

Rising Phoenix and Code of Freaks – Two Documentaries about Disability / Impairment

Welcome to the latest podcast, digital disability, looking at disability film on film, et cetera, with the dot transit dr. Mira Griffis and myself pulled off. So this week we're looking at to this week, this time we're looking at rising things, the Netflix documentary about Paralympics and code of freaks about disability on in cinema fell.

Let's start with rising Phoenix. What do you think may arise? Uh, it's, it's not, it's not it, wasn't not enjoyable to watch. And I've got, I've got a problem with the pilot Olympics and I find this, this, this perpetual fascination with impoundment of facts and the history, the narrative of the individual acquiring their empowerment or triumphing over their impairment, um, and navigating, navigating the, you know, the life course.

And I think that was. That was transferred into the documentary. I don't know. I don't know who made the documentary. I was, I was interested when I was watching it, who were the actual documentary makers and whether they've done anything on disability beforehand. Um, but it was, uh, it was familiar anyway.

Yeah, it was just, it was throwing out those old tropes of, of, uh, you know, tell people experiencing tragedy. Uh, they're not, you know, being denied opportunities in their lives, so they need to kind of succeed. There's so many metaphors of, uh, overcoming your impairment and, and, uh, and, and doing well in sport.

Um, and it causes this constant, um, it's constant move to, you know, to emphasize the Paralympic, like I said, And of course, what legacy, when you know, it's been, there's been a continuation of, of, uh, of austerity, of a hostile environment for disabled people. That's not even addressed at all in documentary.

And you can say a cause while, you know, it's, it's, it's, it's focusing on, on, on sport, but of course they made so many references to how to say, well, people's, uh, lives were improved. All the attitudes, the one sale people were improved. Because of the Paralympics. I just thought it was so crass not to actually acknowledge the real, uh, political environments affecting sale people and wanted to tell people's community.

So I was not, I did not enjoy watching it and actually thinking, talking about it now it's made me a little bit angry.

Well, I'll, I'll just say I agree. And then I'll ask Alison and then would talk about it a bit more. What do you think Allison. Um, I'm going to start with, uh, possibly the most positive thing. Um, I really enjoyed, uh, the new sec. Uh, the play the child, uh, I think that was some situ with quick hop nation. So that was quite, yeah.

I wanted to hear more of that actually. And it was true. I did actually look here. Hope I didn't look the question that you had, um, uh, um, That that was made specially for that, that was, um, I really enjoyed that. That was, that was mostly pleasant. I'm not SWAT in some ways it was kind of, you know, if I'm being objective about it, never gone to really light.

Yeah. Too many things for me. Um, I mean, I said that I am quite interested in, in debates from power Olympics, so yeah, it felt big time. I think. Um, To not repeat what you've said, all of which I agreed with a mirror. Um, I think it was quite a badly made documentary. Uh, I found it really bitchy. I was just beginning to get into the story of say, well, athletes, and then we'll certainly in history and those were very close, fair soups with the daughter of what's his name?

Uh God-man non-starter so why, you know, why, why are we. Looking right into our affairs, these kind of technical aspects. And then you were just getting into the history of it. And then all of a sudden we're back calm and it kept jumping like that. And I thought, why aren't they doing that? There's no kind of, it was quite disorientated.

And so that was one of my issues with it. But I think another thing that, again, I'm trying to add to what you said rather than repeat that. Um, another thing for me that it kind of, of, um, got me thinking about again, is generally that place of, um, Of well, all people, but disabled people in, particularly in terms of awards and, you know, the, the kind of discourses of winning a warning, which kind of accounts to some of the things are saying about with some volume.

And it's like, you know, I never, I always feel quite uneasy about, about. Um, the fact that most of us go along quite uncritically with being the best actor, the best, some of the best academic call, this type of thing. And I remember Debbie Joely was actually a criticize in public and I was really glad to see it's like that surely as part of the problem.

So that once I was thinking about that, I found it quite hard to focus on, on the program because I find that. Whole issue of, um, this disabled people and a meritocracy and a waltz kind of, kind of quite fascinating. So, uh, yeah, there, a couple of couches I thought were quite daring that I was drawn into the fencer.

I, I really enjoyed watching, um, uh, the young fans that just, just that. Pure curiosity. It was, I found it actually very pleasing to watch and doing that stuff. I almost would've preferred to watch a whole hour of two people fencing. I think, uh, I thought it was dreadful. It was quite funny. Cause. Oh, I was watching it with a young person.

He said, well, you're being totally unfair, I guess. And you can, I can feel you Evernote and Timothy and hatred. And he said, and you're being unfair because. That's the point of sport, just because it's this ability. It's no different, that's the Olympics. Um, if it had been about the main Olympics or a sports championship, that's what, they're all like, this isn't specifically equally bad against you.

