Nottingham Contemporary

Thu 30 Sep
6.30-8.30pm

Access and Abundance

Live transcript

KEYWORDS

captioning, access, stenographer, question, disability, thinking, shorthand, image, people, moving image, disability studies, moment, film, conversation, event

SPEAKERS
Hannah Wallis, Sarah Hayden, Louise Hickman, Tanya Titchkosky

00:08 Hannah Wallis
Hi everyone, many thanks for joining us tonight. My name is Hannah Wallis and I am currently working in an associate capacity with Nottingham Contemporary to co-conceive and deliver this caption conscious ecology program with Sarah Hayden, who I will pass you over to you shortly. Just to share a really quick description, I am a white woman in her early 30s. I have wavy brown hair to just above my shoulders, and I'm wearing a black tank top. I wear small gold hoops in my ears, and I also have a cochlear implant on my right ear. In the background, you can see a painting to my right, to my left sorry, and a door to my right. Just before Sarah introduces our excellent guests for tonight, I just wanted to share some brief housekeeping notes. So our live programme of talks, performances, screenings, seek to create a challenging environment where open mindedness and respect for each other's experiences and perspectives can foster growth. We will keep a really informal atmosphere throughout the evening. And although public intervention is limited in today's digital format, we welcome you to join the conversation as much as you can. You can use the chat on YouTube to write your questions and comments as we go through the session. And Sarah will kindly share these during the discussion in the second half of the event. I just want to take this opportunity to share our gratitude to the AHRC funding that is generously and graciously supporting the caption conscious ecology project through Sarah's

Talk

voices in the gallery project. As well as acknowledging my colleagues, Catherine, Canan, and Jim, who are supporting us this evening at Nottingham Contemporary. So just a quick note on access for the evening. All the events as part of the caption conscious ecology project, including tonight, we have BSL interpretation. Today that's thanks to Sarah Perks, and Rebekah Spencer. We also have live captioning, thanks to Andrew. So if you'd like to activate the captions on your device, you can click the closed caption button in the corner of the YouTube screen. For tonight's screening, Louise Hickman, one of our guest speakers, it also going to provide a live audio description of the film that she'll be showing. An edited version of the talks will be made available online shortly after the event has ended. And you'll be able to return to these conversations at a time that suits you. We also hope that you will share them with people who can't be present for the live stream tonight. So I'll pass you over to Sarah now who's moderating tonight's discussion. And I hope you have a lovely evening.

03:11 Sarah Hayden
Hello everyone and welcome to the first event in caption conscious ecology. I'm Sarah Hayden. I'm a white woman wearing big shoulder pads which make for maybe a more recognisable silhouette on screen. I have quite a mixed up kind of Irish accent, a moving around sort of Irish accent a bit like a leprechaun, which might also help you to tie my name to my face as I'm speaking. This four part series has been devised through a partnership as Hannah has said, between Nottingham Contemporary and Voices in the Gallery, this research project that I lead, on voice art and access. More specifically and socially, this series comes about through a very close generative merry collaboration between curator Hannah, Hannah Wallis and myself. The impetus to organise caption conscious ecology arose from a will to open a set of conversations about accessibility in moving image and voice driven arts practices. We set out to draw together insights on captioning and media access from activists from access workers and scholars across the fields of communication, critical disability studies and Deaf Studies. What we wanted to do was to share with new communities the exciting foment of work being made by artists out of and through access means - artworks that explore exemplify the poetic potentiality. And I say that with a nod to Shannon Finnegan and Bojana Coklyat of captioning and

