

## Digital Disability Podcast 7.mp3

Welcome to the latest podcast, I think is number seven. We're gonna be talking about two films that are fundamentally of the same film. One is the new American film called *Come As You Are*, uh, which has recently just coming in the cinemas. Also, the Guardian did a review of it recently. I loved it that more on that a bit later on, also the original, which came out in 2011 called *Asta La Vista*, which on IMDb is also called *Come As You Are*. So I suppose I'll start by saying I was break depressed after having much these two films, which is quite understandable, really. And the other thing on size is, uh, on. I'll say hi to Matt Fraser cause I know he's one of our listeners, and I know he's been very out spoken in the casting issue. I'll add one more thing before we get into it. There is also 1/3 version off this film, a made in 2016 which is a Dutch film which, given that comes, you are his Flemish is a little bit baffling. Ah, in and that's called *adios amigos*, and I haven't got to see it but looking at it looks pretty much like the same film. So let's start with you, Alison. What's thing? Uh, start with May. Just anything You Right. Okay. Then somebody spoke off, but in some films that watch, but, um, yeah, it's quite quite complicated, actually, because I think off the two phones, the 1st 1 is definitely the best, sir, The 1st 1 being the Belgian one. I think this I mean, I'm sure we'll come back to this, but I think there's a problem in Check it out of off off the cultural context. And I know that there's actually been something written on on er on that cultural contact center, which is in the German press. This book coaches representation. A woman called on Agreed writes about on the road to novels. I don't know if it's saying that, so I think putting that aside that there's this gene issuing in actually ripping it from its original cultural contacts and put in America. But having said that, I think it's what uh, yeah, I think there's been some critique, you know, the journal article on that saw that is being a bit of academic work on this anywhere. Is that, um as difficult, isn't it? Maybe ondas many different opinions will may have on this The whole impetus for the film in the first place. Waas best on a trip original road trip on That was all the whole reason. This was manifested by styles. Understanding is to look but actually issues around sexual rights as the second bill with that to some degree. But it wasn't a strong in terms off off, actually that very blessed a search to get rid of virginity have its problems in that instalment and women I mean, I think women were problematic in both fields. Of course, that discussions around sexual rights and disability a lot do presume a male desirable put person s oh, yeah, the first thing I think was

the best. Having said a light, I like the diversity in the second full, more like felt a bit. Takes tick box with one person brawl Who was East Asia or South Asian? A black person. It was kind of like there's a bit of back bone on a swell, but having said that at first, full waas very white, so I'll leave it there for now and let you take up some positions. Well, let me ask you another question, actually, because I haven't read a lot of the academic what the said And it says Event, cultural content. Could you remember what it is? In essence, Sorry. What's in the punch in Untraceable? Yeah. Um, it's, uh actually, I think that that will interventional foreseeable case is generally it compares. Three different films will think on European road movies, but the I think the one about cultural contact basically the that in the first film. And we kind of saw conversations between the driver on Ban, about talking for ambition, things like that. So they parental. I've got to be doing both of these things running where from their parents is kind of the the men men oppressor was kind of, um also very much set in in a Flemish cultural context on that kind of, I think, a contract themselves, although I don't know enough about that culture to be able to analyze how. But the particular thing that the particular paper that I'm talking about says how when it's uprooted from their it actually doesn't, it becomes a very different fell on those kind of I think it's that price specificity off disable ism with within particular cultural contacts. So there's a big question there about how much you know is said with Hollywood, If you check if we would just west in film and vice versa, it's like how much about actually transfers. So I think I think this quite important questions on that which I don't feel quite quick chances to build this rolling me right? What do you think? Yeah, I mean, I know that there are great films and the films I would go back and watch anytime soon. I think there are some key, ah, concepts and subject matters that could be explored in further detail in terms of a response to the film S O cooking about Allison Points thinking about idea of sexuality, um, of sexual rights as well and our access to explore your sexual identity. There is the issue off off support and how support is primarily in the context. These films given by, um, family members, which creates problems and for the self determination of all the disabled characters, Um and, of course, its own. It's that is that yearning for choice of control of having, um in participating in different environments, which is led by the individuals which which comes out. And I think those that kind of key messages. But I think you're looking at the two films. I absolutely agree with the island with the Flemish film. You've got this this notion of, ah, kind of breaking away from the families segregated tive and protectionist agenda, um, and trying to expand. And by doing that is also trying to explore aspects off sexuality and relationships and also ah, building over social network,