And like, I got what he meant. But he didn't make any bear hug. So, and of course that was the key thing. It was quite interesting because going went to all of the Paralympics, cause I, I was lucky I had pressed accreditation and I did an arts council project there, et cetera, on photography, et cetera. So I went to a lot of it and again, so a lot of it was not true.

This idea that. It was packed at all time. It wasn't that the big stadium was a lot, but that's because people couldn't get tickets to the main one and wanted to go. It was much cheaper.

Uh, most of the other events were quite mediocly attended some of them quite bad. Uh, I quite like sport. I think Miro likes sport.

I tend to quite like sports. So I did quite enjoy some of the sports. Some of it. Just make me laugh, but that's me being cruel, but again, that's true. All sport. So for example, I went to their question ism, uh, in Greenwich park, I think. And I've never seen such a point in this thing in my life, but that's got nothing to do with it being disabled, people doing a question is anybody doing a question is amazing.

Uh, you know, life is too short for humanity to be doing this kind of drivel. But I think that whole narrative, I personally believe like you're talking about the meritocracy and all of that. And I think Miro has said something to me. You said something about it earlier is I think disabled people are in a lot worse position.

Now the massive disabled people are in a lot per what worse position, since the Paralympics due to the Paralympics. It legit, my eight, this whole idea of the deserving and the undeserving, the pathologizing, or personalizing the biome medical model, all of that kind of crap that actually, you know, if you try a bit harder.

You can, you can be as normal is as valuable as anybody else. You know, when I was a kid, uh, I was always threatened with, uh, Douglas Bader. It lost his legs in the war and it's kind of like, well, he could do it with no legs. Why can't you do it? You know? So you, you can learn to walk to the extent that my father wanted to have considered having my legs so I could have false legs to walk and, you know, which was just in retrospect.

Was fucking insane. And so that whole leg, because see if these kinds of people, but I don't have a problem with the Paralympics per se, in the sense of anybody wanting to be the best they can physically in any way whatsoever, whoever, I didn't have a problem with that. But the whole point is, is that doesn't exist in back in outside of the politics of the oppression of disabled people, through what the power Olympics represents and that this didn't challenge that, which I thought was a missed opportunity.

And it, it mealy reinforced it, uh, partly through individualizing it, triumph over tragedy, all of those old tropes that were just pretty much endless. And again, it, it didn't, that didn't mean you didn't get involved with him. You know, I thought the youth of the fencer. Was incredibly charming and engaging.

Uh, but again, that was nothing to do with her being disabled. That was that's the engagement of youth and passion and, and that kind of thing. I think it, it, it kind of. Contrary the kind of failure to recognize its contribution to the furtherance of the oppression of disabled people through the fantasies of meritocracy and the indulgence of normalization through sport that oppresses.

Those who either don't wish to, or can't, or don't want to indulge in. That was a true dereliction of duty here in, on the, in the, in the, in the producers and the makers of it. I had some technical problems with it as well. These glossy. Beautifully photographed individual interviews, that pepper deck about the key people, but not all of them, uh, that were highly

stylized, uh, tended to get on my nerves after awhile, especially if you're then mixing with very low quality film and whatever, and it didn't do any in any particular.

In a particular way. I think if you look up what the directors have previously made, they've made the fashion film about Steve McQueen, the designer, and that whole look of, of, of, of kind of the stylized look in LA. I think the fence there was, it was in a kind of semi derelict country house kind of look.

Uh, which was a throwback to that kind of fashion shoots. I obviously done it just ended up grading with me enormously. Yeah, I agree. I think what struck me in particular actually was I've forgotten his last name, but, uh, that John practiced a guy who gave the most. Oh, you know, all these had the most awful part, uh, that it come from, which was quite interesting in a really horrible dark way.

And then we certainly see him in, in perhaps the most opulent ms. On center, the whole documentary. I just complete your job with Matt. I couldn't listen to him. When one is sitting in this. In this vast room on this velvet solver. Um, so yeah, I think that was particularly bad along with the cheetah, you know, the African animal, you know, and, you know, and it was just like, Oh God do this bah, you know, let's say no one was wearing these got cheater right behind me.

Yeah. That was just please. Me right. Let's come back to you. I'm just saying, because you know, on the one level you can, I understand that's good support is inherently elitist, and it's about trying to dominate and achieve over, over your competitors. But I think that my main problem with the Paralympics is that it then tries to use that, that framing or that narrative.

To then explain to salespeople in broader society. And why does it get beyond sport? That's where I have, that's where I have a problem with it. I don't have a problem with it. Yeah. The issue of sport in general and the issue of salespeople participating in sport, you want to compete, then that's fine. You know, whatever you want to do.

