability is no longer the privileged center but a position in a hierarchy that no longer reigns as ‘superior.’ Within this disability/ability/super-ability hierarchy, Q deconstructs ability’s presumed

superiority, pulling ability toward disability and thereby exposing the brittleness of the boundary between them.

Q performs that deconstruction in a trickster register, using mischief as critique.[6] As an archetype, tricksters "are usually comical, yet serve to highlight important social values. They … profane nearly every central belief, but at the same time they focus attention precisely on the nature of such beliefs."[7] Tricksters queer, crip, and flip norms; their "primary function is to unsettle, continually recentring uncertainty and finitude in any discourse."[8] The 'disabled' body can also be read as a trickster. The same characteristics of the trickster figure—"chaos, rebellion, foolishness, failure, roughness and rudeness, lack of stability and control, irrational and uncivilised"—are the same traits often projected onto the 'disabled' body.[9] Disability studies likewise plays the provocateur, "levy[ing] its critiques of contemporary and historical representations while playing the trickster's game of being everywhere and nowhere at once."[10] Such play positions Q to challenge how disability is narrated. Studying Q as a trickster who crips disability narratives (both social narratives of disability and fictional narratives' representations of disability) provides a worthwhile experiment.

While Q appears in several Star Trek series including TNG, Deep Space Nine, and Voyager, I limit my focus here to only two episodes in TNG: "Hide and Q" (season 1, episode 10) and "Deja Q" (season 3, episode 13).[11] In these episodes, I examine how Q challenges, questions, and provokes both the crew and viewers about their perceptions and beliefs about disability. First, I look at how Q disrupts ableist logics by normalizing disability; then I take a deeper look into the ways in which Q troubles the intersections of

disability, gender, and sexuality; finally, I inspect the ways in which Q challenges disability tropes and narratives in his ‘happy ending’ in “Deja Q.”

Normalizing Disability

Norms produce disability by defining which capacities are considered valuable. Simon van der Weele argues that norms around ability often underwrite (un)ethical rationales for discounting, dismissing, or harming people labeled as disabled: “The very categorization of disability hinges on norms and values about ‘good’ health, ‘right’ abled embodiment, and ‘true’ human well-being.”[12] Normativity as we know it must be “questioned, challenged, and disrupted” in favor of a normativity that includes and uplifts disability; as van der Weele puts it, “normativity is ‘done’ by *undoing* it.”[13] Enter Q: a trickster-provocateur who disrupts ability-centered norms. Through humor and strategic disruption, he crips the “normal,” showing how ableist norms label bodies, allocate value, and police the boundaries of what constitutes an acceptable body. In practice, Q enacts the very “undoing” van der Weele describes—unseating ableist norms by undoing what it means to be able-bodied.

In “Hide and Q,” Q interrupts the crew on a dire rescue mission. When Riker urges that they must "help some suffering and dying humans,” Q flippantly quips, “Your species is always suffering and dying.”[14] The laugh lands first, but the line resets the baseline: suffering and mortality are not deviations from the norm—they are the norm. This calls forth the idea of TAB: temporary able-bodiedness. Lennard Davis notes, “The category of disability is permeable—anyone can become disabled . . . the acronym TAB (Temporarily

Able-Bodied) serves to remind us of the shaky footing on which normalcy [able-bodiedness] rests."[15] The fact that Q addresses this comment to Riker—the epitome of able-bodied normativity—reminds viewers that *all* bodies are either disabled or pre-disabled, destined to "suffe[r] and d[ie]" as an inevitable consequence of living.

Q's generalization that "your *species* is always suffering and dying" reframes disability as a condition of embodiment and, in McRuer's sense, crips the category of the human. As McRuer writes, crip theory not only unsettles problematic social constructs, but also "consistently points outward to the relations of power that constitute and reconstitute the social."[16] Q's comment contributes to that work: it decenters able-bodiedness and draws disability out of the margins toward the center as the true norm of human embodiment.

The episode "Deja Q" continues Q's normalization of disability, albeit in a trickstery, provocative way. The plot begins as the Q Continuum (Q's societal leaders) strips Q of omnipotence and renders him a mortal human as punishment for "torment[ing]" a less powerful species.[17] He is thus dis-abled in the most literal sense, in that he is now 'dis-' (not, opposite, lack of) 'abled' ("not being able to do something").[18] Q frames his new body as 'disabled' even though, by human standards, he is considered able-bodied; this contrast satirizes society's arbitrary thresholds for "abled" and "disabled". The episode uses this differentiation to expose how labels reflect shifting social expectations and histories, not fixed bodily truths. As Q learns to inhabit his mortal, dis-abled body, he repeatedly interrupts the crew's urgent rescue mission. The Calamarain, whom he once tormented, attack the now-powerless Q, forcing the *Enterprise* crew to protect him. Q

departs alone in a shuttlecraft, drawing the Calamarain away from the *Enterprise* to save the crew. The Continuum reads this self-sacrifice as redemptive and restores his omnipotence, rendering him super-abled again.