of audio description. Work by some of these artists will be screened as part of these conversation sessions. And we'll be making an announcement soon with details on that. So that's the point where I tantalize you with what's still being held back before later dripping further news of what's to come. Through the workshops in the series we're hoping to prompt artists and arts workers to begin to think about how and why captioning could be embedded in what they do from the point of conception, rather than as a fix, or a sort of compliance widget that's laid on over the top in post production. If any of you are keen right now to mark your calendars for the future, our next talk will be on protest and practice. And that'll be with Jaipreet Virdi, and Collective Text and some soon to be announced screenings on October 14, as well as those two talk sessions there'll be a captioning workshop for artists, led by Asad Raza and Olivia Fairweather on October 8, and one for curators and arts workers led by Eleanor Morgan, together with Hannah and myself on October 21. You don't need to remember all of that now, in any case, you'll find information on how to sign up for all of these on the Nottingham Contemporary and the voices in the gallery websites. In conceiving of these events, Hannah and myself, we were compelled to harness some broad realizations experienced by many living and working extra online this past year and a half in a strangely synced in some cases, pandemic context. These were belated realisations in many cases, including I'll readily admit my own realisations about the responsibility to consider digital spaces as public space, spaces that need to be accessible. Media Access matters, access to Art Media Matters within and far beyond the spaces in which that art is immediately encountered. As Elizabeth Ellcessor has argued, in her words, the ability to participate culturally, and civically is closely tied to the ability to use, to consume, to watch, to make sense of one's surrounding media environment. So the public value that's at stake when media are made accessible or not, or when art is made accessible or not, is that of citizen equality? I suggest we keep this in mind in thinking about the political work of and in contemporary art. Captioning, as we're going to learn from Jaipreet on October 14, has its roots in resistance. It has its roots in the activism of deaf and disabled people. And its provision remains political, it needs to remain political. In plotting this series, through periods of closures and special measures, we were conscious to have conversations that were afoot then and that

continue now about what should happen next. What changes and creative and curatorial practice could or should be carried out, back out as people were saying, but maybe we could query that into the spaces, the physical and the virtual spaces of art into our hopefully hybrid art future. Which is to say, really, there's the question of captioning material online. But there's also the question of captioning in the museum or in the gallery. Learning to ensure that online art presentations and events are captioned, that they're audio described that they're advertised with alt text, cues a reappraisal, it should cue a reappraisal we think of the very often partial and contingent accessibility or otherwise of the public spaces within which Moving Image art is commissioned. And within which it's shown. It's not enough. It never was enough to have accessible websites and inaccessible exhibitions, performances and screenings. So taking our cue from Carolyn Lazard, we're going to be trying to imagine access as in their words, a speculative practice and caption consciousness as one move towards establishing to borrow Lazard's words a more inclusive foundation to the cultural work that an arts organisation does. Our hope is that these events might contribute to, could even possibly fertilize the germination of a more caption conscious ecology, a shift in attitudes and expectations but also and crucially, a shift, and we mean a meaningful one, a long lasting one in institutional and making practices, one that might permeate how Moving Image meets its audiences and or its viewers, its receivers. We very much want to draw other people into these events and their legacies. And on that we'll have more details to come in future. So if this work intersects with your own, with your own interests, and your own activities, do get in touch with us, we're keen to keep learning and we're going to be thinking about captioning for a long while yet. I smile at Hannah with that as a kind of an almost like a threat and a promise to Hannah, we're still going to be thinking about captioning beyond beyond these events. I'm going to introduce our speakers in a moment and then we're going to have Tanya Titchkosky who will speak on encountering access as perception. Louise Hickman then will first give a short introduction to the film captioning on captioning by Louise Hackman and Shannon Finnegan. We'll screen the film and Louise is going to audio describe it to us live, which is a really exciting proposition. A Very generous thing to do. And then Louise will segue into a short talk titled more abundance, less austerity. We'll take a short break for five minutes,

you can run and grab a drink and come back. And then we're going to have a conversation and we'll be open then to your questions. I'm really keen for your contributions. Dr. Tanya Titchkosky is a professor in social justice education at OISE. That's the Ontario Institute for studies in education at the University of Toronto, teaching and writing in the area of disability studies for more than 20 years. Some of her books include disability, self and society 2003 as well as reading and writing disability differently, 2007 and the question of access, disability, space, meaning 2011. Tanya works from the position that whatever else disability is, it is tied up with the human imagination, steeped in mostly unexamined conceptions of "normalcy", and that's "normalcy" in inverted commas. This disability studies research and teaching orientation relies on other critical approaches to inquiry that question the grounds of Western ways of knowing, such as phenomenology influenced by black, queer and Indigenous Studies, by grappling with the act of interpretation, Tonya hopes to reveal the restricted imaginaries that surround our lives in and with disability. With co editors she has a new reader coming out in 2022. I would mark my diary with that news too, titled Disappearing: Encounters in Disability Studies. Dr. Louise Hickman is an activist and scholar of communication and uses ethnographic, archival and theoretical approaches to consider how access is produced for disabled and deaf people. Her current project focuses particularly on access produced by real time stenographers and transcriptive technologies in educational settings. She uses an interdisciplinary lens drawing on feminist theory, critical disability studies and science and technology studies to consider the historical conditions of access work, and the ways access is co produced through human and primarily female labor, technological systems and economic models and conditions. Louise is a research associate at the Minderoo Center for technology and democracy hosted at the Center for Research in the arts, social sciences and humanities that's most often known as CRASSH, which always sounds I think, quite exciting, at the University of Cambridge. Louise is also a visiting fellow at the London School of Economics. She holds a PhD in communication from the University of California, San Diego, and is currently working on her eagerly anticipated first manuscript Crip AI, the automation of access. As I think should already I hope, be clear, these bios are more than enough in themselves to explain why Tanya and Louise are our guests tonight. Their generous, rigorous and often

