

"Technoableism and future AI"
Ashley Shew, Virginia Tech
International Disability Rights Affirmation Conference 2021
November 26

[2021/11/26 14:29] Elektra Panthar: Hello everyone.

Today's presentation is being transcribed so those without audio or who require text only can participate in real time. The presenter may also use a teleprompter (speak easy) in local chat.

A little explanation about this service.

Voice-to-text transcriptionists provide a translation of the key ideas discussed, NOT a word for word transcription.

Voice-to-text services provide an in-the-moment snapshot of ideas and concepts, so that those who are unable to hear or to understand the audio program are able to participate in real-time.

You will see the transcription in local chat.

Transcription is provided by Virtual Ability, Inc.

The transcriptionists are:

Elektra Panthar

Carolyn Carillon

The speakers will be identified by initials as they speak.

The following initials in the transcription record will identify the speakers:

AS: Ashley Shew (DrShoo)

[2021/11/26 14:30] Sitearm Madonna: Gentle beings, welcome to this session of the International Disability Rights Affirmation Conference. My name is Sitearm online, and James offline.

I am a member of the Virtual Ability Community. I have family and associates with disabilities and I am temporarily able bodied.

I have had the honor to work with the Virtual Ability Community on several projects, and along those lines it is my privilege to introduce our next speaker, Doctor Ashley Shew.

Doctor Shew, who is DrShoo online, is Associate Professor at Virginia Tech in the Department of Science, Technology, and Society. She sometimes describes herself as a "transmobile crippborg-cyborg fighting technoableism."

Ashley is Co-Editor-in-Chief of the Official Journal of the Society for Philosophy and Technology. Her recent publications include "Let Covid-19 Expand Our Awareness of Disability Tech" in the international journal, *Nature*.

Doctor Shew is a National Science Foundation grant awardee for "Science of Broadening Participation: CAREER: Disability, Experience, and Technological Imagination." Her presentation today is on "Technoableism and future Artificial Intelligence".

Please welcome Doctor Ashley Shew!

[2021/11/26 14:32] Varahi Lusch: /me claps her hands

[2021/11/26 14:32] Namaara MacMoragh: 

[2021/11/26 14:32] Namaara MacMoragh:  Applause 

[2021/11/26 14:32] Namaara MacMoragh: 

[2021/11/26 14:32] Mook Wheeler: applause!

[2021/11/26 14:33] DrShoo Resident: Thank you for that introduction, Sitearm Madonna, and thank you to the organizers of this event for inviting me, especially Gentle Heron, who has been so kind to help set me up here as an avatar and find my way to this podium and provide so much well-organized information about this event.

And thank you to all who are gathered here today for this talk too.

I am excited to talk to you about technoableism and technology design for disabled futures, and I am just awed to be in this disability-forward space among other people like me.

I am required to tell you that this presentation is based on materials developed as part of a NSF grant, though does not reflect their opinions.

My presentation title is Technoableism and Future AI.

Image description: I'm a white person avatar in some rather standard clothing standing at a podium; my slides throughout are black with off-white text.

I will describe any images as we go, which will matter when we talk about memes, but otherwise it's off-white on black text-heavy slides because I am a very serious academic (said jokingly).

(next slide)

So, I've gone ahead and used the word in my title, but what is technoableism?

Technoableism is a word I've been using to describe what I think will sound familiar to most disabled people.

Ableism can take many different forms. Ableism is bias and discrimination against disabled people, but it's more than that too.

Fiona Kumari Campbell calls it "a trajectory of perfection" that influences how we value people and create systems.

[2021/11/26 14:36] Elektra Panthar: (from the book 'Ableism in academia')

[2021/11/26 14:35] DrShoo Resident: I often talk about ableism as "the sauce we're all marinated in," meaning that ableism is a regular feature of how things are made and people are assessed and defaults are assumed -- reflected then in infrastructure, attitudes toward disabled people, and technological design.

Technoableism is a particular flavor of this ableism sauce, and it's one that's so pervasive.

So often our stories about technology for disability herald every small development as life-changing (even when some of these technologies are not desirable to disability communities),

depict disabled people as pitiful subjects of design who need technological intervention (ignoring that we can and do lifehack and design on our own),

and depict designers as heroes to disabled people (and often these stories interview makers and caretakers, but not disabled tech users).