"Deja Q" turns the trickster inward, confronting Q with the ordinary terms of being human and exposing how easily able-bodiedness forgets its limits. Q tells Picard, "You've been a mortal all your life. You know all about dying. I've never given it a second thought. Or a first one, for that matter."[19] His fall from super-ability to mere ability exposes an able-bodied privilege: the ease of ignoring pain, decay, and death—an option often less available to people with disabilities. As a super-abled being, Q never had to register bodily limits; as a human, he loses the privilege of being able to forget those bodily limits. For able-bodied viewers, this encounter offers a mirror for their own limits and returns them to the baseline of "suffering and dying" inherent to all bodies—disabled or pre-disabled.

Q's words and actions explicitly disrupt the presumed normalcy of able-bodiedness. He declares, "I stand before you defrocked, condemned to be a member of this lowest of species, a normal, imperfect, lumpen human being."[20] The line affiliates "normal" with "imperfect" and "lumpen," collapsing the hierarchy that determines bodies as acceptable or aberrant. From Q's perspective, all humans—impairments, prosthetics, and all—are ordinary; it is particular human cultures that relate certain abilities to concepts of normal/abnormal. As Davis notes, "Disability scholars want to examine the constructed nature of concepts like 'normalcy' and to defamiliarize them," which is exactly what Q's mortalized, 'disabled' persona does.[21] Complaining to Worf, he itemizes embodiment's hazards: "Being too hot or too cold, growing feeble with age, losing my hair, catching a

disease, being ticklish, sneezing, having an itch, a pimple, bad breath."[22] The list mingles minor, temporal states with conditions considered disabling, effectively recoding disability as ordinary.

The classification of disability itself echoes the same mixture of quotidian and life-altering states of being as Q's list. Garland-Thomson writes, "Disability is an overarching and in some ways artificial category that encompasses congenital and acquired physical differences, mental illness . . . chronic and acute illnesses, fatal and progressive diseases, temporary and permanent injuries, and a wide range of bodily characteristics considered disfiguring, such as scars, birthmarks, unusual proportions, or obesity."[23] Read together, Q's comic inventory and Garland-Thomson's capacious taxonomy underscore disability's breadth and heterogeneity as an umbrella category—for better and for worse. In both lists, the boundary between the "everyday" and the "pathological" blurs, signaling how far the category stretches. For Q, senescence and disease are as normal as bad breath—banal facts of embodiment. This accords with Garland-Thompson's point that "The concept of disability unites a highly marked, heterogeneous group whose only commonality is being considered abnormal. . . Disability is the unorthodox made flesh, refusing to be normalized."[24] Q—abnormal by his own account despite fitting the crew's able-bodied norms—puts pressure on the supposed stability of "normal" by categorizing the 'abnormal' with the normal, making all aspects of embodiment thus 'normal.'

Q's newfound experiences with pain also disrupts viewers' perceptions of disability as 'abnormal.' When he experiences painful muscle spasms in his back, Q turns to La Forge and Data—both with visible 'disabilities'—and asks, "What's the right thing to say?

Ow?”[25] The joke works because pain is familiar; at the same time, his uncertainty spotlights how hard pain is to name and share. If ‘cripping’ is disrupting “normative ideals . . . and encouraging new ways of thinking,” then Q’s tentative question crips the ableist habit of treating pain as aberrant or as belonging to someone else.[26] It relocates pain from the margins to the center of human experience. That relocation matters: it gestures toward the routine dismissal of people with chronic pain and challenges the reflex to minimize what cannot be easily expressed. Because Q performs pain in a ‘disabled’ body while inhabiting a human form considered able-bodied, he becomes a bridge—able-bodied and ‘disabled’ audiences alike can locate themselves in his bewilderment. This universal relation to pain decenters able-bodiedness and recasts pain as a shared condition of embodiment, not a deviation. Taken together, these moments show how Q’s cripping of the ‘normal’ dislodges able-bodiedness from the center and reframes disability as an inherent condition of life.

Disability, Gender, and Sexuality

Disability, gender, and sexuality are co-constructed: social perceptions of bodies become the criteria by which identities are named, sorted, and policed. I group gender and sexuality here not because they are identical, but because they are often co-performed and can be analyzed together. I use the term ‘heteromasculinity’ to name the heteronormative masculinity upheld by patriarchal systems that center cisgender masculinity and heterosexuality as the norm. The term heteromasculinity does not

collapse gender and sexuality into one; it marks their entanglement within heteronormative patriarchy.