poetic thinking was foundational to our imagining of these events. In trying to think about what a caption conscious ecology could achieve, we were thinking particularly of how in the question of access Tanya overturns and overwrites the understanding in her words of disability access issues as a thoroughly individualised matter. We were thinking of how Tanya surfaces the ways in which the construction and constitution of social spaces legitimate some bodies, some sensoria and delegitimate others as potentially excludable. Thinking with Tanya, we come to understand how the advertising of a single one time event as captioned or as BSL interpreted as a special feature might show up what she calls the assumption of a general lack of access. That assumption predicated on a conception of disability as in Tanya's words again, not yet something to which a community needs to respond, at least not all the time. That assumption still everywhere pervades. Making captions a given communicates an expanded expectation of who is making and who is engaging with moving image in an act an expansion of the community of those who can or who could. We've been thinking too of the utterly timely attention that Louise brings to, in her words, the production of access as an important object of study in and of itself, and specifically about speech to text translations as social texts. Louise highlights the entanglement of care, subject specific transcoding expertise, and what Mia Mingus and Sandy Ho call access intimacy in real time captioning. Louise shows us that the work of CART captioners and stenographers as well as audio describers and sign language interpreters is always effective. It is always situated. It's always relational. Louise is writing about, in her words, the deployment of what are too often considered to be neutral or transparent technologies at a moment when the automation of access is everywhere proffered as an easy fix in this moment when access is increasingly spoken of, and increasingly misrepresented, misunderstood. So before I hand over to Tanya, allow me to say finally, thanks to all of you so much for being here this evening. Thanks for tuning in. And thanks to Louise and Tanya, for taking up this invitation.

15:46 Tanya Titchkosky
Hello, everybody, this is Tanya from Toronto, Ontario, Canada, where today it's the national day for truth and reconciliation, the first, the inaugural time of trying to reflect on what white settlers have done to

indigenous peoples and the loss of many children. And I just would like to thank Sarah and Hannah, for your reflective orientation, which I think is part of what the National Day for truth and reconciliation is trying to nurture in us is that what Hannah called a cue to reappraisal and I hope that this event participates in us developing that interest in and commitment to being cued for a reappraisal and I'm really thrilled to be here. And thanks so much for this opportunity and hope to share a little a few of my thoughts on a caption conscious ecology. So thanks very much. I'm really grateful to both Sarah and Hannah, for raising, nurturing a consideration even a consciousness for access and inclusion that I hope to contribute to today. And they've asked two questions or approached us with some questions. One was why we need to caption Moving Image work. And they also asked how to go about making this a given and creative and institutional practice which the introduction did such a great job of setting that up as an issue. Moving Image work is an expansive and inclusive category of the arts. And it's likely something I'm imagining that you do, it might be part of your identity. There might be some people who say, I am a moving image creator. There may also be some of you that identify as a captioner. And you know this language and it's art. I though, I don't identify as either. I don't know the language and arts of captioning, nor of moving images. I'm an interpretive sociologist doing disability studies who is dyslexic so what is this middle aged, white looking blonde woman who can still do cartwheels doing here then? I have shown such work to disabled to mad, divergent and dyslexic people, including myself. I've watched the use of codes and practices behind the doing of captioning and image production. From dyslexia, I remain amazed and frankly, baffled at the potential intimacy of the languages and practices shared between captioning and moving image work. That this intimacy is so often denied or happens only after creation rather than during, or that imaging and captioning become discordant. This too is also amazing and baffling. With this perplexity is provocation. I hope we can consider the ecology an ecology is that house of living relations the root of the word ecology, a house of living relations between captioning and moving image creation. While the relations between creators of images or captioning can lead into acts of reduction and confusion, degradation, we might encounter these differently by joining with Hannah and Sarah and their way of wondering why we need to caption moving image work, how to go about making