But when you start then trying to use that in order to make sense of. To say what people's position in society about. That's where I go. I didn't know it. I mean, I watched the Paralympics. Yeah. And it's, it's astounding. How many times, you know, even when, as the athletes are preparing to raise or whatever they're doing, you were literally get, you know, the camera will look at, uh, athlete number one.

And you've got backstory about that. What's the impairment explain that the impairment affects what's the history of how they acquired their impairment athlete to what's their impairment. Yeah. And it's just like, you never, you never get this. And it's just, you know, it's almost in its purest form, this idea of the kind of voyeurism of, of impairment, the idea of.

Oh, yeah. The curiosity of the impairment, rather than of the competitor, trying to tie into, you know, what's the skill level compared to the no, to those around them. Um, and, and, and, and that's why, you know, I just, it just, it's so unsettling. There's this guy documentaries, because they, it reinforced that message of, you know, breaking the BA breaking down barriers to achieve whatever you want to achieve there, live life to the fullest.

And so on. I mean, I think I may have said to you, Paul, after I watched it, when you send me your link, Yeah, it almost felt like you could see this being on a loop and DWP benefits center or, you know, in an office building, you know, that kind of, because it is, it's a biopsychosocial model off. Yeah, you got impairments and yeah.

There's barriers that you experienced, but you know what, if you think positively and you're trying to be elitist and competitive, you'll get through this and then you'll get to sit on these velvets and stuff. So if it's, you know, with a cheetah by your side, I completely agree with Alison. Yeah. The, the guy, uh, John buckteeth, and he's talking about it is his story.

And then he starts a little bit, you know, you started to talk about his experience sort of hate crime. And, and disability hate crime as well. And it's like, yeah, I in France and it's like one minute, and then just boom. And then it's gone back to hit. It has gone back to him sitting on the developers, he's sofa, talking about how he was in the Olympic census.

So in the Olympics relish. So there's just real. This is real. Yeah. I have two real problems with it. And also I think one thing I was really interested in was when they were doing the history of it and I talk and I go back to the kind of Goodman era. And, uh, I don't know. It might even be Prince Harry who says it.

Yeah. He says this, the, the idea was to try to get salespeople, to be taxpayers as, you know, and try and get them to be citizens and be productive to society. The answer to produce productive in society is to be competitive and to be, yeah, yeah. That would be worthwhile. That's quite, I wanted to bring up as well.

I completely agree with you on why Prince Harry, where Nick, why. Invictus games. He's been inspired to set up the Invictus games for, you know, disabled soldiers. It's just, Oh, you know, but I think that what you're saying, the going on, on the sofa, how they bought up the politics of, of tribal hatred that had led him to there.

Purely to explore it. There was no sense of like bringing politics into it into a broader sense. It was a purely exploitative use of the politics that engaged with and trying to, uh, it was just, it was just absolutely trash. I could. It's interesting. Wasn't it? Because there was so many of the, if I can't even think of any, all of the, all the athletes who were interviewed.

I think talked about how they, you know, they really struggled with this, this acceptance of their identity as a disabled person. They know they were there. They were desperate not to associate with several people. And it's almost like you've got it. They've got to get that in. And then they talk about how sport was the catalyst for action, accepting it, but accepting it in a way which is about not really, yeah.

Identifying with the politics and the salespeople or being a police side sale, put person. So it it's it's, it, it not only does it kind of advance our understanding of disability in the politics of disability or politics, or just, it, it almost reverses what we've, you know, what we've been doing for years, because it's an idea of, well, you know, we, we acknowledged it.

There is this problem of identification, but the way to solve it is through this kind of elitist narrative of. Triumph over adversity. And I think for non-disabled audiences or for people

who are new to the world of, of being of identifying as itself person, this is really problematic. I think documentary I'm surprised.

But what I would say is, and I think, and again, it, it, it's part of an agenda that's incredibly dangerous. And again, because, you know, we both come from kind of activists, political awareness, political engagement.

This was almost trying to claim and the people who run it, uh, As the Paralympics as the political movement of disability. A map that is a real, really dangerous, awful thing to be doing, you know? And it was, it was, I would say it was actively all the people in it were actively doing that kind of like what they were claiming, which of course is completely untrue.

Uh, kind of like all progressive, progressive in disability, disabled people's lives is Dan as Paralympics. And in fact it is. That's what you've drawn to explain. It tends to be a retrograde step every moment, you know? Uh, and it was funny cause they can go for the interesting moments like. For example, uh, George Osborne was booed, apparently pics in London, uh, as were a number of other politicians all from the country, but he didn't stop them continuing doing what they were doing.