which is then determined by the individuals rather than, say, the family in the American film. It's very much about that individual is, um, off losing of losing your virginity off the, you know, the instant paid gratification that comes from I'm seeking out sex workers. Andi. It's interesting how women are positioned in both films. I think both, um, you know, position women, very problematically. But in the American when I was really taken aback by how how the majority of several of the women characters are, ah, objectified, sexualized to the point where actually, some of the characters you don't even see their faces, you only see their bodies in the center, the first person in the dream sequence. You only see the body when they when. I think Scotty is, um, amazed by the disabled baseball player, his relationship with his partner. You don't see her face. You just see her body. And what Scott he's looking at later on as well when they meet Pete, different people, just this kind of throwaway characters. It's all about not not necessarily seeing the face is all about objectifying the body and reinforcing that that aggressive pursuit for a heterosexual normative sexual interaction. I think no, some other key points as well I was. I was interested in that notion of off the family dynamics and the and the and the way that the family then reflect on their on the ah attitudes and their behaviours towards the disabled Children. Andi. It was really interesting because in the taking an American one, you have the situation where the family, going further than then discuss between themselves about whether it's appropriate or not. But even though I and even I I interpreted as they were then starting to question their authority authoritarianism around the disabled Children, they still then thought it was acceptable to decide what what was gonna happen next decide the parameters of what they were gonna experience in terms of the hotel on whether we're going to stay and so on. So even know it was supposed to be perceived as the main characters were now able to have their own a level of self determination. Actually, it was still controlled by the individuals, and that's it. And it reminded me of I think it's Emmons research on sexuality relationships. And I did that yet it's It's the It's the state and the and the and the committee that determined to interact with and who we had the chance to fall in love with or who we have affection for. And that is very much part of films. But it's it's It's misplaced, They think, because of that, that that narrative of the individual triumphing beyond the impairment effects beyond their the barriers that they believe that is a result of themselves rather than the way society is organized. And the film becomes them trying to use a road movie to navigate some of those barriers without perhaps making emphasis on the on the the broader physical Ah, and in community institutional practices that denied to sail people opportunities to explore their sexuality. I know I wouldn't

dispute any of that. I think that both irredeemably bad movies, actually, I think there's very little good about either of them, in the sense that, as as movies within the kind of normal a drama kind of genre, they're pretty cliché pretty unoriginal. And talking about them in relation to that one's a remake of the other one. And then there was the one in the Middle is, well, the deviation between them, I think, is startling. Young, original and whole scenes, whole kind of directorship elements, script elements, acting elements are just duplicated, which I think is a true, a really tragedy and a lack of imagination that is quite startling. I think. To me, the casting is an issue. I don't generally have an issue. I didn't have an issue with it per se, given that it's about the carnival structural imbalance. But I understand why film needs a star, but you could say, well, you could. Everyone around the disabled character is the star in order to give it that legit from seeing that power. You guys gonna save it? Actor. But when you're talking about three films, nine actors, every single one of them is a non disabled actor, that's astounding. I I found that there was very little off any significance in either film other than the exploration of, you know, disabled people exploring sexuality, etcetera. But even though I thought it was done incredibly badly because I think that it was purely within a kind of normalizing context, and I think What, What? It's funny because I I prefer the American version to the Belgian. And one of the key reasons for me was the one seen after they have sex in the Belgian film, which is the scene with God, uh, where they, uh, they all have sex. And then there's a little dream sequence of thumb all being normal in quotes, the two in the wheelchairs and walking and the visually impaired guy he can see. It's very brief on its beautifully sunny, and that was such a disappointment to add that scene that I thought it was really on. I was really pleased that the American movie, which is the one I would have expected to do that he didn't do it. And I thought that that was so much bad to not do that. Uh, but I did find that there was It was both of pretty irredeemably bad. And if we come back to the casting issue, I think you know, three films, three actors in each nine disabled characters, none of them played by disabled people is pretty pretty crime, a crime against humanity. Into some extent, I I thought there was very little that was predictable for either film. And I think, I think one of the key issues for me waas that they were It was sexist, racist. I think it's probably even a little bit homophobic. I can't remember a bit particular, uh, but But I think a key problem for me was summed up by probably one of the very few quite different scenes on its When in the original Flemish film, they've all just had sex. And then there's a dream sequence where they're all in quotes, normal for a few moments. It's bright sunshine. They're all perfect. The two in the wheelchairs can walk and the one who can you