In *Crip Theory*, Robert McRuer argues that able-bodiedness is intertwined with heteronormativity and heterosexuality in dominant U.S. culture; to perform one’s gender and sexuality, one also performs able-bodiedness. Conversely, the queer body is presumed “disabled” in some way: both queer and disabled bodies are “understood as a distinct type of person, whose difference [is] legible on the body.”[27] That linkage slides quickly to gendered readings: anything short of visible able-bodiedness in male-identifying people is cast through an effeminizing lens, producing the misperception that disabled men are effeminate and/or nonsexual. This can lead to the problematic “assumption that sexuality is inappropriate in disabled people.”[28] We see this entanglement in two episodes: “Deja Q,” where disability is feminized as Q becomes dis-abled, and “Hide and Q,” where the male bridge crew are permitted performances of heterosexuality only insofar as they appear able-bodied. Q troubles these couplings by exposing and manipulating their conditions.

Feminization in “Deja Q”

Q enters “Deja Q” naked, on his side, hovering in the air. The camera stages Q so that Picard’s body blocks his male genitalia from view—a purposeful feminizing gesture. The camera frames him in a passive, vulnerable pose akin to a feminized art nude, emphasizing his newly mortal flesh. In this opening scene, dis-ability and feminization arrive together: Q’s newly human body is framed as both vulnerable and gendered. This pairing is well-

documented in scholarship: “Many parallels exist between the social meanings attributed to female bodies and those assigned to disabled bodies. Both the female and the disabled body are cast as deviant and inferior.”[29] In fact, the bodily experiences Q faces is rather reminiscent of pregnancy—a condition considered by some to be a “temporary disability”—the ultimate embodiment of the feminine.[30] Throughout the episode, Q experiences back pain, hunger pangs, mood swings, and fatigue. When he asks Data how to decide what to eat when hungry, Data responds that Deanna Troi “usually eats something chocolate,” adding, “I have seen it have a profound psychological impact.” Q immediately orders ten chocolate sundaes, creating a direct comparison between himself and Troi—the most overtly feminine woman in the crew.[31] Q immediately orders ten chocolate sundaes, staging a direct comparison with Troi—the crew’s most overtly feminine figure—and, by excess, out-performing the feminine script. The fact that he immediately decides to eat none of them highlights the false association between femininity and disability.

Garland-Thomson draws undeniable parallels between the disabled body and the female and/or feminine body, arguing that the two are “inextricably entangled in patriarchal culture.”[32] She goes on to list the ways in which the historic “practices of femininity have configured female bodies similarly to disability,” such as foot binding and corseting, to which I add that the ultimate sign of femininity (within a patriarchal culture)—pregnancy—is a direct combination of womanhood and disability. Q’s pregnancy-like gestures mirror this entanglement; at one point he braces his lower back as if easing the heavy burden of a swollen belly.

The clearest marker of Q’s feminization is the stark contrast between his dis-abled interlude and the hypermasculine revelry that follows his “restored” super-ability: after the Continuum “cures” him for sacrificing himself to save the crew, Q celebrates with a caricature of straight, able-bodied power. He conjures a Mariachi band, cigars, and sexualized women for Picard, Riker, and Worf—arguably the ship’s most heteronormatively masculine officers. The tableau verges on camp: Mariachi is culturally coded with machismo and cigars are overtly phallic. Crucially, the women are presented as prizes allocated to men—whom Riker labels “fantasy women”—so that heterosexual access to women becomes both the proof and the means of restored capacity.[33] This display aligns able-bodiedness with hypermasculine heterosexuality: once Q appears able-bodied, the scene immediately scripts him (and the crew) back into the norms of straight masculine performance. The dramatic pivot from feminine, ‘disabled’ embodiment to able-bodied heteromasculinity reveals the extent of gender and disability’s co-constructed entanglement.

The episode demonstrates that disability itself is gendered, not just the bodies that are assigned as such. As Elizabeth Donaldson notes, literary culture often genders disability by casting women’s as “congenital and chronic” and men’s as “coincidental and curable.”[34] “Deja Q” reproduces that pattern. Because the Continuum both causes and reverses Q’s condition, the episode frames disability not as constitutive of identity or as a congenital sign of (supposed) weakness, but as a temporary plot problem, resolved the moment masculinity and heterosexuality are resecured. As the episode alternately genders Q, it foregrounds how disabled male bodies are often feminized because the same

“institutions in our culture that produce and secure a heterosexual identity also work to secure an able-bodied identity.”[35] In “Deja Q,” heteronormativity and able-bodiedness act as mutual validators: Q’s restored super-ability and his heteromasculine performance effectively ‘cure’ one another. As Janice Hladki notes, “Masculinity is also constituted through a normalizing emphasis on surviving injury and deformity . . . and the capacity for rehabilitation from injury and disease.”[36] Q “surviv[es]” his (so-called) “deformity,” which licenses his reentry into masculinity and heteronormativity; in turn, the mariachi, cigars, and “fantasy women” operate as evidence of his “rehabilitation from injury and disease.”