this a given. Answer is access of course. And I'm reminded at this point that there might be a outline of my talk that's been put into check. The answer to why caption seems obvious - for access of course, and for an expand and I should say this with more emphasis for an expanded audience a more nuanced sense of community, captions for community to be responsive to who and what we are - people that are not all the same, especially when it comes to hearing and seeing and speaking and other forms of sensual discernment. Working from the assumption of perceptual and communicative differences as the beginning place of creation seems to be an obvious solution. Despite the obvious, we still find ourselves without a close and ongoing relation to the question, why caption? The routines of access, even the mere question of access seems to fall away quickly, easily. Maybe the task of combining creation and access captioning Moving Image creations has never been fully established. Given it isn't established, when the access mandate leaves our consciousness, or the access person leaves our creative team. captioning is imagined mostly after creation, as Hannah and Sarah would say. Despite the obvious answer solution - include captioning as a starting place, it seems so much more complicated than it first appears. And maybe we have to hang on to the questions that Hannah and Sarah have given us for just a little bit long. So here's a story. One way I tried to hang on to questions of access, despite how easily they slip from our imagination. It's a story which I hope isn't just a lament, but invites us to pursue a politics of wonder. Back in 2006, I started anew, becoming a faculty member at the more or less accessible big urban University of Toronto, where I am today. I had left a more or less inaccessible small liberal arts rural, East Coast University. But my move to the big university came with a shock - for all their big city ways, and signs that everywhere said for captioning, signs that everywhere said we are accessible. There wasn't even an accessible toilet in the large building where my office was located, and where I would teach - for the Canadians who might be listening, the word there is washroom, but toilet for those who are in the UK. No accessible toilet. There were however, signs everywhere that said otherwise. The collective I of my new workplace seems fooled by the blue and white stick figure using a wheelchair. This icon of access was posted on many heavy narrow doors throughout the building, including inaccessible toilet doors. How could I keep my job? How can I keep my paycheck as a new disability

studies professor, if I worked in a building that didn't even have an accessible toilet. I had trouble sleeping knowing that I worked for an organisation that didn't seem to know that disabled students, faculty and staff were not there, were missing in action. It took a few years, but we did get signs taken down and toilets and other accessibility features were built. But then we'd find them shut down or locked up. So I began to create, to write about these encounters, to narrate them as they came with a lack of a desire for and the lack of an interest in disability experience. And in a workplace that nonetheless had icons of access strewn seemingly everywhere. My writing somehow transformed itself into a book, the question of access. And I wrote not only to sleep better, but to keep my spirit intact and also to try to make sense of a situation where inaccessibility was perceived as either not interesting or justifiable, or not noticed at all. No toilets, or no captions makes for a highly exclusionary environments. And yet it remains the norm. And it's readily justified. Despite the obvious lack of access, this lack was made to make sense. People said, too expensive, too complicated. No one's gonna use it anyway. These justifications were ready at hand. For all the people who felt their belong, who felt their fit. Clearly, whatever else access or lack of access is, it must be more than a task, or a rule or a new routine. What is it? Pursuing such a question requires a politics wonder. It turns out that writing a book that helped me sleep better, also has a few gems in it for waking me up to the question of access. And to wondering about what we are after. I suggested in that book, that practices of access new or old, are really forms of perception, ways of sensing and imagining people and their environments. Simply put, we only ever raise access questions or make access for and imagine someone or something that we perceive to be in need of access. Even though access is always that issue, it's rarely a question that's asked, we have to perceive a need in order to ask it. It's a form of perception. After all, some versions of access are always there. But it's taken for granted and remains more or less unquestioned. For example, lights in the room or on zoom, name tags on our person or under our picture, sounds, mic off mic on. All of this is access for sighted and hearing people, but it's regarded as normal, and then not as access at all. Somehow such access practices leave the realm of the question of access, and become just the way things are. Until and unless something goes wrong. One thing this means is that the ecology that is the house of our living