can't see can see on one of the best things about the American film Come as you are the new one was that they didn't replicate that scene, which surprised me considerably. But actually I thought that that was one of the best things about. But given what Alison said earlier about the kind of tick boxing tick box exercise that was very evident in the in the American version, that the scene with the driver who was very famous paying precious, Gabba rated BB, she says at the funeral, some crass line about you know we can all live our dream. And given the kind of notion of intersectionality and the parallels between racism, sexism, disable ism that that that line was just defensive Onda wasted opportunity not not offensive because you know you're reading a script, get by, but actually a missed opportunity off staggering potential thrown away. What do you think of that statement from me, then? No, I agree. I think I think there was, even if there was, I think my issue was I I read it a lot on Dallas, and I think it's screened, but I couldn't really hate you, Signal went, but I I got a feeling a lot of that they were trying to emphasize this this triumph over adversity because, you know, in the bits where Scotty is doing his rapping loads of it is about kind of, ah, you think making peace with this Barkley. I think it is one of the lyrics that he uses. Um, you know, talking about, ah, about the risk that the limitations of his body restrictions placed the problem. Then there's some really bizarre moments when you have the same way, drops his phone, and then the camera has spent a good three or four minutes. Just what following him, how he how he tried speaker was found bits when they when they all decide to drive the vehicle themselves When, um when the, uh when Sami is hospitalized, Um, so it's just that narrative off dismissed the broader, institutionalized practices associated with society, the issues that actually affect how we perceive ourselves and also our sexuality and desire for relationships or the denied access to relationship. Andi on again. I think that would be in the film, like just some you know that that's how it summarizes. But there is made loads of problems even, you know, even if you take the issue of how sexuality is is represented in the film. It's living American well, it's really aggressive heterosexuality, normative ideas off sexual intercourse. It doesn't account for anything in the variance off, off sexual identity, in terms of asexuality or in terms of LGBT identity. Um, eso, the old knows that there's so many problems with it in terms of have it portrayed. I think it and and then I think it's really harmful in the way that it just reinforces that narrative off. Do what you can on do spend time making peace with yourself because that's how you can then try to overcome some of these feelings that you've had about your identity or about your pursuit of relationships. I don't think it's a lot of the only problem with that. I think it doesn't it doesnt stick like the 1st 1 did to that very roll thing way actually want

to. We want 12 to access sat sex just on that very hedges sexual Nell thing. Doesn't even do that well, because it's almost like this is this is the secret. Why didn't they don't really just want section That spirit's just a sexual experience, which I think is really bad because it's not really there after a relationship. I I actually I don't rap quite strong, too, that it's like, What? What's wrong with you? Just about normal typically and that's passed on. Opportunity is what's wrong. Actually, in just wanting sex outside of a relationship, it's on. It just kept. I just kept leading towards that at that moment that you said, Paul, when when you said how good it was to see them come out in the wheelchairs. Yes, I agree with that. We could steal. The war was horrendous for that kind of heavenly type of. And now now we're flying the first thing that say on top of this, you know, supposed glory of having sexually turns out. Not today glorious for them is that they're older. Through the friend has become a couple, which is all the way you get food. That's all we really wanted in the first place. A zoo. Much is, you know, foot. Visit this issue off disabled people on go right to tell, tell it for relationships, whatever There it's it's like, well, I should falter after sex. It z like it just does it cause so far away from the original intention of the first, it becomes meaningless. Absolutely, absolutely stop and not. And that's why I think I because they both fall into that into varying degrees. Although and again I think that to be a big problem is with the driver slash nus slash help cut in both films, I think is, is quite problematic. I think it let and again less so in the Belgian film, actually, because I think they play around with some of those cultural context that a very specific about language, you know, French and Flemish and where they're playing off against one another. And I think that whole thing about the Flemish being linked to Belgium as a kind of multi a multinational state within within its own existence, I think it covers that for some extent, which again American doesn't have, I thought was interesting is well, I did quite enjoy looking at in relation to him. Were the differences one of the key differences in the narrative? Waas Andi. I'd forgotten this until I watched it again because I watched the American one first before I watched the belt from one again Waas that whole narrative thrust off you don't or some of the characters don't know that the one of the campers is gonna don't in it till quite late in the American version. Whereas that's quite explicit in the Belgian version from the beginning. And that may come back to that cultural context. All flock the Fleming she's gonna don't lie in, you know, the He represents Flanders, etcetera in the kind of Belgium context. But, you know, I have not known, but the whole notion of telling you that he's going to die because then once that's at the beginning of the film in the Flemish one in particular, you know he's not gonna die in the end where, as they say that to, like, 2/3 of the