These stories, which talk about technologies as empowering for disabled people, about how we need to develop tech to empower disabled people, have ableism at their core and are themselves disempowering by suggesting that disabled is a bad thing to be, that disabled people by just existing are calling out for help, and that designers, not disabled people themselves, are the ones doing the action to rectify the situation through technological development. So, technoableism is ableism instantiated and reified through the stories and development around technology that often make news. Technoableism insists that the solution to disability (with the assumption that disability is a problem) is technology. Behind this idea is the limited imagination that (a) disability is always a bad thing and that (b) disability is an individual problem, not one of context, environment, and community.

(next slide)

When I introduce technoableism as a topic, I need to explain why I work on narratives about technology as told by disabled people. The fact is that most of us are living against a backdrop of media tropes about disability where what people imagine about us is framed by cultural, media, and religious imaginings, often led by nondisabled people. What people think we need as disabled people is often framed by these tropes. And, so, the technologies we see developed, and how we talk about them in the context of disability, reflect stereotypes perpetuated in media and cultural views of disability. My work attempts to counter some of these harmful tropes by elevating disabled expertise about the experience of disability and technology.

But what are these stereotypes?

Here I want to note that these tropes that I'm about to describe don't apply equally to all disabled people, and there are some specific tropes that end up mapping onto specific categories of disability that aren't represented here. For instance, Lynn Manning, in his poem, the Magic Wand, describes the specific stereotypes associated with being a blind black man, having to do with being extra-wise and excellent at piano, which are particular stereotypes for being a blind black man. The Magic Wand, the title of his poem, refers to his white cane and the moment where he unfolds his cane -- at which point he can feel the shift that people make as they transform him from the media-driven stereotypes of being a tall black man, like that he's good at basketball, to the stereotypes with being a blind black man. He ends: "I only wield the wand / You are the magician." His transformation is in the attitudes of the people around him.

(next slide)

The media tropes I offer here are more general than what Lynn Manning describes with respect to his own categories, and of course won't speak equally to all types of disability or disabled people.

And, in fact, say more about the people telling the stories than they do about actual disabled people.

A lot of the research I do has to do with the narratives disabled people tell that differ from these tropes, but being judged up against them, especially when it comes to how they narrate their relationship to different technologies.

You can find these five tropes in a lot of the memes that get passed around about disability, actually, so that's what I'll be showing you here.

As a side note, the one consistent source for non-tropey story-telling around disability are stories from disabled people and from Afrofuturism.

Sami Schalk, in *Bodyminds Reimagined*, talks about speculative fiction from black women as offering seeds of resistance

to these and other narratives that frame the lives of black disabled and queer women. <https://www.dukeupress.edu/bodyminds-reimagined>

So, these media tropes that are indeed rough categories are: moochers and fakers, bitter cripples, pitiable freaks, shameful sinners, and inspirational overcomers.

These will look all too familiar as I show you some memes.

(next slide)

This slide has three memes representing the category moochers and fakers.

From left to right, we have first the Snarky Willy Wonka meme with the superimposed words "Bless Your Heart... Trying to Get Disability Benefits. I don't think lazy is a disability."

The second is a screenshot of George Takei on Twitter sharing a meme. He writes above the meme "She was filled with the holy... spirits"

and the meme is a woman standing in front of her wheelchair getting alcohol down off of a top shelf in a grocery with the text "There has been a miracle in the alcohol aisle."

The third meme is sensationalistic talk show host Maury Povich saying "I see you have a disabled parking card. The fact that you walked to the store determined that was a lie."

In the trope of moochers and fakers, the assumption is that people are faking their disabilities for social or financial gain.

Often policing of disability in this vein happens over the use of disability infrastructure or technology.

This trope plays out in many viral memes, but also in entertainment (There's Something About Mary, and many others)

and in real life where people are loathe to be seen as disabled in public *because* they will be questioned and treated harshly.

Especially for people with non-apparent disabilities, using disability infrastructure or claiming to be disabled can invite criticism, policing, and hate.