In true trickster fashion, Q stages an exaggerated social display to reveal gendered, ableist couplings—only to trouble them in the final moments. After he vanishes, Picard muses, “Perhaps there’s a residue of humanity in Q after all.” Instantly, a lit cigar appears in Picard’s hand and Q’s disembodied voice replies, “Don’t bet on it, Picard.”[37] The term ‘residue’ invites a double reading. On one level it names what lingers: the episode leaves behind traces of Q’s time in a feminized, ‘disabled’ body, suggesting he is not as “rehabilitat[ed]” as the hyper-masculine performance would present. On another level, the word’s material associations (what clings, stains, or leaks) resonate with the episode’s pregnancy-coded motifs, connoting bodily fluids of the feminine, ‘disabled’ body such as those of menstruation or childbirth. The cigar—an emblem of heteromasculine able-bodiedness—seems to restore the old order, yet the restoration is itself authored by Q, now bodiless. Masculinity and able-bodiedness arrive as props he conjures, not essences inherent to the male body. In that final beat, Q both bequeaths and withholds closure: his voice affirms that the social script has resumed, even as it reveals the script’s

ventriloquism. Read this way, the episode’s last gesture reframes the celebration as critique; it demonstrates the linkage of ability with masculinity and heterosexuality is a trick that can be staged, amplified, and just as easily unraveled.

Emasculation in “Hide and Q”

In “Hide and Q,” Q grants Riker omnipotence—functionally, super-ability—and Riker sets out to please the crew with “gifts of affection,” trying to “guess [their] dreams” and “g[i]ve them something [he] know[s] they’d like.”[38] As the crew rejects their “gifts,” Riker finally realizes the ableist error of his ways and the episode ends as the crew are restored to their original bodies and circumstances. Riker’s ‘gifts’ for La Forge and Worf (able-bodied vision and a Klingon sexual partner, respectively) display a problematic entanglement of disability and sexuality; Riker treats able-bodiedness as the precondition for masculine competence and heterosexual fulfillment. Offering La Forge able-bodied vision implies that his existing body is inadequate (I explore its relation to heterosexuality momentarily); offering Worf a Klingon sexual partner implies he lacks the means to fulfill his own heterosexual needs. In both cases, Riker’s assumptions do the emasculating—they script La Forge and Worf as deficient men in need of correction or provision. Their refusals reject that script, defending self-definition and sexual agency. The episode is didactic, but useful: when care is equated with ‘cure’ and desire with possession, ableism and heteronormativity converge to diminish male bodies that do not conform to able-bodiedness or heteromasculine norms. By making those assumptions visible and

rejectable, the episode exposes the fragile linkage of able-bodiedness, masculinity, and heterosexuality.

Riker’s “gift” to La Forge begins with presumption—“I know what you want”—and he alters La Forge’s vision before La Forge has the chance to respond. The gesture turns the gift into a verdict on La Forge’s body: treated as defective, it must be repaired. The moral is heavy-handed, but La Forge’s behavior once his vision changes complicates the scene. When La Forge removes his VISOR, two sights awe him—the starscape on the main screen and Tasha Yar—and he tells her, “You’re as beautiful as I imagined, and more.” [39] She is the only person who elicits a personal reaction from La Forge. The scene thus codes visual normativity as the gateway to heterosexual desire: La Forge’s attraction existed (“as I imagined”) but is framed as activated and legible only once he is able-bodied.

Notably, Riker does not “gift” La Forge a lover (as he does for Worf); he prioritizes ‘curing,’ implying that disability must be ‘fixed’ before sexuality can be properly performed. Up to this point in the series, La Forge has not overtly pursued Yar, yet within moments of the visual ‘cure’ he praises her beauty. To be clear, La Forge has clear vision due to the assistive technology of the VISOR: he sees in infrared light, so he is able to see Yar’s physical body just fine prior to Riker’s “gift.” Furthermore, one of the distinguishing characteristics of La Forge during the series is his explicit desire for a romantic partner (he never finds a long-term partner in the show’s seven full seasons). If Riker truly did “know what [La Forge] want[s],” it would most likely be a heteronormative romantic relationship—not a different type of vision. The sequence scripts La Forge as sexually inoperative until

corrected, equating able-bodied sight with masculine, heterosexual address—and by deciding for him, it also sidelines his consent and agency.

Garland-Thomson argues that adaptations to the body are permitted when they move a body toward culturally sanctioned gender ideals (cosmetics, corseting, foot binding), but modifications that do not advance those ideals—such as assistive devices or ‘atypical’ embodiments (calipers, insulin pumps, mastectomy surgeries)—are cast as disfiguring and abnormal.[40] In this visual economy, so-called “beautification practices” center the body within the norm, while ‘disability’ instruments and procedures relegate it to the margins. This binary is reflected in how altered bodies are looked at: “Feminization prompts the gaze; disability prompts the stare.”[41] Riker’s choice of “gift” plays as a makeover: removing La Forge’s VISOR “beautifies” him by aligning his body with the ideal of able-bodied masculinity, implicitly casting La Forge’s nonnormative vision as deviation from that ideal. The VISOR removal reprises the familiar makeover trope—akin to the ‘glasses-off’ reveal in popular romance—where desirability becomes legible only after normalization. The scene immediately tests this alignment: once visually “normalized,” La Forge is able to turn to Tasha Yar—conventionally attractive and able-bodied—and say, “You’re as beautiful as I imagined.” Within the episode’s logic, desirability becomes legible and actionable only after the assistive device is erased. Now free from the “stare” of others, La Forge is able to “gaze” upon Yar.