relations is imagined from a particular able bodied non disabled perspective. This metaphoric house, its lights, doors, steps, windows, furniture, sound becomes taken as just the way things are. And if this doesn't fix someone, well, that's just the way things go, it is the person and not the house that is understood to be the problem, a lack of fit, and you become an exception, imagined as a person with the condition, a condition that typically only represents a lack of fit, or limited function. One way to consider how access is a form of perception is by considering the universal icon of access. So I'm just asking you to imagine that right now, a white stick figure sitting in a in a white round circle. With a bright blue background. It's a still image, it's almost never captioned, although sometimes it has Braille on it, which is sort of you wonder how you find the icon and Braille it but and how does it work? Someone makes the icon, but they put it here and not there. Someone else has to look for it here and there, but not everywhere. Icons everywhere wouldn't make sense. We know to look for the icon, because we assume because we know maybe even the icon teaches us that exclusion is the norm. We have an assumption of exclusion as the norm, and therefore we can perceive where to go find access. This imagined meaning of disability as a lack of fit with just the way things are leads to a logic or a language of naturalised exclusion. It starts to seem natural to exclude, or to include disability but imagined only as a limit and lack that we'd rather live without, since it doesn't fit the house of our living relations, does not fit the ecology of just the way things are. Instead of imagining disability as a lively experience, as a form of sensuality, that is already in the house, part of our living relation, we ask instead, how far do we really need to go, given disability experience seems outside the loop of normal life? For the creator, though, the image maker, the captioner, the book writer, the dissertation writer, matters must be different. Everything about just the way things are, is the place of your creations. Creators, artists know that what is perceived is made, know that there's no perception outside of human relations, the human imaginary imagination, imagination and perception are always tied. The Moving Image artists and captioner know, they must know the perception is cultural, and know this very deeply. How else can we create? Perhaps this is why James Baldwin back in 1962 says that societies always have trouble with their artists, since the artist is the incorrigible disturber of the peace. The artist disturbs the peace found

in the sensual certainty, this is just the way things are. Creators disturb the peace of the taken for granted. However, from the perspective of the everyday, the readily available perspective, disability is represented in an unimaginable, and unimaginative, even inhumane way. Disabled people are those who appear as having a lack of function, a person who has a loss of fit. This is an image unmoved, dominant, it needs to be disturbed, or else accretion of any sort is reduced to a reproduction of just the way things are the status quo. This is why captioned friendly ecology cannot happen merely by shifting the rules or mandating the practices. Since the act of captioning might only include disability as lack of function loss of fit. There's little social change that can be found in mandating a policy for a new practice, without truly wondering, disturbing, recreating what we're already doing. To create, we need to perceive how we have already imagined who or what is in need of access. And I think here's the cool thing. Images of access, and those in need of access, images of those perceived as having a lack of function and loss of fit can can be made to matter as a space of creation. We can after all, denaturalise our perception simply by asking where is disability, is disability or deafness included as anything other than lack of function, and loss of fit? But asking such questions creation can start again. Imagining disability experience as a starting point for creation, as already part of the house of our living relations is a radical task for creators of images and captioners. There are many practices, including new ones that rely on conceptions of disability as lack of function and loss of fit. And in so doing, they participate in reproducing more of the same even as they aim at social change. And I was going to use one more example but I'm a little worried about my time Have I gone over? I'm going to keep going. Okay, great. So one more example to help to nurture this politics of wonder. A new online practice, I participated in it today too, for public talks include speakers beginning with a self description, presumably as an access practice for the inclusion of blind and visually impaired people. Sometimes these descriptions include articulating markers of race, gender or age, sometimes what shirt one's wearing, I do have an orange shirt on, or what appears in the speaker's background, all my many books, providing access to some aspect of their appearance is typically followed by no one ever speaking their names even in a multi speaker event. The new describe yourself access practice reasserts an aspect of visual aesthetics, while leaving establish

sighted norms, norms that organise participation untouched. Speakers Names are made available only to sighted people in the small print below their image, PowerPoint slides or charts are not translated into a non visual register. This describe yourself practice orchestrates a form of care, or can orchestrate, a form of careless caring in the face of an impairment imagined as lacking a momentary sighted aesthetic pleasure over and against robust participation with those so described. It also assumes that what blind people really want most of all, is sighted people's sight. This inclusion practices practice places people with visual impairments firmly on the edge of participation and this edge weren't to be noticed wondered about what has so much to tell us about the use of sight in the formation not only of aesthetic, but of knowledge, order and human imaginary. So just by way of concluding to why do we need captioned moving Image work and how to go about making it a given? Whatever we have done and will do we have already created a version of a human community, we have already sketched the contours of belonging and the edges of exclusion. And this is why we need to ask the questions that Hannah and Sarah are asking and that will help us do it anew, asking how we can disturb our peace. And I think that's how we can do it. Thanks very much.