Moochers and fakers trope is used to discredit disabled people who seek technologies for their daily lives,

and suggest that people avoid using technologies that could help them as they are policed away from use.

Questions like “do you really need that?” can be hard to answer for people with disabilities that vary or flare, too, which opens up public scrutiny like we see in the memes here.

(next slide)

The next trope is bitter cripples.

Here we have the trope represented by Lt. Dan from Forrest Gump and Captain Hook and the images I have here are screenshots of the two characters, no text.

These archetypes are so well-established in cinema that I don't need memes.

Bitter cripples are people who are warped by their self-pity and hatred and lash out at others *because* they are disabled.

This is a common way in which disabled people are depicted - and part of far too many villainous backstories.

Often we know these people are villainous or troubled because of the technologies they use or the scars they show.

Often these characters are depicted with older or less glamorous disability technologies - or make their technologies less glamorous in their use.

I think here too of how many disabled people do not use hook tools because of public perception, because kids will be afraid of them in public.

However, bitter cripples is a trope that is used to discredit disabled people who might speak up against injustice or against social configurations that interfere with disabled life.

I see people want to use the trope whenever they disagree with what a disabled person is saying.

If disabled people talk back against technoableist technologies or against designs made without disabled input or even how we talk about a technology,

I've seen it play out time and time again that that disabled person is depicted as not properly grateful, not representing a larger group or community (a one-off dissatisfied person), or not being a good person.

If you follow the disabled design critics Alex Hagaard and Liz Jackson on Twitter, the replies that they sometimes get are wild.

(next slide)

The next category is pitiable freaks.

Pitiable freaks is represented here by a screenshot of an Autism Speaks ad that depicted autism as a terrible force and something to fight against called “I am autism”

and in a meme of a disabled woman dressed up with a young man in a suit with the words “He asked her to prom even in her condition! Like and share = respect).”

I dread prom season stories for their depiction like the second meme here.

I should also note that this Autism Speaks commercial upset a lot of people in how it talks about autism and should be treated with content warnings if you go to view.

Autism Speaks is also regarded as a hate organization by many autistic-led autism groups.

The pitiable freaks trope suggests that disabled people warrant pity and intervention, that we are in need of nondisabled heroes to be acceptable or even included.

This is a longstanding trope - and harkens back to freakshows where disabled people were displayed for public consumption.

It still operates today, and many disabled people, especially from the LP community and people upon which people are bestowing charity, report being videoed or photographed without their consent for messaging in this vein.

Technoableism is found in these representations in warranting technology

because the disabled people in question warrant action in some way.

Often these technologies are about elimination- with biotech intervention having a lot of this narrative involved with an emphasis on how bad it must be to be disabled.

I'm still very mad about a talk by a nondisabled white man on my campus that was entitled "The End of Disability," as if that were a good or possible goal.

Disability is kind of a huge category to be saying things like that about.

(next slide)

The trope of shameful sinners casts disabled people as either sinners themselves or the products of sin.

It's a longstanding disability trope, one with deep instantiations in our culture, especially given biblical stories

and medical justifications that insist that, say, autism is the result of cold mothering (as recently as the early 1990s, and it's not).

Here we have a man with a box of frosted flakes with marshmallows and the words "New Frosted Flakes with Marshmallows, Free diabetes inside every box."

In this trope, the sin might be moral or against god or be personally inflicted through bad behavior or choice.

You see this trope weigh on people who acquire disabilities as a result of trauma and health problems.

From a history of congenital disability being seen as a reflection of a mother's sin to acquired disability being seen as desert for the sins of the person with a disability to recent tropes that frame disability as the fault of the disabled person or a challenge given by god for someone or a family to grapple with.

Disability as a reflection of sin exists as a cultural template -- one which at some times requires a technological redemption...

Technology gets cast as addressing the moral infraction and helping a person recover body and mind - to feel whole again. Technology gets read as a moral fix for broken people.

Harriet McBryde Johnson has this great anecdote in her novel *Accidents of Nature* where two disabled summer campers are talking, and one says she wishes there were just one story from the Bible where the cripple didn't get cured -- that there was just one story where they let the disabled person be disabled, so that people would just treat her like a person instead of a disability to cure or heal.