way through in the American film, Uh, what did you think of that? Miro? No, I think that's quite interesting. And even the way that's depicted in the American film in the sense of to show the deterioration of his health, you know, and the and the and the use of medicine by, um, by math, you know, in that sense of, ah, when he taking his tablets and medication in the vehicle. It's it za riel. Point of curiosity for Sam outside the vehicle, then later on, when he's trying to pursue, um activity with the with the woman in the In the Jazz Club on day again, it's kind of, you know, that his impairment and the effects have been is impairment prevents him and denies him from exploring that further. Um, I under yeah, until you said that I hadn't really connected the two together, really in there. But no, it's it's any of its And he made me think about actually the broader cultural context of what it's trying to say declared in the finished film. But yet in the American film. But I don't necessarily see what the relevance is of having the character die off. Um, which I would say, I would like to think about further.

Alison. What was the question you asked me in mirror organize business into very calm. I was just thinking about how vote that kind of idea, that in the Flemish one, you know that the character is gonna die pretty much at the beginning. And in the American one they hold back back to like, 2/3 of the way through? Um, yeah. I mean, I don't know if it was important at all, to be honest, but a kind of light like that. The whole performance in the first investor. And I found I found myself moron. Could it help with the clearance? It all to expect him to die a spots. It was John Song dispatcher as well in the first, because to some extent I saw it as being about heart hierarchy. Kind of like, you know, you may well be a quadriplegic, but stop fucking complaining. You good. You know, that's not as bad is going to die on. There was a whole hierarchy of the impairments within each film, which I thought was, you know, oh, a little bit crass on kind of every level and again de politicizing the whole notion off disablement, for example. Although it has to be said, at least be buying to the usual Trump's around a visual impairment which waas Possibly the most refreshing thing about the film is we didn't get another sexualized well, mum with a visual impairment. Or they did them Corbett between the American one, which I don't particular remember in the other one, that that touching feeling, you know, least he didn't feel a face, which I thought was a bit of a bonus, but he was feeling it was all about the touch stuff. I think I think all the kind of you, if you mark teach stereotype that perhaps for the lesser of people's what off the wall, which I hinted at earlier Thio was which I found unforgivable. Waas gotten an immigrant Delaney, Delaney, FINA at the end of the second fill, the one disabled person that I'm aware off, uh, who's involved in the film being the booby prize at the end. I think we've got to think rethink

that phrase Booby drives that well, not very much in in the usual, but we've got to rethink the phrase booby price. No, no, I'm stunned by that. As some by that on. Did you just so passive about me? You know, we've In the past 10 years we've got we've got so far with disabled with his representation. That was just beautiful. But yet she was the only desirable person that I was aware off. So eso that that back to may rated higher on the on on the rotten tomatoes scale as it were, things gone wrong. I also thinking in the American film that I was interested in in some of the fringe characters, Um, the use of they used the York near the awkward interactions with its tail past as a source of comedy as well. So I think no. When when Matt goes to meet his girlfriend and sees that is this selling brewing with I think it's Bobby. Um, yeah, And then they kind of the lingering shots on Bobby being really uncomfortable and not realizing that that this person was dating. Ah, Wheelchair user decided eso used using the site of impairment to be t reinforce those ideas of off uncomfortableness but actually do it in a way which is both ridicule the situation. And yet all that actually played offers is actually this this individual whose being pushed out of his relationship with his partner on his partner just, you know, I think what I was I was astounded by the line of his partner uses when she says to him in the library, Yeah, I need to start thinking about the future. And perhaps there four years and sail past is not a viable option for the future on because later on as well you get the you know, the the interaction with the police officer Ondas underst terminology that he uses. And again, it's it's it's that I just like it was really, like the kind of, you know, the old tropes of using the uncomfortableness of being around tail pet people. Um, I guess a certain truth is the in the fact that she knew it was dyeing s so that there is a very kind of of every kind of real space issue that 80 partners day Andi Hearts breaking. So I agree with you. Actually, I No, no, I agree. But I think at that point, unless I'm mistaken, appoint as the audience you're no aware off off off the terminal illness as she and she's doing She hasn't gonna worry about that much into the future anyway, is she? So you know that in that respect, it's very much like me before you is her for a future which seems a bit old because she was a very marginal current. So why would be care about the future? I to me one of the big problems was that terrible issue of infantilizing disabled people, which again works much better in the Flemish film because they are very young in the Flemish film on That's a Part of It, I think is about, you know, becoming teenagers and adults and that whole thing there, which has a kind of greater residence, whereas there are they're all much older in In In the American version on those is only they will try to play younger it, says his agent, one point on the actual actors. I'm not five years old. You you've seen what a random thing he could have just made it on a par. But