37:14 Louise Hickman
Hello everyone, I'm Louise and I am just completely inspired by Sarah, Hannah and Tanya's kind of collective contribution tonight. What a feat to follow. And well, I'm really kind of, I'm going to do an audio description of a film tonight called Captioning on Captioning, which was commissioned by Lux film collective. And I produced this film with Shannon Finnegan, who has joined us tonight on the other side viewing. I kind of you know, by setting up this film tonight for you all, and I've never done a kind of live for your description but before the event Sarah and I practiced a couple of times and really tried to think about pushing the kind of parameters of what audio description is a kind of more performance type, I've done performance kind of performative iterations of access work before. As we go through the film, I will kind of step in and like try to give, kind of pretty hard when you're doing the audio description, it's so dense with visual information such as captioning not to go into directors mode, and especially being a lecturer in a previous life, undergraduate, not go into a mode where I'm

overexplaining in everything. So this is going to be kind of an interesting experiment to see how I kind of move through the film. So why captions? Like why have I come to this point where I kind of disassembled and taken apart all aspects of captioning and I've arrived at a point where I now think about Crip AI to like, how do we centre disabled people kind of disability learn design in the practice of thinking about network building community building technologies and so forth? Um, you know, it's really interesting like listening to Tanya, discussing the talk tonight, like, I first read questions of access when I was, alongside actually really important, Alison capers work, Crip Queer Feminist, I've forgotten the title of the book, wow. And what's really great about reading these two book alongside each other is that Alison Caper eloquently writes about disclosure, and then Tanya as we just heard talks about the question of access, and how do we come to know access, and these work stand in conjunction with each other, especially tonight. I can take the position of self disclosing my disability I've been deaf, as I already said I have been a deaf lecturer. So I have used captioning in a§ very different manner than what you might see when you're watching a media broadcasting when they're happening at the bottom of the screen. I've used captions, I'm going to say real time captions, as a way to signal where real time captioning is at our moment of being in time with captions, okay, but this is a very different temporality. And, and I'm going to kind of pause there, and I'm going to have a wonderful production staff to bring in the film. Pause, yeah, here's how we're going to do it. I am going to say pause and then I'm going to provide a description, so the opening segment of this film is using a series of title cards that is handwritten by Shannon and the first title card says, captioning on captioning, the film title. And what's interesting about this opening title, title card, each of the title card, uses the indexical signs for the greater than sign. You can carry on. Pause. So in this particular part of the film, Jennifer was actually captioning, Jennifer is the kind of other protagonist in the film if you'd like, who is the captioner like Andrew is with us tonight. Jennifer was captioning our names in the centre image as we kind of move through the film. This will be explained in the next segment, I'm not going to provide an audio description of what's happening right now. Now we can go back to the film. pause. We have another title card with the text, the handwritten text again, captioning is access work. And in the footage that directly follows this real time captioner is describing

her role in the classroom, and she writes, I provide CART captioning in the classroom for Deaf with a big D and hard of hearing students and academia. You can play. Pause. And Shannon has beautifully described the kind of audio description of the layout of the screen. I should add to this audio description of this liveness today is that these are actually some of the difficulties Shannon and I've kind of struggled with is how to prioritise this information coming on screen - there are actually errors that appears in the captioning for example, live captioning appears first as tapping and text fleetingly appeared as tech and then there's really appears rather than relatively, that is separated from the background. How did these instances appear on screen and then the next segment of the film there's a really lovely moment where the kind of phonetics of what's being said, actually phonetics is not in the immediately at hand in the dictionary, so there's this really nice moment. Carry on. Pause, the next title is access work is shaped by relationships. This is a, the section that follows on is a rather visually overstimulated section where Jennifer is walking through her relationship with her dictionary, so there are columns and columns of phonetic shorthand that follows with colleagues of mine. And Jennifer is kind of moving around on the screen of her laptop to kind of open up various parts of a dictionary to show how they are in situ. We can play on. Pause. We have another title card- access work is hidden. I just want to comment on the previous section, it's really interesting that even though there were on screen, there were columns of text, there was moments where the kind of movement between screens was punctuated by Shannon's own captioning of the film. So imagine the kind of multiple layers are going on, there is the open captions versus the real time captions so that is another layer of kind of visual information that is being presented. We are gearing in to the next section which has fewer windows but there are free kind of zoom windows, if you like of the three kind of presenters of the film in the right hand column where Shannon, Jennifer and myself are depicted, and at various stages throughout the film, there are the moments where we're all in three different time zones. London, New York and San Diego and it's really nice some of us are in dark, some of us are in daylight outside and we're often wearing different clothes, on most often we're wearing the same clothes and that has tickled us at times where we're like oh we have the same outfit on on different different days. Um, and let's play on. Pause. We have another title with access