Riker then turns to Worf.[42] Notably, Worf is not treated as ‘disabled’ by the crew—only by Q—underscoring the socially constructed nature of disability. Worf promptly rejects Riker’s “gift” of a Klingon female partner: “I have no place for it in my life.” Q,

astonished, snaps, "No place, micro-brain? What possesses you?"[43] By naming Worf "micro-brain," Q momentarily recasts him as having a mental disability; within that frame, Riker's offer implies Worf's sexuality is defective and requires provisioning. The logic echoes long-standing tropes in which men with intellectual disabilities are "variously characterized as childish, beastly, and feminised," so their desires are policed or redirected.[44] In this scene, heterosexual access is imagined as something to be granted to a 'lesser' man, binding ableism to heteronormativity. Worf's refusal is key—not because he lacks heterosexual capacity, but because it rejects the premise that masculinity and sexual legitimacy depend on an ableist certification or approval. "Hide and Q" thus pairs a didactic critique of cure-as-care with a more troubling entanglement of disability and sexuality that risks reinstating the very assumptions it seeks to expose.

Taken together, these episodes show that the intertwinings of disability, gender, and sexuality are as tangled as they are troubled. The ways in which "health and ability [are] naturally linked to heterosexuality" generate binaries that marginalize queerness and disability—often in compounding ways.[45] "Deja Q" makes visible how disability and gender are socially constructed, unsettling the societal narrative of disability and gender as inherent, biological factors; "Hide and Q," even as it affirms disability's value, inadvertently reinscribes scripts that feminize or emasculate disabled men. Read through Q's trickster provocations, however, these linkages are shown to be performative and provisional: able-bodiedness aligns with heteromasculinity only insofar as the narrative stages it. The critical payoff is clear: in *TNG*, disability, gender, and sexuality operate as scripts, not essences. Seeing them as scripts lets us dislodge able-bodied

heteronormativity from the center—and it is precisely this dislodging that Q’s antics model and invite.

Disability and Narrative Endings

Fiction routinely loads disability with the work of additional metaphor and meaning. Jay Dolmage identifies the “kill or cure” pattern that resolves disabled characters by elimination or medical restoration; David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder describe disability’s overdetermined metaphorical function as a “narrative prosthesis”; Amanda Leduc shows how fairy tales frame bodily difference as enchantment or fate.[46] However one models disability, the figure of the disabled character is asked to carry causal, moral, and thematic burden disproportionate to other traits. “Deja Q” both participates in and troubles this economy. On the surface it chooses “cure”: Q’s powers are restored and the interlude of ‘dis-ability’ ends. Yet the episode satirizes the cure’s logic (by tying “restoration” to hypermasculine spectacle) and refuses tidy closure: the final, disembodied “Don’t bet on it, Picard” undermines the norm-affirming “happy ending” a cure is meant to provide. Read through Q’s trickster function, the episode exposes cure as a staged effect rather than a natural telos—the narrative prosthesis is displayed, then destabilized.

Mitchell and Snyder outline “a simple schematic of narrative structure” for disability with four main steps, and Q’s arc in “Deja Q” tracks it closely. Step one—“first, a deviance or marked difference is exposed to a reader”—is literalized in the opening image: Q’s naked, human body hangs suspended, starkly “exposed” to the viewer.[47] The opening naked exposure singles out his dis-abled body; even once dressed, the plain gray jumpsuit

continues to differentiate him from the uniformed crew. Step two—the "narrative consolidates the need for its own existence by calling for an explanation of the deviation's origins and formative consequences"—unfolds through dialogue and plot pressure.[48] Q must explain why he is suddenly mortal (punishment by the Continuum) and confront what follows from that loss of capacity: pain, hunger, fear of death, dependence on the crew, and vulnerability to bodily harm. These exchanges not only justify the episode's focus on his altered embodiment; they also translate "difference" into stakes (endangering the mission, drawing hostile attention). Q's 'disability' is the engine that propels the episode's inquiry into embodiment and consequence.