So it had no effect on them at any CRE. Then you had the little moment of. Oscar Pistorius center, as well

know, let's pretend that didn't exist. And, and of course that, that he, Oscar Pistorius just actually fascinating in that link into Paralympics and male sport linked with masculinity and all of those kinds of things that, you know, I think it probably key points of what led into what he did. But as, as the young person, I was watching it with said when he was telling me I was being completely unfair.

And he said, you should. I see it as being about disabled people, because if you watch any sport, they're all fucked up. They're going to stay fucked up. And it is just a fucked up business. And that was it really? So to some extent we are being harmed because that's what elite sport is. It's just, it's fucked up that point.

Fine. Well, that's what I'm really anything is really, you know, it's usually rooted in some kind of seriously warped problem anyway. So, uh, I think, and I've always said, you know, even when I, you know, 20 years ago, I always said to me, any film. Well, I'd probably get into that in the next time as well. If normal people like it normally in quotes, obviously.

There's usually something seriously. Well, I was gonna tell you, you haven't, you haven't read out the comment, you know, when you usually read out the comments of IMDV while they say about it, you shouldn't, you shouldn't read that out and you've read them. They all love it. I was waiting for you to read them out.

I think it's safer not to nowadays. Well, he didn't trust anybody. He had, I think it was, it felt crave. And at one point it says, yeah, it says in the documentary, this is a move and movement for good. How do you, and how do you substantiate that Philip and cost? Well, the one thing I did enjoy about it, and again, it was glossed over it, it kind of referenced it,

but it was more involved in the, in the self-indulgence of how the, the three of them sorted out the problems in Rio with the funding.

Yeah. That's a really fascinating area to investigate into. Yeah. The, the politics of accessibility, the representations of people that were looked into to take people seriously in a, in a competition. And the idea that it was all just kind of framed as, yeah, well, you gotta be of a corrupted crypto establishment who spent the money.

And we spent all our time trying to get some additional money through to try and solve the issue. And of course, yeah, that alongside these claims and the documentary that. It sail people's position in China has improved. Drastically since then in London, it's improved Rio. There's now more representation and all the way thing I'm sitting there thinking yeah.

And put some quotes of the shadow reports of the UN. And then when they, when the commission, he investigates human rights violations against the other people in all these different countries. Yeah. There's a real disparity in what this documentary was trying to portray. And I know it's not surprising, but I was just getting really aggrieved.

There's that it was nice to compare that to the next documentary they've watched. Well, it's always good to leave comment with the comment I was aggrieved by watching, right. I think we've said enough about that one. So moving on to Coda freaks, uh, Mira is started the last, so Alison let's start with you.

Coder freaks.

I was really disappointed. I was really looking forward to it. I'm sorry. Very scattered thoughts on this, um, spelling, spelling. There was some people who. Said some, uh, some of the talking heads on it were, uh, were very good. Uh, you know, obviously I think for me anyway, uh, Lawrence Carter long and, uh, of course, um, I forget everybody's names actually.

Um, I've got forgotten it in. No shit. Um, yeah, no, I can't. That was formed very humorous woman on that. Jackie, Jackie. Yes. Yeah. Yeah. I really liked her. I think she made some really good point. However, um, I, by in large, I wondered, I think it, I think it will be really, really good introduction for somebody who's like, who knows nothing about it, about the area.

Uh, I think some of it was misrepresented. I think some of it actually was over simplified. Uh, so those bits kind of, I found quite bit changing. I had marching, you probably bought given, you know, the, the, the depth of your, uh, your knowledge in this area. So, um, I kept trying to stick. This is probably for, you know, an audience she's not us, uh, but certainly for us, um, and didn't learn anything new.

Um, and, uh, again, I think, I think it would have benefited from an eraser all the way through, uh, rather than just talking heads saying, uh, one, particularly one particular point where I've got quite annoyed actually is right at the end. Um, when they certainly started with the cushion of, uh, I think three people were saying, and I had to replay that over and over again because I, I'm not good at hearing.

Uh, um, people's words, is it both? Uh, I think that was really, really in that sense. Um, so yeah, by and large, if I'm disappointed and that was a huge omission for me in it. Uh, the, these kind of seem a bit, bit unbalanced in the, kind of it deliberately went to some issues, like, for example, the intersectional, um, Black and disabled, uh, issues.

So rest and disabled issues and, uh, given the sort of, of support themselves there, but given the work I've done on this just a little bit, um, I found it extraordinary that they could talk about that and use a few specific. Uh, films and not mentioned a nonwhite women at all. It's like it was all about black masculinity.

And I think it was quite a partial account. I did agree with a lot of the analysis that those films, but I think that they repeated that over and over again. Another example, uh, for example, was when they were talking about blind women. And again, as you know, uh, Northern for example has done great work on that.