work is a co-production of priorities.. And we can play on. Pause, we have another title card with Shannon's handwriting. Reading is not the same as listening. We can play on. Pause. The laughing there appears on the previous screen was I was amused that Jennifer had esoteric in her dictionary. And then I go on to self narrate my own access, and then we have the last title card that says the end. And we can play on for a short snippet. And we can pause, and we had briefly popped up on screen was a gallery view that we have come familiarised with on zoom, with the three of us all positioned looking at the camera. And as I say goodbye I waved my hands and the other two kind of laugh at me. And that is the film and my audio description added in. Before we, if the production staff want to take this off screen I can just bring this segment to a close and just add a note. Thank you for doing that. I have to say that Shannon and I have had extended conversation around the audio description version, we did not want to go back in and just describe the kind of technicality that's appearing on screen. And rather, really think about how audio description actually reorders the narrative that we've just gone through, and actually think about audio description as a form. And I'm gonna leave it there. And then I'm sure we'd like to have a five minute break.

58:44 Sarah Hayden
Thank you, Louise, and thank you, Tanya, that was just absolutely extraordinary. I can't believe that you quite did that live. For us, it feels like such a generous thing. And I think we could have an event entirely just about the process of you doing that and being in process with you in this same space together. It's kind of magic. And Tanya, I feel like you've given us just so much to work with and so much that's so exciting. I'm gonna send everyone off for a five minute break, get some nutrition, get some sustenance. And please come back and join us in just five minutes. When we will come back for a conversation, you're really welcome to come and participate in that. We'll just say that, as you can see, what we're trying to do tonight is a kind of attempt to evolve and think about, about how we do access around this event. So you know, we're really open to your feedback. If you feel there are things about how we're doing things tonight that you'd like to give us any notes on for the future. And for the future events, please do get in touch with us. We want to we want to try to tailor these to be as accessible as we possibly can. So please do just get in touch and see you all in five minutes. Thanks, everyone.

1:00:05 Louise Hickman

Hi, everyone, are we are back online? Yes, we are great. I'm just going to do a quick presentation tonight, just to kind of round out what I've just been speaking about in the film and the audio description and really get into it a little bit more. I was kind of centring around that kind of idea of more abundant and less austerity. And this is something that I think many of us on either side of the Atlantic Ocean experience to some degree or another. I'm going to go next slide, please. So I think you know, I think it's really interesting with Tanya being here tonight is we, you know, in the film in itself, there's this moment where Jennifer refers to remember that laptop, you remember when I lost it. And what she was referring to was a moment that was actually a signal in my work, like, Jennifer arrived to the classroom one day and was like I've lost everything and by this point in time, we've been together for two years. So we had worked closely, I started teaching undergrads. And I didn't fully comprehend what Jennifer meant and then the laptop came out, and the captions came on. And I realised that all the words that I had been using prior, the kinds of readings I've been doing, to graduate students, the kind of colleagues I had around the seminar, table by name, they were all gone. So, um, one of my favorite one is, Faber, the theorist was mistaken for Darth Vader. So there would be conflicts between theorists and popular culture, and I kind of, I realised there was a kind of relationship between the phonetics you know like, how they appear on screen. And so this was my moment where I realised the differences. And so if I want now to open up, and if I go to the next slide, on this particular slide, I have a collection of texts including Tanya's work and Aimi Hamraie, Bess Williamson, Sarah Hendren, Meryl Alper, and these collected texts, Elizabeth Guffey, I am actually struggling to see the slide. But these collected texts I would call a kind of a clustering, a merging ecology of critical access texts. To me as a scholar that I've kind of come to written with captioning and that kind of ecology of thinkers who are really thinking about how can we think about access in ways that are from the ground up, co production and codesign. So I really wanted to kind of signal that moment of like this is a collective ecology. And what's really interesting, is we're thinking about collective ecology is I made the film with Shannon, that is a kind of a form of access intimacy. Not only have we kind of captured the relationship with