I think about that a lot. We need authentically told stories so we can just be, without interference or without assumption.

(next slide)

For the final trope I want to talk about, I just have a screenshot of an image search result for the words "the only disability in life is a bad attitude"

with various colorful memes of amputees in action and wheelchair users with these words superimposed. This meme saturates positive thinking spaces.

There are a million memes for this trope with images of people on running blades and the words "What's your excuse?" Or "Can I get an amen?"

Or that ask us to appreciate life more because, somehow, a disabled person is still able to enjoy theirs.

This trope is often woven through with disabled children and military heroes. While the last four tropes we looked at obviously suck, the inspirational overcomer is no better a trope.

It suggests that disabled people are objects of inspiration for other people, that that is our role, and still suggests that disabled lives are harder, worse off, or exceptional rather than regular.

Stella Young has brilliantly critiqued this trope, and calls stories that objectify disabled people for the inspiration of nondisabled people “inspiration porn.”

(next slide)

Here is a screenshot of Stella Young’s TED talk, which I highly recommend.

There are downsides for disabled people in being cast as inspiration porn – and I want to note my focus here on inspirational overcomers is because often disability technologies are part of this story:

that people found the right technologies, guided by humanitarian technologists and therapists, to properly overcome the circumstances of their bodies.

But why is this a bad thing?

- Treats us as exceptional individuals, rather than as community members of an underrepresented minority who may need access and accommodations and structural change, rather than gadgets to help us individually function.
- Asks us to live for other people - the goal becomes about being seen properly in this role.
- Works against inclusive design and disability rights. We shouldn’t have to be at our best to be allowed to participate.
- Exceptionalizes, rather than normalizes, disability as a facet of the human experience. It exaggerates how different we are.
- It suggests that we have to do this fighting thing instead of setting people up for adaptation or creativity in thinking about participating in various things.

This frame can be quite annoying too –

I’ve been standing at a grocery store picking out ears of corn, literally the least inspirational activity, and had a stranger approach me to tell me that I am such an inspiration.

(next slide)

In terms of technology relevance, the inspirational overcomer narrative sits in lock-step with narratives that promise empowerment and redemption for disabled people. Often these narratives talk about service or sacrifice, and justify the cost of technological development, while playing up how sad disabled life is in the absence of technologies (recycling that pity trope).

The job of a disabled person in these stories is to serve as backdrop for stories about technological redemption, empowerment, and power.

This is not to say that disabled people don’t like or want technologies, just that these stories undercut our agency in shaping technology use, our ingenuity in creation, our off-brand off-use adoption of technologies, our retrofitting, our creativity and power.

It also speaks against our dissatisfaction when things don't work.
It's not the technology, it's we who do this work of making technologies good for us,
where they can be.

(next slide)

We have a problem here in that we have so few authentic representation of disability
in the media sphere.

Dominick Evans and Ashton Law do a great job of classification in their reports on
filmdis.org of summarizing years of content, but the fact is that most disabled
characters still are played by and written by nondisabled people.

Rarely is disability part of the background of our stories - there often aren't just
random, normal characters who are disabled as part of most media,
which is contrary to how life is, where we all know and interact with disabled people,
are related to disabled people or are disabled ourselves.

We also have a problem in how nondisabled people are actively encouraged to
over-write the experience of disability with things like disability simulations,
where people blindfold up to "learn what it is to be blind," as if an hour in a blindfold
can teach you anything.

The sociological data - and here you should check out Arielle Siverman's and
Michele Nario-Redmond's work - about disability simulation
is actually that it increases negative attitudes nondisabled people have about the
competence of disabled people.

Simulation encourages people to take on our experiences and voices without
actually consulting us.

My life as a hard-of-hearing amputee isn't just about wearing a prosthetic limb and
hearing aids, which maybe you can simulate briefly,
but such an experience can't account for the adaptations I've made to my own life
with these devices and this body,
nor can it account for the environmental infrastructure and attitudes I encounter over
my time in public.

Even if we could get a perfect simulation, my life shouldn't be a fun awareness
exercise,

especially when so many nondisabled people enter these simulations wanting to
read things through the media tropes they are familiar with.

These tropes limit creativity about disability and further abnormalize disabled people,
make us an exception rather than a norm in the way the world is conceived.