There's quite a lot of work on that and it didn't even begin to broach some of those issues about sexuality and blind women. So all in all now, I think it's a really good introduction if you're not absolutely nothing. Uh, but I think it could have been executed faster. Oh, I'll I'll, I'll go with what I thought.

I, I think I agree with you completely. I think it, it. It was for people who didn't know anything. Uh, and that's fine. That's fine. That's not a problem, I think, but I do agree that I think it missed massive opportunities. I think it missed an opportunity to break down scenes, for example, to be a lot clearer and specific.

I presume there was some copyright issues on how long you can show a clip for, uh, I think for example, That quite like the paramount of the Catholic, her ending with the elephant man ending in the sky. And, you know, I thought that was a really nice piece and I would have liked her more of that. Yeah.

Break down of a few key things that you talked about a bit more in depth of, uh, I, I thought it. I hated the fact that they said that there's no good representations or no interesting representations, because I think there are, and I think there's quite a lot of them. But I think the biggest problem for me, it was training.

Can the idea of that negative, positive? Yeah, it couldn't, it couldn't get to playing with that. For example, many disabled people I know in myself included, you know, we get a great deal out of the most awful or representations of disability because you can sit back and think. I'm Ryan society does see me in that way.

And actually you can get quite a significant degree of validation from watching a representation that is fundamentally awful, but actually reveals something about the nature of society that you can think of. Fuck. All right. They do hate me. Yeah. Yeah. And so I think it didn't have that. It got caught in wanting to be negative, which, which is quite a bizarre thing to say, because.

I think there were people who said to me, yeah, the interesting things, I think Carrie sandal, uh, how have you say a name said some really good stuff again, a lot Lauren's caught along. I

thought it was quite interesting. Like they sort of said, cause uh, you know, I do veer towards this, this idea that if decide to people, make it, it will be better and it will be different.

Yeah. Then they talk about a film that was written and directed by a disabled person. And it isn't, uh, because often it's, it's caught within the own strictures of the industry, et cetera. So, and I thought I would have quite a bit, bit more to brighten up cause it was my short documentary. So I think there was space to go with it.

So, and there were some interesting things on intersection and all that kind of stuff and race and gender. But again, it didn't bring it all together. Talk about how, how those. Tropes cliches, archetypes stereotypes, all play to reinforce one another. They were all still separate. And I thought that that was a great missed opportunity to kind of broaden the kind of scope of analysis to talk about how we fit in within that whole kind of cultural section of oppression.

Just call it about a phrase. And I did get a bit pissed off with the constant green screen. Yeah. Uh, Oh, ye this, they were all green screen with a film. Yeah. Oh, in them. Uh, which I thought extracted from, from it quite a lot. I do quite like green screen, but again, I think it would have been nicer to have someone engaging a seat in green screen and walk you through, actually, that would've been really nice.

And I think that that was a missed opportunity. I think, you know, it I'm making it sound awful. It was quite good in the sense that you kept thinking. Yeah, I've seen that one and I liked films where you go. Yeah, I've seen that one. I think, uh, there's a film called final cut, which I think my mirror, my Evel, whatever, which is basically a, and it was a bit like the film at the Tate a few years ago.

That was a. It was the whole point of that film is it's the day in the life of humanity. And it goes through the day through clip from films, they tend to be about 10 to 20 seconds long. I think the thing that the Tate was a 24 hour loop of film clips that were at the time of day that it happened. And you think, and the joy of that is going.

Yeah, I've seen that one. I've seen that one. Oh, I haven't seen that one. I forget that one. Where's that one? Add it, you know? Well, , you know, and actually the key problem for me, apart from the, uh, I think it was ticky Nicky, he was, it was quite humorous, but in a dead pan kind of way, there was no fun. You know, the humor of it, you know, some representations of disability, all so awful.

They're funny, you know, you can just sit back and, and laugh and enjoy them and you thought. You can do that, you know, uh, just give us a little bit of joy in this. Uh, so it was, it was, it was quite an interesting watch kind of just in talking to me, I think, I think Martin could use a bit of fun. I actually, I disagreed with that photo, but I found it funny.

The one about him against, um, uh, Uh, a blind assailant. Um, I disagree with the point was making, because I think the Marvel university is something within itself. And, uh, even though obviously I created them when it was full night, um, I found those moments actually really helped the documentary along. Yeah.

I think there's a one Oh one for film makers in film schools. It would be, you know, try and avoid cliches kind of. Educational tool. And I think it did that quite well. And it was, I kind of wasn't too long. Like the lecture me Miro. What are your golden words on this? No, I I'm. I'm pretty much in agreement.