Step three—when "the deviance is brought from the periphery of concerns to the center of the story to come"—arrives as the Calamarain target the *Enterprise* because of Q's past abuse of them.[49] Now 'disabled,' Q is the locus of danger and the obstacle to the crew's rescue mission. The episode forces a dilemma: choose personal safety and remain under the *Enterprise's* protection, endangering both crew and the imperiled planet the crew is trying to save, or choose certain pain and (near-certain death) and leave in a shuttlecraft to draw the Calamarain away and save the crew. This turn sharpens the disability narrative's stakes but also exposes its bias. Q's 'disability' is explicitly framed as punishment (the Continuum revokes omnipotence for his ableist harassment), casting disability as moral consequence. His solution of self-sacrifice leans toward "kill" of the kill-or-cure trope, eliminating the 'disabled' body; the aftermath—restoration—reverts to "cure," erasing the 'disability' as a reward. Together these plot points present disability as temporary chastening: a negative state to be endured until a lesson is learned. In other

words, the episode centers disability to generate crisis and redemption, confirming Mitchell and Snyder’s schema even as Q’s trickster framing reveals the machinery at work.

The fourth step occurs when the “deviance” is “rehabilitate[d] or fixe[d] . . . in some manner. This fourth step . . . may involve an obliteration of the difference through a ‘cure,’ the rescue of the despised object from social censure, the extermination of the deviant as a purification of the social body, or the revaluation of an alternative mode of being.”[50] In “Deja Q,” step four appears as a combination of several closure types at once. On the surface, ‘cure’ arrives when the Continuum restores Q’s omnipotence; a limited “rescue from social censure” appears in the crew’s willingness to shield him despite past harms. Q performs an “extermination of the deviant as a purification of the social body” when he sacrifices himself to be “exterminat[ed]” by the Calamarain; furthermore, his shuttlecraft flight away from the *Enterprise* enacts a sort of “purification of the social body,” literally expelling the “deviant” body from the larger social body.

Most importantly, the coda gestures toward “revaluation of an alternative mode of being.” Picard’s line—“Perhaps there’s a residue of humanity in Q after all”—names a trace that sticks. Q’s reply—“Don’t bet on it, Picard”—is delivered without a body, while a cigar materializes in Picard’s hand. The staging separates the symbols of masculine able-bodiedness from embodiment, casting them as performative props Q can conjure rather than essences anchored in a stable, corporal form. It is not only Picard’s remark about a “residue” that models “an alternative mode of being”; Q’s conduct toward the Calamarain also shifts after his ‘restoration.’ Before inhabiting a ‘disabled’ body, he openly “torment[s]” them. Once “restored,” he reprises that posture—shrinking the Calamarain

to his palm and warning, “If you think I tormented you in the past, my little friends—wait until you see what I do with you now.” [51] Yet, he does not make good on the threat. Under the Continuum’s watch, he disperses them rather than retaliating. Fear of losing omnipotence again is plainly part of his calculation, but the result nonetheless is tempered power: excess checked, cruelty withheld. The moment also rubs against his own sneer that humans are “all sopping over with compassion and forgiveness. The human race can't wait to absolve almost any offense.”[52] Taken together, the final scene’s “residue” and this restraint illustrate Q’s “alternative mode of being” as a more compassionate being.

Q’s arc both follows and unsettles Mitchell and Snyder’s pattern for disability stories. “Deja Q” completes the pattern, but it also reveals the gears underneath: the macho “restoration” is a performance, and a small “residue” of his ‘disability’ remains. Mitchell and Snyder argue, “Narrative approaches disability as a wound in need of a dressing, and thus the narrative act is completed only to the extent that the breach is healed and a disruptive anomaly is concealed.”[53] Q’s sticky “residue of humanity” (‘disability’) leaves the wound visible—unconcealed, unhealed, neither killed nor cured. The episode thus completes the prosthetic cycle while showing its seams: disability is removed but the supposed return to normal does not quite ring true. In short, the episode grants closure but makes it feel forced, nudging viewers to read ability, gender, and disability as staged choices rather than fixed traits.

Conclusion

As Garland-Thomson reminds us, disability “is perhaps the most universal of human experiences. After all, if we live long enough, we will all become disabled.”[54] Read with that premise, Q’s provocations in *Star Trek: The Next Generation* do not simply trouble the crew; they expose how able-bodiedness operates as a script that can be performed, reassigned, and resisted.

This essay advances three main claims. First, Q ‘crips’ norms around able-bodiedness by destabilizing the binary of ability/disability; instead of ability/disability, he reframes all bodies as either disabled or pre-disabled, changing the harsh, binarizing line into a faint threshold of temporal inevitability. He recasts pain and limitation as ordinary conditions of embodiment, normalizing disability. Second, the series feminizes disability and couples able-bodiedness with heteromasculinity; through Q’s staged extremes (feminized vulnerability and an orchestrated return to ‘able-bodied’ heteromasculinity), those couplings read as performance rather than essence. Third, “Deja Q” deploys the familiar cure ending yet exposes its scaffolding: restoration is declared, a swaggering celebration is staged, and a faint trace of ‘disability’ remains. The episode thus ‘crips’ its own conclusion, letting the narrative—and the character’s—“wound” show beneath the performative dressing of a tidy happy ending.