I thought that that kind of the cliché have invented fantasizing Disabled people was much more prevalent in the American one because they were so much older. Which would you neither excusing the younger one or it's part of that process off adolescence, etcetera. What did you think of that as a parallel between the two? I think was interesting. Yeah. No, I agree. Well, I think I think it's at the beginning of that. You know, I have I have a problem with the way again, particularly American I had lot from the American in the way that the parents of position, because you have this can a protectionist, um, family dynamics where they are reducing the self determination of the characters. Um And then, of course, when they catch up with them in the hotel and they have that full blown argument where it's revealed about what with the whole idea of the road trip, it's Yeah, I kept. That is, you know yours first, then kind of empathize with how the parents to start the change of perspectives and think about, you know, Okay, maybe we should support this, but really, what they're doing is they're just they're just giving permission for the young people to get for the night and younger for the adults that kind of carry on with their with their road trip, which, of course, is entitled the individual's choice. But yeah, it's a question of well, even though the parents have now come to terms with the idea of what it is that they're trying to do, this still requires that the parents to give the permission to to to create the parameters of off what they will have in terms of choice and control. And, of course, then to determine where they stay in what they do, you know, you know, on the subsequent Daniel a road trip. So I I think the it was It could have been a way to explore the dynamics of how families can also institutionalise people, particularly when we're talking about people trying to explore their sexual identity on. Yet I think it just fell for that cliché of off parents determined self examination and then, through the through the revelation of realizing that their Children want to have choice and control over what they do, they have been still required to being a position to authorize that and permit that I find that quite interesting, actually, because I obviously I agree with you. On the other hand, it's back to that that kind of the issue that dogs that dogs, you know, representations of disability in the I mean that the parents, in a way sound, emphasized several anything and, of course, something for themselves as a people who often do just disable that their own Children. But the fact is that a disabled person on Andi have you seen many of seven people in said in same situation. Just about any power that I managed to get in society is is given to me by non disabled people. Like I am always, always contingent on them, allowing me or no eso. So this is very, very real issue. I mean, I think the spells were in the film civility it could cost because once that was given that that just kind of

disappeared. But But I but myself, I'm quite interested in that tension there anywhere. There's lots of tensions in the boat with four kinds of them about that kind of service and difference and kind of freedom and not freedom. And all on a lot, something. So in one way, um, kind of don't mind, in a way that way see that its contingent once again upon the mission off the people who disable its because that that's something nobody's really works out how to escape it. So I think I think, But I think I think again, you know, just gonna add to that you you've got you've got the extensive way in which the character disabled characters create those forms of resistance off. You know, breaking out. You're using our lives in terms of siblings. Teoh establish ways of getting out. You know, the very sick ways in which they tried to resist their parents. Andi absolutely has to say it then just kind of falls back to Teoh to the parents approval. But I started to admit, no, in my view, it was I I I know, you know, I think Paul said before, we should never try to imagine the film. What It should be Something else. But it's not. It's this, but that was, you know, that from May I was I was definitely want to them to just kind of although I know what the film is gonna happen to have seen the original. But I just want the situation where they were just kind of dismissed completely what their parents today and challenged and say. Actually, we're adults and we'll decide we've paid for the nurse and we'll decide what happens next. It was almost like legitimizing that idea of Well, you had the parents. The parents have come around to their way of thinking on ditz. It's fair that they kind of diplomatically decided what happens next. Um, which which which I think was but problematic. But equally I would say cause I gravity. And from what you're saying about how that allowing you to have some kind of power is bestowed on you by by non disabled people by normally except. But I think one of the problems for me in a film like this is they had an opportunity to explore that process rather than just passively show it and reinforce it as as perfectly ordinary, because that continues even right through to the funeral. When he starts to wrap on, the father says to the priest, You know, literally just let him do it. You know, it's going right is the bestowing of power, which it wouldn't have been that difficult to show that process and been critical of it by actually reflecting it back onto the parents. Look, I think you know some of the best films about racism, for example, are where the younger people may reflect onto their parents how they've allowed that toe happen, allowed or been unconsciously passive in that. And I think this this had opportunities to be able to do that. For example, in the main characters, I presume it was a single mother. Although that wasn't a place in the Belgium one that you never see the father and that one. There were home elements that he thought he literally a line here and there could have given it so much more significance in