I wasn't, it was okay. It wasn't, it wasn't a standing. I think the, as you said that the, the depth of the analysis wasn't there was it, the critique wasn't there. So, so as an introduction to these issues, To be played out to kind of, you know, uh, an entry level. So an undergraduate in disability studies or media films work.

Okay. Um, there's some good, you know, there's some interesting bits that they said, but I wanted them to then build on that. So, you know, when, when at one point they talk about, um, yeah, the idea of, I think very early on, they're talking about how inspirational. Inspirational story sale. And that, yeah, there's a domination of to have these kinds of stories because they, they work within the Hollywood formula.

I wanted them to kind of explore that further and, and think creatively about, well, how do we resist that? And how do we challenge that good at the beginning, they make that assessment. Well, you know, we're competing with a media industry that wants to have these types of messages because that's what the, how the formula is set.

And that's how you can succeed in getting the funding and so on to make those kinds of films. And then at the end, you've got Matt Fraser quite violently highlighting, um, the, how non disabled actors playing tailored characters, then getting reinforced because they, they typically win and the Oscars or the golden Globes and yeah.

Match, rubbing and call around, you know, Hollywood stopped being discussed from reality. Stop trying to set up this horrible agenda. It left me with saying, thinking, so what, you know what, so what, what did we do then? Well, you know, and when it goes, yeah, my background is not in and kind of know disability film, but I, but I am aware of that depth of critique and analysis that goes on within it.

And I thought, well, why can't we have that as part of the documentary as well, because you've got the introduction to it, but yeah, there's kind of tropes and those kinds of stereotypes that have been written about for years, And there's a lot of, there's a lot of interesting, innovative work about how this impacts on the way that we understand certain people's position in society.

You know, you know, it, it, and of course what fascinates me. As well as somebody who's not completely massive and disabilities. Yeah. It's how these representations reinforced and or legitimize the discriminatory practices like go on out in everyday life in everyday society and that's completely messed.

It almost feels like it contains this discussion of film within film and it didn't link them to, to, to the broader issues that are at play. You know, that the desire for inspirational stories, the, the heart, you know, as Matt said, the horrible agenda is the disconnect. Um, and that's why I I'd like to do more of, but as you said, Paula, it also, you know, I always do that.

I go to this thing, I have, you know, I'm writing down all the films as I'm watching it, the ones I need to like look at plastic case, which I've never seen is absolutely fascinating. If you watch it for 20 seconds and this documentary, I have no idea what's going on. I feel, and, and it's equally horrifying as it is intriguing.

So that's my next steps. My weekend film. No, it's funny because I thought it had a. Have so for example, and they said things though that really did quite annoyed me apart from the word people with disabilities, which I hire as a phrase, because you know, to me, there's no such thing as people with disabilities, disability is something that happens to people like Senator they're my buddies, but that's just an American phrase.

So you know, that's life. But actually I think, I think that time, you know, that would have been a nightmare. Thing. Cause it, it was actually about impairment. Uh, you know, and again, that's fair enough, but let's stick to impairment. So it was kind of fairly deep politicized, but trying to be political. So, but equally someone, someone said at one point, you know, Uh, this is the only engagement most people will ever have with a disabled person.

And I thought, nah, that ain't true. You know, there's so many disabled, but everybody knows. He's able to people in their families and whatever. What to me is interesting is how, uh, popular culture can override personal knowledge. I cognitive dissonance that actually it can, they can see a film as someone that they then applied to this person that they know they've known all their fucking life.

And go, you know, one company being all that, but you've known them your whole life. Why is this is suddenly so, so significant. Well, one and I thought that that was a bit of a missed opportunity. So just as saying things like that, I thought, no, that ain't true, you know? And isn't it. It's not the people, you know, it's this whole thing.

Yeah. Yeah. You know, and so, uh, but again, there were far too many. But it ties in with that whole thing about, there was a lack of fun, you know, the actually representations of decisions people, uh, can be so gloriously awful, but they're fantastic. Uh, you know, uh, tying with this other good represent, you know, to me, the better this disability film of all time was young Frankenstein.

That's full of disability, you know, uh, you know, why, why, why wasn't that in there? And I thought, because it, it didn't go along with their narrative. And so. And that showed that it had its weaknesses because they tried to ignore things. I've challenged that, sorry. Thank you. Alison you'll first, could I add the positive and negative thing?

Um, I think in some bits today, maybe this was done to the producers. I think he got really quite low. I mean, apart from the fact that what you were just saying and the constant negative thing makes you think of all those people think the same thing, which I'm sure there is. There are different interpretations within there of those films.

Um, one thing that particular, I've got a bit of a book bear about this film. Anyway, um, those kinds of quick pictures of stills of film are all just little segments are then included. I filmed it

didn't talk about which is shape of water and, uh, me, Alison, Sheldon, and Joel Crawshaw I've written. And defensive that foam, for example.