Then, when someone goes to design after simulation, these distortions of disability
experience get embedded, crappy narratives persisting.

(next slide)

Technoableism reflects the tropes we've seen, and powers them up. Technology
gets read through narrow frames that do a disservice to our people.

And technoableism is *the* story when it comes to technology and disability.

It asserts better living through technologies.

It asserts that disabled people are made good, acceptable, palatable, are made
citizens through technological means.

We are supposed to be transformed by technologies - either made better or
palatable.

Technoableism wraps with eugenical and transhumanist ideas to highlight disabled people as the test pilots for the future - for futures without disability, without disabled people.

Even when there's talk about empowerment, the underlying assumption is that disabled people need to be empowered by technologies and by nondisabled helpers, these humanitarian engineers or designers – rather than addressing systemic issues that lead to disabled people having less power or sharing in a community of other disabled people.

(next slide)

This is just a cursory look for this presentation but here are a few headlines:

The Tech Giving People the Power to Deal with Disability

How Technology Will Change the Lives of People with Disabilities

First Prosthetic Limb Designed for Women: 'I Feel Liberated'

Robotic Exoskeletons Are Here - and They are Changing Lives

I get into specific technologies in some other work - particularly prosthetic arms and exoskeletons in more depth.

The stories disabled people actually tell about these technologies are VERY different than the news coverage.

Second thing: Most of these stories leave out the context -- prosthetic arms adopted because of staring

or exoskeleton development excitement because the built infrastructure continues to suck, nearing 30 years post-ADA ...

or because military contractors want to make supersoldiers and this is just humanitarian cover.

All of these stories are outside a context of consideration about how we might normalize disability as part of the human experience and build infrastructure and technologies that serve disabled people better.

<http://www.newmobility.com/2014/08/crip-buzz-august-2014/>

(next slide)

We see technoableism all over once we start looking -- in the headlines and hype, in "feel-good" stories that don't feel so good,

like the viral cochlear implant turning on videos that the Deaf community has spoken up against,

in the virtual reality stories for various disabilities (in the absence of information on how disability simulation is actually bad),

and on justifications for abusive techniques (thinking here of therapies for kids that put them in therapy for 30+ hours a week, which is far too much no matter what the therapy is, if you consult the memoirs of disabled people).

(next slide)

We have to work against technoableism by revaluing disabled expertise and authentic stories, and learning our shared disability history.

We have to value disabled designers and view disabled bodies and minds as good, adaptive, and full of creative possibility.

We have to move from independence to interdependence, since independence was always a lie.

The Sins Invalid collective has been particularly forceful on this issue and how it fits into Disability Justice.

We also have to recognize the cost of war, and of life, with technologies we choose. We can embrace cross-disability community and move away from restrictive ideas about what is normal or good as we do this.

(next slide)

So, the advertised title of this talk is Technoableism and Future AI, and I want us to have technoableism in mind as we consider any technology development around disability, to avoid.

I think of things that are currently underway or rolling out.

We know a lot about failed technologies in the disability community - with so many things shared with enthusiasm that will never be a reality for most of us.

We know about the iBot stand up wheelchair that was a commercial failure, despite being a technology some wheelchair users liked,

because it got classified as transportation and therefore not covered through insurance or Medicaid.

We know how systems of maintenance fail us, and how long repairs take, and about how upgrades can mean personally costly software failures.

We worry about how data will be used against us where it can.

And I think that's the facet I want to focus on here with the time we have remaining: data.

We are in a world where more and more is collected on us.

We have politicians that have thought about looking at claims for disability benefits against whether disabled people are active on social media:

as if being active on social media means that you can hold down a job (and as if discrimination and ableist norms didn't shape employment for us).

We have systems in some states of electronic visit verification –

where a cell phone is used for personal care attendants to clock in and out, effectively also counting location and other information that the state doesn't collect about nondisabled people.

The Cyborg Jillian Weise has voiced concerns about how step counts on computerized knees mean that prosthetists, manufacturers, and insurance companies now have access to amputee step data

in ways that can and will be used to deny prosthetic components and upgrades, to tsk-tsk users for not getting in enough steps, to evaluate us without talking to us.