power that then, given that particularly the American one is just a pure tick box to then have no comprehension off. Why you're doing a tick box exercise in representing cultural diversity. Because all you do in representing controversy as a tick box exercise is reinforcing the values that that make you have to do it tick box exercise in the most banal and tokenistic. Why, which I think was it was it was a terrible missed opportunity about more the other moments. You get one thing and you know, like for example, I think you're thing about like, most what? There's no problem in just having sex for the sake of sex on. I think this was an opportunity, particularly given the debates around sex. You know that the the Ash Astor Philpott I think his name is asked to Philpott, who actually piers in both of them in different elements who did the BBC documentary, and it was followed that these air rooted in and he affected the script to actually take that because that is about the pure experience off sex outside of a relationship in that lack of, you know, you don't need to have a relationship to do that. That's the kind of normative Bush bourgeois banality off the kind of version of life that his involvement in both films he actually appears in it in the beginning of the Belgian one and then at the end in documentary footage showing you who he is, both with claims to it. Being true story stuff to actually take out the politics of what asked the Philpott was trying to create was a real tragedy and a missed opportunity on every level. Of course, there's an additional point as well. You know the idea of going to the sex workers. It has to be especially it has to be specially sex workings. So it's no if it reinforced the idea of what even if you do want to just su ah, the sexual experience on Tonto engaging in insects, you the characters are forced to go, you know, to go and find this this specialized service ritual, cater just for them, rather than tried to actually think about how to ensure that still, people have accessible experiences of engaging in sex and sexuality. Um, but again, it seems kind of specialized, it seems, almost to the point, being a kind of almost being medicalized in the way that they deliver it. It's Ah, I saw that with interesting as well, like kind of segregated nature of what we want this. But we have to bank pursue the specialist service in order to experience it. But it politically, what's interesting about that? In particularly with these two that we're talking about? I don't particularly about the Dutch one. They have to go to a different country as well, which again, I think is quite quite interesting in it. It's saying something about, like our our country's backward or our country's forward, that it doesn't allow its not quite sure what it's saying. Ah, but any comments on that Alison, I'm not. Not really. Because a lot of love just heard this mournful so I wouldn't be a secure Okay, I think What will? Were there any other differences? Were there any other differences between the two films as films in that culinary

of thrust in the way they were made. Given that they're basically the same script that you thought were interesting until mirror, um, we'll start a little thing called What was the question again? Because again, that was a bit muffled in relation to the differences in how it was presented, given that it's fundamentally the same script. But we've spoken about the dream sequence that was going one on the keeping secret that guy was going to die in the other. Were there any other differences that you thought were interesting? I probably going to swerve that question completely and say, actually, what the captain was more interesting to make? Um, I mean the captain the death in the 2nd 1 But the medic much more sanitizing there because in the 1st 1 it kind of was heightened by the fact that he nearly went out to sea on in the second when he was way back from safe from That really mattered to May. So I just want you did that, given that the first was a nice I've being dramatic feel to it. Dead on doubt to see a Z were. But I don't think that I particularly didn't like about hostels. And I'm like, Why did the repeat on, you know, as a signifier? I think this was being which was the individualistic kind of perspective that that was the driver of both bones, which was the mom on because it up to minimal the mom feeding from hizzoner that the mom feeding him on, watching the to day at the same time on that kind of getting it wrong. That's quite trigger for me giving form to my sister. But it's like I'm partly I want to shut this group. Not feeding disabled people, you know, wrongly is not just a signifier off. You know, uh, we should trick trick to several people, but bastard could actually kill us on. And I thought, Why did my kick in? It was almost the same. It was all so miss the first. Well, so I was quite interested, given that they were from veered from the script quite a lot in some in something deep in reversed, I found what the captain really, really instructive on on what? What the filmmaker we're trying to achieve. Really? Yeah, so me around Any single man? No, no, nothing tired. I think nothing out to me. I think I want to go back to the casting thing because I thought that was got what would what we can say about that that can make absolute difference. And given that dive, recently read a ah, some book proposals that mentions about different changes by some legendary writer that I know. Uh, I'm interested in in how how we think. For example, I think I said earlier. And I hope I said earlier, we coy about how the casting, you know, that I think what was interesting, you know, nine for three different movies, nine different disabled characters, all played by non disabled people. What I find interesting is, is, is a the splintering of other disabled people splintering the sprinkling off rial in quotes disabled people around the periphery to give that legitimacy in. There's there's the baseball game in particular in the in the American one on Ben again, the receptionist is disabled is the booby prize at the end.