Science fiction—especially in its utopian modes like that of *TNG*—works as a systems lab: it prototypes social arrangements, stress-tests inclusivity, and spotlights the cultural logics that maintain norms around disability. Q is useful because he runs the very routines that bind able-bodiedness to virtue, disability to gender and sexuality, and “care”

to correction—then plays them until their constructedness cannot be missed. Allan and Cheyne state, “Disentangling representations of disability in science fiction and fantasy, genres that are themselves often relegated to the margins of traditional literary study, might well be the next frontier.”[55] Taking that charge seriously means reading—and building—futures where access is designed in, ‘cure’ is optional, and disability is treated as a fact of life rather than a narrative problem to eliminate.

Endnotes

[1] See Kathryn Allan and Ria Cheyne, "Science Fiction, Disability, Disability Studies: A Conversation," *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 14, no. 4 (2020): 390, 389; Bérubé, Michael. “Disability and Narrative,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 120, no. 2 (2005): 568.
[2] Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability In American Culture and Literature* (Columbia University Press, 1997), 22.
[3] Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, “Feminist Disability Studies,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30, no. 2 (2005): 1559.
[4] See Robert McRuer, “Crip,” in *Keywords for Radicals*, 115, and Robert McRuer, "Disability Studies," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature*.
[5] See Justin Ream and Alexander Lee, “Material Agency: The Limits of Technostructure in the 24th Century.” 85; Duncan Barrett and Michèle Barrett, Star Trek*: The Human Frontier* , 28.Larry Grant, “An Impossible Standard: Dangerous Knowledge, Moral Progress and the Prime Directive,” 27; Judith Barad and Ed Robertson, *The Ethics of* Star Trek (HarperCollins Publishers, 2000), 51; Daniel Bernardi, *Star Trek and History: Race-Ing Toward a White Future*, 119.
[6] Although Q is genderless (or perhaps genderfluid), Q appears as a white male humanoid figure. I will therefore use he/him pronouns when referring to Q in this article.
[7] William Hynes and William Doty, *Mythical Trickster Figures: Contours, Contexts, and Criticisms* (University of Alabama Press, 1993), 34.
[8] Sunny Dhillon, “The Trickster Archetype: Education to Stupefy,” *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 59, no. 1 (2025): 187.
[9] Dhillon, “Trickster Archetype,” 189.
[10] David T. Mitchell and Sharon L Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse* (University of Michigan Press, 2014), 44.
[11] *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, season 1, episode 10, “Hide and Q,” directed by Cliff Bole, written by C.J. Holland, aired November 21, 1987, in broadcast syndication, Paramount. *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, season 3, episode 13, “Deja Q,” directed by Les Landau, written by Richard Danus and Ronald Moore, aired February 3, 1990, in broadcast syndication, Paramount.
[12] Simon van der Weele, “‘Doing’ Normativity in Disability Studies: Soft Suggestions Towards an Empirical Ethics of Disability,” *Disability & Society*, 39, vol. 3 (2024): 526.
[13] Van der Weele, “‘Doing’ Normativity,” 532.
[14] “Hide and Q.”
[15] Lennard Davis, “Crips Strike Back: The Rise of Disability Studies,” *American Literary History* 11, no. 3 (1999): 502.
[16] McRuer, “Disability Studies.”
[17] “Deja Q.”
[18] Carol Thomas, “Disability Theory: Key Ideas, Issues and Thinkers,” in *Disability Studies Today*, ed. Colin Barnes, Mike Oliver, and Len Barton (Polity Press, 2002), 38.
[19] “Deja Q.”
[20] “Deja Q.”
[21] Davis, “Crips Strike Back,” 504.
[22] “Deja Q.”

[23] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 13.
[24] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 24.
[25] “Deja Q.”
[26] Dan Goodley, “The Dis/Ability Complex.” *DiGeSt. Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies* 5, no. 1 (2018): 10.
[27] Robert McRuer, *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability* (New York University Press, 2006), 11.
[28] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 25.
[29] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 19.
[30] The state of California considers pregnancy as a “temporary disability,” and any “employee disabled by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition is entitled to up to four months of disability leave per pregnancy” at their place of employment. State of California Civil Rights Department, *Pregnancy Disability Leave Fact Sheet*, 2022.
[31] “Deja Q.”
[32] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 27.
[33] “Deja Q.”
[34] Elizabeth Donaldson, “The Corpus of the Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness,” *NWSA Journal* 14, no. 3 (2002): 109.
[35] McRuer, *Crip Theory*, 151.
[36] Janice Hladki, "Hazardous Futures and Damned Embodiments: Disability and White Masculinization in Science Fiction Film," *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 14, no. 4 (2020): 457.
[37] “Deja Q.”
[38] “Hide and Q.”
[39] “Hide and Q.”
[40] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 27-28.
[41] Garland-Thomson, *Extraordinary Bodies*, 27-28.
[42] His assumption that Worf wants above all else a female sexual partner enforces heteronormative expectations, and while it is meant to be an embrace of Klingon culture, Riker’s choice to give Worf a Klingon partner implies an anti-interracial message.
[43] “Hide and Q.”
[44] Valerie Pedlar, *The Most Dreadful Visitation: Male Madness in Victorian Fiction* (Liverpool University Press, 2006), 16.
[45] McRuer, *Crip Theory*, 11.
[46]See Jay Dolmage, *Disability Rhetoric* (Syracuse University Press, 2014); Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*; Amanda Leduc, *Disfigured: On Fairy Tales, Disability, and Making Space* (Coach House Books, 2020).
[47] Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*, 53.
[48] Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*, 53.
[49] Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*, 53.
[50] Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*, 53-54.
[51] “Deja Q.”
[52] “Deja Q.”
[53] Mitchell and Snyder, *Narrative Prosthesis*, 164.