And I think if they didn't say why they were putting up as a bad practice, but I'm assuming it's because the impairment she has in the film, isn't the impairment that she has in her life. And it was not, it was not talked about it. And he was just shooting that. This was the wrong film. I really don't. And this idea that we, that we all think the same thing, anybody criticize his disability infill or any other media, um, all think the same thing, which we certainly don't.

Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. Cause I'm aware that mayor wants to speak, is it? We didn't everything back to him. We talked to Frank Jude, uh, junior moon and there was the thing that came up, um, And a woman about wanting to see more than one disabled person together. And I've said it myself, in writing I've done is, is like, you know, the, as Norton said, they're disabled people usually by themselves are usually isolated.

And the one thing about the junior boom was able to do was to get a really good relational view despite its flaws. And, and of course, going back to the premise of the film freaks, uh, we, we, we only get that collected sense because we're seeing real disabled people, um, interact. You could even get up out of the way non-disabled people playing those roles as well.

So it's like, that was kind of glossed over, which is a shame because one thing that did come out really clearly in the form was, uh, That, that feeling I much in, most of us who've been looking of how is that not feeling when you're with your disabled community and up to that feeling of volume, which I certainly felt when I was first introduced to the disability arts movement in particular.

And I really felt it was a shame that, that wasn't pursued more. Cause it was definitely in that at the beginning then, but that issue of, of. Having more than one person then personally, I think he's ready to inform. But, but again, linked to that, actually this idea that if it was about two disabled people who ended up together, there was this idea that that would be better intrinsically, which isn't true.

Uh, you know, it's just, uh, it's about what it is and, and just, yeah. And you know, and I understand you've picked your roots and you're going to go with it and, you know, and that one Oh one kind of stuff, and, you know, but there were so many. It's not for us, you know? And I think that, that, that was quite, I would recommend it to people because I think, you know, particularly non-disabled people who don't particularly know anything.

Cause I think they'll enjoy it and think, well, I remember that feeling, you know, there's often this thing or, you know, there is art, there aren't many disabled people in film, but again, watch this there's lots there all over the place. Miro, what were you going to say? No, I was going to get, I was going to ask you both fear.

I think there's myself quite before around. It kind of like the, the rep. Yeah. They kind of see the comedy of some of the representations that with people and, and filming. And again, I think there's one point there's, um, one of the, one of the people being interviewed talks about the Farrelly brothers films and it says, Archie, I quite like them.

And then talks about, they kind of, you know, does does comedy around disability? De-humanize does he hear me now? I just wondered as to, as twisting colors, those and, uh, and films and film and disability. I wouldn't, what was your view of kind of, not just finally brothers' films, but in general, but in fact, when film I'm approaches disability through the lens of comedy, Well, I'll leave that to Alison and she's written the book.

I didn't quite hear all of that for some reason. Uh, but, um, I wouldn't have my chapters in my book again, um, on that, um, in my last book, my next book is on the front for this and I, I. Just think I agreed with him. That was one of the more interesting parts of that. Actually, I, I agree that this is, this is just an absolutely excellent way to getting to understanding what's at stake in, um, everybody's interactions, um, with disabled people on screen.

I think comedy is, can be, well, it can be very impressive too, you know? Same old stuff on competent theory, but, um, but it can be, uh, more significant. Um, I think, and I think the front of the brothers were exceptional at that almost as you will, you will read if you read my book. Uh, I think that the fact that they were so good at that actually were the industry.

Uh, and I'll hopefully they'll just say, well, this isn't entirely my, my idea. I thought I'd do it. The disabled people say the same is that I think the industry we're getting frightened at the increasing politicization win, win, win within that comedy. So this unreal issue that of, of, of, um, how far, how far you can go with actually a satire on, on, on discernible ism as it were.

I'm sorry if that didn't answer your question. No, I think it did didn't get me wrong. I know. Absolutely. Because for me it resonates, I can't remember the person's name in the film, but he talks about the failure brothers and I, and I tend to enjoy probably brothers because what it does is it reminds me of the, the, the comedic events that happened when I do engage with particularly non-disabled people.

And because there's that kind of awkwardness, there's that kind of. Yeah, there's, there's, there's a, there's a, there's a, there's something here more it's about the interaction of somebody entering the world of disability, but not being clear on that. Not being able to understand it and not knowing the kind of principles and the politics behind it.

And of course it's a single person belonging to itself, but people's community. You then go to your peers and you kind of talk about that and you reflect on it and. And process it and you see the comedy in it. And I think that's why he was trying to stay around the kind of the way it humanizes then the experiences of the tail past and being part of that community, or tell people, watching films that are, that are in one way problematic, but in another way, Allow you that, that way of then of having those conversations about the way we are positioned, the way that we are engaged, engaged, engaged with by non-self.