And then in the 1st 1 it's the drink, the wine tasting thing, which is full of disabled people. Uh, that back going again? That's an old kind of method of giving legitimacy, even from things like the men with Marlon Brando Riot coming home. The main character is not stable, not disabled person, someone pretending to be. And but you Sprinkle riel disabled people around the edges to give it kind of agree legitimacy. Which, of course, I think is it doesn't particularly work because it's about a narrative. Andi, would you agree that the importance of casting rial disabled people in these kind of roles will fundamentally affect the narrative thrust to give it a kind of greater truth and insight and kind of depth, but equally that that isn't intrinsically true either, because often just for example, the scriptures often pre written and then they're slotted in, And how much would they be effect? Change that? So what do you think, Alison? I think that all of that, But I think you basically asked being about whether there's an intrinsic difference between happy, desirable people cast, um on, I think, actually in the abstract, Um, I don't call me what we caught them. I found it waffle that that all of them that all of these thieves turns has been on disabled. I think in an ideal situation, you know, where disabled people get old ALS at. My position hasn't changed on this. I think that it's equally true that that, um that that disabled people can bring truth to non disabled roles and vice versa. But as a disabled person watching these, the the the kind of strength of having three non disabled actors waas where too much eso. But that's partly an issue about knowledge. Uh, I decided to go into the 1st 1 not knowing whether they're stable, did not. I found myself googling it halfway through because Medi contradict myself. Maybe that there is something about it not being convincing enough. I'm, uh, yeah, so I'm not sure. Not really. Not sure in the end, but I don't I think essentially it shouldn't have to matter. But we're a 1,000,000 miles away from that situation, so I would fully support much position on this at the moment. But I think to me, to me what's interesting is is often we had said, Oh, well, if disabled people like it will be bear on guy. I don't believe that to be true on any on any level. But that's no. That's no intrinsically because it's about the power structures within the within the means of production accosting and within what you have to deliver for an audience expectation which will bring me to my last question. But I'm gonna let me row so something on this. Well, I think for me, I'm What I'm most interested in is the reasons and the tolerance for the exclusion to the electives in this context. So, yeah, absolutely. It's horrendous that you got nine main characters and I'm not one them, is it sail past within a story at exploring disability? Um, but it's It's usually when you start to kind of impact that you read about the justifications given to that I find deeply uncomfortable. The idea that there aren't enough to

stable actors out there or or the quality of a table doctor is not, is no, um as as ah, lined with non disabled actor, and therefore it's almost gives the doctor. The doctor gives them justification, say well, I can't get a decent actor from its from from the steal people's community and yet that's also accepted. And the way a cinema goes and film watches. You know, for the majority of us, I mean majority of us in terms of beyond the pale pupils community. We don't we don't take the subway that we know. We don't really highlight this as a prominent you or we do is kind of stand alone silo films, and then we can't dismiss it. So it's a question of wide. Why do we tolerate the exclusion of disable active? Um, and I build up. Yeah, I agree with Alison's point entirely intensive. Is there a problem? It is not just It's not just in its not just in in cinema TB or off Theatre either, is it? It's everywhere in yet? No, I agree. I was going to say, Well, you know it. It's also about going beyond in the context of film. It's going beyond the just acting as well, because the question is how much kind actor influence the narrative of the film. So but equally year, What we want is actually want to have tell people involved in the whole of the film production and a gnats away. Then off off questioning some of these narratives questioning some of the ways in which we position disability in saying contexts. And of course, it doesn't mean that we are always gonna have political films when it comes to disability. Because again, a lot of self people's come into your not politicize. They don't talk about the kind of issues that we're talking about or could take in those ways. And when you want to watch wholly political films, all the turn. No, absolutely no. You You also want to see the rubbish like like like this. But it's ah, it's about trying to. For me it's about trying to question Why is it that we tolerate this level exclusion so on? I think that's what to me is very interesting is that only six I probably mentioned Fall do go. It takes into all sorts of Dr Areas assists because I mean one thing that happened in the shape of what it was. The impairment much and stuff for some excessively disabled actor. Andi She She got lots of flak for playing playing that part so and you know a lot of things written by several people about the fact that she must drive the impairment one about there not being from the right culture as well any site, but we haven't. We don't seem to have a systematic kind of agenda as to what it is we actually want. And I think that's really important. Is actually for no after about what? What are we actually asked on? What does that look like in the interim? Because we all know in the end that you know, if there was an end, that it would look like everybody can go for any job with on disabled people employed throughout throughout the industry's. But what does it just I could begin in the middle? Well, I think the problem of criticizing disabled actors for doing stuff and not being the right