Given issues with fit and swelling, the issues limbs have, it's so easy for me to imagine how this data is being used inappropriately and without user consent or knowledge.

The specter of the moochers and fakers trope looms large in all of these spaces.

We see it also in concerns around heart and insulin monitors that upload to the cloud, and not just for the users or their personal doctors.

The way these things can be moralized and played into tropes around sin seems easy here too.

There are problems with being counted and tracked and datafied, as already discussed, especially in denials of needed technology and repair and benefits.

There's also trouble brewing around not being counted, where disabled people are not recognized because their movement may be different or their faces aren't recognized or their eyes don't track in typical ways. Not being part of the set can be deadly if we're talking about things like autonomous vehicles and application systems and test monitoring software and more. We need disabled people in all areas of technological work because our underrepresentation and misrepresentation is literally deadly, costly, awful. What they think we need, how they think we need to be seen, how they read us, what they think they are doing: they've gotten the story wrong.

(next slide)

So, when I think about how we should talk about future technologies, including disabled people, but also letting us lead, is of great importance. Recognizing technoableism, and remembering the tropes, helps us understand why certain technological solutionism, as posited by some designers, fails to do good and can often do us real harm, especially as we look at future AI. Applications that see disability as a problem to be overcome, or disabled people as fakers or sinners, give us the wrong approach because they begin and end in ableism.

Thank you for coming to my presentation.

I'm happy to take questions and comments now.

I know there are parts I haven't fully explained, and I'd love to hear from some of you on your own experiences with technology and disability.

It's unique to get to present here at Virtual Ability and like this, with a predominantly disabled audience.

I love that this was actually so carefully built and designed as disability-led, disability-forward, disability-friendly.

I recognize with humility that you all have expertise here.

(next slide)

Final slide here with a note about my grant, a hand-drawn image of a prosthetic leg with the words "socket to me!"

[2021/11/26 15:08] Elektra Panthar: AS: My email is shew@vt.edu and Twitter handle @ashleyshoo

[2021/11/26 15:07] Shendara Destiny: *.. (*.. ♥ ..*)..*

[2021/11/26 15:07] Shendara Destiny: .♥.....APPLAUSE!♥.

[2021/11/26 15:07] Shendara Destiny: ..*.. (*.. ♥ ..*)`*..`*..`

[2021/11/26 15:07] Gentle Heron: Dr. Shew, there are so many points you have made that resonate with us.

[2021/11/26 15:07] Sitearm (Sitearm Madonna): Very nice!

[2021/11/26 15:07] Slatan Dryke: stunning presentation thank you !!!!

[2021/11/26 15:07] Varahi Lusch: /me claps her hands

[2021/11/26 15:08] Rinny (hatsunemiku66666 Resident): Thank you!

[2021/11/26 15:08] Shiloh e. (Shiloh Emmons): fantastic presentation.

[2021/11/26 15:08] Gentle Heron: I want to remind our audience to click on the box at Dr. Shew's feet to get some information about the resources she mentioned throughout her presentation.

[2021/11/26 15:08] Sitearm (Sitearm Madonna): /me raises hand -question comment

[2021/11/26 15:09] Elektra Panthar: Sitearm: Comment - you resonated with me about the data topic

There's a meme about someone shoveling snow off steps and a wheelchair user asking why don't they shovel the ramp first so everyone can use the access point There's also the problem about data being accessible, as for example when one is kicked off Facebook if they're being hacked

AS: I think about the presentation of medical ableism earlier, that it shapes the way people look at things

[2021/11/26 15:11] Carolyn Carillon: [15:08] Mook Wheeler: COMMENT: I speak to Stella Young's notion of 'inspiration porn' (IP). For ideological change to happen, people must usually experience discomfort. Comfortable people do not usually choose to change things: comfort is a reason to stay as you are. Therefore: Use people's discomfort to invoke change. If people come up to us and say "You inspire me", don't say "That's inspiration porn, go away" -- use their greeting as a foot in the door to initiate awareness. Carry giveaway cards containing a careful explanation of tropes, IP, your condition, etc., with links to additional information (like this presentation!). Cards can contain more information than an awkward conversation. I like this method because it takes me off the back foot, and it introduces that little wedge of discomfort into their worldview, haha. However, cards are ... low-tech. ;))