[54] Garland-Thomson, “Feminist Disability Studies,” 1568.

[55] Allan and Cheyne, “Science Fiction,” 496.

Bibliography

Allan, Kathryn and Ria Cheyne, "Science Fiction, Disability, Disability Studies: A Conversation." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 14, no. 4 (2020): 387-401.

Barad, Judith A, and Ed Robertson. *The Ethics of* Star Trek. HarperCollins Publishers, 2000.

Barrett, Duncan, and Michèle Barrett. *Star Trek: The Human Frontier*. Taylor & Francis Group, 2016.

Bernardi, Daniel. Star Trek *and History: Race-Ing Toward a White Future*. Rutgers University Press, 1998.

Bérubé, Michael. “Disability and Narrative.” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 120, no. 2 (2005): 568–76.

Danus Richard and Ronald Moore, writers. *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. Season 3, episode 13, "Deja Q." Directed by Les Landau. Aired February 3, 1990, in broadcast syndication. Paramount.

Davis, Lennard J. “Crips Strike Back: The Rise of Disability Studies.” *American Literary History* 11, no. 3 (1999). 500–512. https://doi.org/10.1093/alh/11.3.500

Dhillon, Sunny. “The Trickster Archetype: Education to Stupefy.*” Journal of Philosophy of Education* 59, no. 1 (2025): 184–97.

Dolmage, Jay. *Disability Rhetoric*. Syracuse University Press, 2014.

Donaldson, Elizabeth J. “The Corpus of the Madwoman: Toward a Feminist Disability Studies Theory of Embodiment and Mental Illness.” *NWSA Journal* 14, no. 3 (2002).

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. *Extraordinary Bodies: Figuring Physical Disability in American Culture and Literature*. Columbia University Press, 1997.

Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. “Feminist Disability Studies.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30, no. 2 (2005): 1557-87.

Goodley, Dan. “The Dis/Ability Complex.” *DiGeSt. Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies* 5, no. 1 (2018): 5–22.

Grant, Larry. “An Impossible Standard: Dangerous Knowledge, Moral Progress and the Prime Directive.” In *Exploring Picard’s Galaxy: Essays on* Star Trek: The Next Generation, edited by Peter Lee. MacFarland and Company, 2018.

Hladki, Janice. "Hazardous Futures and Damned Embodiments: Disability and White Masculinization in Science Fiction Film." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 14, no. 4 (2020): 453-67.

Holland, C.J., writer. *Star Trek: The Next Generation*. Season 1, episode 10, "Hide and Q." Directed by Cliff Bole. Aired November 21, 1987, in broadcast syndication. Paramount.

Hynes, William, and William Doty, eds. *Mythical Trickster Figures: Contours, Contexts, and Criticisms*. University Alabama Press, 1993.

Leduc, Amanda. *Disfigured: On Fairy Tales, Disability, and Making Space*. Coach House Books, 2020.

McRuer, Robert. “Crip.” In *Keywords for Radicals: The Contested Vocabulary of Late-Capitalist Struggle*, edited by Kelly Fritsch, Clare O'Connor, and A.K. Thompson. AK Press, 2016.

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

McRuer, Robert. "Disability Studies." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature*. Oxford University Press, 2020.

Mitchell, David T, and Sharon L Snyder. *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependencies of Discourse*. Kindle ed. University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Pedlar, Valerie. *The Most Dreadful Visitation: Male Madness in Victorian Fiction*. Liverpool University Press, 2006.

Ream, Justin, and Alexander Lee. “Material Agency: The Limits of Technostructure in the 24th Century.” In *Exploring Picard’s Galaxy: Essays on* Star Trek: The Next Generation, edited by Peter Lee. McFarland & Company, 2018.

State of California Civil Rights Department. *Pregnancy Disability Leave Fact Sheet*, 2022.

Thomas, Carol. “Disability Theory: Key Ideas, Issues and Thinkers.” In *Disability Studies Today*, edited by Colin Barnes, Mike Oliver, and Len Barton. Polity Press, 2002.

Van der Weele, Simon. “‘Doing’ Normativity in Disability Studies: Soft Suggestions Towards an Empirical Ethics of Disability,” *Disability & Society* 39, no. 3 (2024): 525-547.