impairment is often really because of the narrowness of what the opportunities are on. That won't be an issue once it's expanded. If it's ever expanded, I push we got to get ever will be, but that that's that's but I But I agree with you completely. But to me, I think often what shows that the filmmakers are actually very aware of the problems is that sprinkling of real disabled people around it, to some insight on what we tried, we did. I bet you know it's there. We really didn't make an effort which causes bullet. Oh, uh, So I'm gonna ask you I think we'll end on one final question because I think we covered most of it on. I'll try and coupled together. And I apologize to the listener if it doesn't sound good. Given up. Breaks in in transmission, etcetera. If you looked at the imdb reviews, all that audience review or any review of this pretty much no one ever use that unquote normal people love these movies. Why do you think now use? I'll start with you, Alison, I think a lot. Sorry. I'm going to say I think unfortunately, and I don't think it just applies to disability. I think a lot of people are more holding about performance and reputation on looking like the, um that they were the things on our very liberal in their outlook on this adds today portfolio off good things. I do the humanity e anything. Anything I say. Beyond that, we'll only be completed. I think I agree. I think it adds to that. You couldn't put their portfolio of humanity? Yes, in the manifestation management. I call it Yeah, and equally because I think there is a terrible move towards this some kind of sentimentality. I think I used the example someone said to me to watch the repair shop because they said, It's about the craft and you know, there's no fasten Wherever on then I didn't watch it, particularly then I start. I watched a couple of episodes because people recommend after years, and it's just the most awful sentimental A. And I said this. The people said that you recommended and said, Oh, yeah, it's completely changed. It's moved away from being about repairing things to being about this, adding in, you know, a narrative a story about, you know, about dispossessed people, dying people, disabled people. Andi, even they think it's awful now. Me, right? What do you think? Why do you normal people love this shit? I don't disagree with anything you said. I think Just add to that, um, you know, I was when you asked that question. I was reminded of Howard Becker. Um, work on, You know, you have to decide whether you're on the side of the oppressed on the oppressed. There On what? These kind of films? Those they allows people to ah Teoh to be complicity in assuming that they are not the one to a contributing towards the marginalisation of people off of the community that we've bean referring to, because you're the such films and it's they reinforced. But for many, there reinforced Michael Oliver's notion of the individual model of disability. And of course, that is helpful, then, for just to find the actions and the positions of

those who influence and determine what we have access to on. Because if you started to question that, then people then have to start questioning how they contribute to the way in which society is organized, which which fundamentally disables us and creates these unnecessary barriers. These films ride, I think, a wave of saying to the viewer, You got not you got nothing to be. But you know you're not blame for anything. You just It's just about people trying their best to overcome it. And, of course, some of these narratives and reinforce that, such as the end of this film in the In the American Film of the End with the line about Just Be Who You wanna Be and you'll be fine, so I I think it's from a It comes from that idea of trying to justify to read into the viewer. You're not the problem. You're not to blame. And, of course, from a social perspective, I would question the actions and activity of of Oliver's and responsibility that we have to create an inclusive and accessible society. And when we don't have that, we're all complicit in. And if you learn the right terminology, you'll be falling. Yeah, don't call us horrible things. Talk cause people with disabilities, in fact, that people disabilities don't exist anyway. But that's, uh, that's the social model for him. Anything else from anybody? Alison, you won't say anything else about like one. Please don't make me watch. Please. Oh, I said that's what exactly right away. When I came with call, I said, compassionate. Good. Please. Well, I thought for the next one, in a couple of weeks time or a few weeks on, we would do the raging moon 1971 uh, which I think you have. I'm pretty confident you have. And oh, I am on the lookout for a good one. Although I think the raging mean has. Ah is awful, but has some things going for etcetera which we'll talk about in so the raging moon. But that Udari if you're a listen up, watch it so that you can join in and shower you listening and I'll pick up a different one as well. Hopefully a foreign one that I'm gonna I'm looking for Teoh. Make us read a bit more anyway. So I will say thank you to both of you on dial Hubble this together and put it up and I'll see you next time.