Yep. And of course, I would say that you could argue, you know, that the industry could. Watch this and go, well, you're being completely unfair because we treat everybody like this. You know, our stories of working class people, they're inspirational, you know, stories of women, thereby inspirational, all their horrific, all their, whatever.

This is what we do to people. And, and, and in a way they'd be. Fair to say that that you're being unfair on the industry. We treat everybody this bad. That actually messages another

issue that I was thinking about with the documentary actually, which is, and it rarely gets touched upon even in a lot of academic work is nobody, even though we can, we can look at the, Oh, we must look at the intersections of theirs.

You almost look at the intersections, but nobody ever just the class thing hardly, hardly ever. Um, and you know, when you look at it film, which was briefly there in that documentary rear window, you talking about a very rich man, you know, and, and, and similarly with me before you and not, and when that white disabled usually wheelchair use is at the center, it usually is a very ritual as well.

We've got absolutely it's always manages to completely separate. Um, wherever you should look at impairment, impairment and sexuality away from any considerations of how on earth, how on earth you make any of this stuff happen? Uh, which I find a hugely problematic, which again, meet the industry would step back and said, well, they're the only people we represent in any group.

Well, yeah, there was. Yeah,

absolutely. Absolutely. But it, I was just thinking about what you could say back to it and you'd go, well, that's true. You're treating us all, all that. And you do only to pick rich people. You know, it's never lived with people in council as is. They've always got penthouse apartments on fifth Avenue. That kind of shit.

No, I was gonna say, in addition to Alison pointing out on the course, the opposite of that. For those, you know, and game is, I think if I told you, we only briefly mentioned that the documentary, the idea of, you know, those who are working class, or those are lower socioeconomic value by the, by the, you know, viewed by the other building that their answer is keep them where they are or place them in institutions.

And when you have that idea of institutions using these kinds of films were portrayed as diva desirable places to go. So I am fences when they send birds, the brother or the nephew to the institution that owns the house where he stays and I call it, it's the idea of, you know, if you've, if you've got the wealth and you've call it and you and your classes have a, a high class, then you can pay to have those adaptations and you can have had that space that you can live in and, and live your life.

But of course, if you have a lower socioeconomic value, the answer to you and to all the concerns that you have is institutionalization. Uh, but of course, and it's portrayed in a desirable way. Well, yeah, and I think a shit, I forgot what I was gonna say, but I think the institutions again, cause I, I worked for a few years for an organization that is the largest institutional advisor of disabled people in Britain.

Uh, most people in those institutions loved it and were very glad to be there. And it's about thinking, why is that? Cause outside. It's shit and scary and you have to worry about money. And so actually, you know, there's this idea, Oh, Jason's institutions, you know, an army gangsters, Ephesians I'm against institutionalization, but actually I can see and understand from my own personal experience and the life and the work I've done that actually, I can quite understand why to a lot of disabled or some disabled people they'd think.

Man, this beats living in the fucking real world. Yeah. I had the same experience when I worked to promote independence, they went from people who'd been staged, institutionalized, and there were, all of them were very frightened. I felt very uprooted. So I think I completely agree, you know, and I think it's those kind of nuances that you can't just make kind of generalized statements and, you know, you can't even win.

I won, which is what we've agreed, basically. This is, and, and I get that. But I think there was, there were whole little things like that and equally this idea of the positive and the negative, actually, if your life, as a disabled person in experiencing the real world is, and large negative to see a positive representation, which tends to be a normalized affluent.

One is nothing positive about that. If that's not your life, you know? And so, yeah, there's so many things apply there that you just think. You know, you need to be careful. I think we've discussed in previous ones, you know, saying about when you're talking about, uh, the water one, I've forgotten what it was called, spirit of the war.

And what was the one with Sally Hawkins? You know, so talking about how, you know, it should have been played by a disabled person, but she is a disabled person. Uh, and there's all these things apply there that you just can't. It's becoming too complex that you need a kind of whole different narrative. You need to be, to be able to extend it and push it beyond and, and understand the diversity of disabled people.

Like you said, at the very beginning, this is of the view that every disabled person thinks like this. And it's not true and it's understandable that they don't. And actually to say that they're wrong would be insulting to them as well. Uh, but again, I will recommend this to people, uh, but it, it, it, I think it's, this is an awful thing to say, but we know far too much for it to be good.

And I'm glad that the last true, uh, but I'd still recommend it to people. Anybody else want to say anything before we finish that moment of silence leads us to the end. Thank you, Mira. Thank you, Alison. And see you next time.