[2021/11/26 15:12] Elektra Panthar: AS: I appreciate this comment, Mook! I have a friend that asks 'What are you inspired to do? ' when people come up to her and tell her she's an inspiration

People are confused because most of the times they only want to say something My friend is an amputee like me so her question sounds vaguely threatening which I like

[2021/11/26 15:12] iSkye Silvercloud (iSkye Silverweb): I am one of those who have said with activists in RL "nothing about us, without us" especially when it comes to tech or accommodations

The word "accommodation" can also feel a bit ableist

We don't want to be accommodated, we want to be included and empowered

[2021/11/26 15:15] Elektra Panthar: AS: I like what iSkye commented

Sitearm : I feel guilty for being in this conference as a temporarily able-bodied person, how can I talk to disabled people without pissing them off?

AS: As better more informed interaction you can look at series written by disabled people (Speechless for example)

I know there are few and far between for now

Also disability communities

For example 'disability visibility', where she and other disabled people interview each other

One needs to be more discerning about finding less tropey material

[2021/11/26 15:18] Gentle Heron: Disability Visibility Project - <https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/>

[2021/11/26 15:17] Sitearm (Sitearm Madonna): ty!

[2021/11/26 15:16] Varahi Lusch: COMMENT: I have found that new tech often merely speeds up the ableists in my life - so they expect me to go even faster to match their pace and they often push their freedom in my face! Almost saying "now you have this, surely you can be free (and meet my expectations)" ;)

[2021/11/26 15:17] Shiloh e. (Shiloh Emmons): I had a late friend in college, who would have been an amazing anthropologist, I never treated him as "different" .. intellectually interacted with him as any other person, even though I pushed his wheel chair (a horse fell on him at Notre Dame, he was a equestrian) ... The point is: I just talked to him like any other grad student friend of mine ... Thank you for an great talk ...

[2021/11/26 15:17] Mook Wheeler: [15:11] Gentle Heron: QUESTION- Dr. Shew, when a person with a disability encounters an ableist technological or structural barrier to full participation in some activity, what is the best way to approach this issue? Perhaps you could give an example of how these problems are best addressed without increasing tensions that get twisted against the person with the disability.

[2021/11/26 15:20] Elektra Panthar: AS: Good question, I advise people to find a community - if you are part of a group that works together it's easier to talk about issues and not have the person being singled out
I believe in the power of cross-disabilities organizing

[2021/11/26 15:21] Varahi Lusch: solidarity :)

[2021/11/26 15:22] LV (LoriVonne Lustre): Like Virtual Ability? Sounds familiar :-)

[2021/11/26 15:21] Gentle Heron: You are talking about Centers for Independent Living

[2021/11/26 15:22] Elektra Panthar: AS: Centers for independent living are an example but my point is, if a group of diverse people present the issue, it shows that it's not a single person's problem

It's great to hear from one another

GH: We haven't exhausted the topic but we might have exhausted the audience!

AS: Thank you , I appreciate you inviting me

GH: Maybe we can work more together

AS: It makes me glad to see this setup and group

[2021/11/26 15:23] Sitearm (Sitearm Madonna): Very nice!

[2021/11/26 15:23] Shendara Destiny: *.*.*.*.*(*.*.*.*.*♥.*.*.*.*)*.*.*.*.*

[2021/11/26 15:23] Shendara Destiny: .*.*.*.*.*APPLAUSE!*.*.*.*.*♥.*.*.*.*.*

[2021/11/26 15:23] Shendara Destiny: *.*.*.*.*(*.*.*.*.*♥.*.*.*.*)*.*.*.*.*

[2021/11/26 15:23] Eme Capalini: Great job! Thank you

[2021/11/26 15:23] Mook Wheeler: applauuuuuuuuuuseeeee!!!!

[2021/11/26 15:23] Varahi Lusch: yay for Shoo

[2021/11/26 15:23] Alisa Farshore: Thank you very much for this

[2021/11/26 15:23] LV (LoriVonne Lustre): Applause!

[2021/11/26 15:28] Elektra Panthar: <<transcription ends>>