Jennifer. They were the editing of the film after the fact. And how do we go about prioritising that access as well, that's something I cannot edit, the film itself. So that is something that we spend a lot of time talking about, how do we propose to do that? How do we come to an agreement and then another segment of thinking about ecology,and captioning access is what's really interesting for me captioning is a form of sociality. And so quite often you don't really read aloud. If you read aloud the text, more often than not, the captioner will have that before the event, and they will preload that so there's not really the same encounter. And I name another colleague of mine, Kevin Gotkin, and Kevin is really central with Shannon tonight in this conversation, because it's a conversation, it's an unfolding of coming to knowledge and coming to understand. If we can move to the next slide, I just wanted to kind of quickly signal here, when we're thinking about captioning, it's a phonetic and discursive, and actually, when captioners have to finger spell, finger spell is something that is more familiar with sign language interpreters in individual letters. But for a stenographer to do that, and a real time writer, they have to use multiple keys at once to spell out one letter, whereas more often what they're more used to, I feel saying this when Andrew is the expert in the Zoom room with us, but, what's happening is that words can be, there's an output of words and short phrases too, so there's temporality within the output of keying, which I kind of have on the screen here, this really kind of crude kind of, I love it, you know, a drawing of a phonetic keyboard, and then, and kind of a division of the keys. And underneath is the vowels, I think I can't quite see it but I believe that's what it is. We can go to the next slide. This slide is actually my new kind of newer one, and it emerged out of conversation with Kevin, and we had a conversation at another art gallery, in Amsterdam, outside Amsterdam, and in this conversation, we really kind of explored the kind of abundance of captioning. And what was really interesting about it is that I knew that content, the conversation, to really think about the conflict of captioning itself. And so this slide here, I'm going to, I'm going to hang on a moment, guys, because what I need to see is that actual slide. Okay, I've done it, everyone I now can see what I'm presenting. So here, I have a slide on screen with the phonetic A-BG, and so Andrew who's here with us tonight might have a different shorthand for access. But what's really interesting is that the shorthand A-BG is also academic, and accusation. So these three words and many

others share the same phonetic. This is where the relationship with the machine really emerges. Because the stenographer, the real time writer, they have so many names I'd really like to kind of sample them all just to you know, signal the different roles, and is that they have to work and differentiate between these three terms to fit in within their kind of working culture. If we go to the next slide. Again, we have PHA, that's the shorthand, machine, mental anguish and parole, completely different meanings, but I kind of it tickles me that the three shorthand have such different outputs. If we move to the next slide, we're going to get back into this kind of I've had this image up on the screen here, of a kind of rather clunky machine. And this is the machine that was designed in 1955, if I remember rightly, and it's called a GT-Tek standard, and it was used in the United States, and what's really kind of special about this machine, this was the first real time machine. So this is not the machine that you've seen when a stenographer is sitting in the courtroom on the law and order program, whatever crime program you might watch, but this is a clunky machine that recorded a kind of real time complete citation output. I'm trying to not get technical, but I am nerdy about this, because what emerged in this moment is that the clunky machine meant mobility for stenographers to move around. So let's go back to the kind of phonetic shorthand, we go to the next slide. So this is interesting because I, the possible conflict that might arise is you know, when you're watching kind of 24 hour news and you will see the captions going along the bottom and you see these moments where there's this kind of friction point where they're, they're swapping the words, swapping in and out and it's because captioning in many ways ia discursive, these moments of switching is work that has been going on behind the scene where the stenographer is training their dictionary. And so to kind of as we're kind of in this space tonight we're in a gallery, and Kevin and I spend a lot of time in this conversation. Don't forget this is how our conversation and this is what real time captioning is, it is capturing conversations, forms of knowing, forms of epistemology, like Crip epistemology. So here we have on the screen, we have another shorthand which for the sake of everyone I'm going to read out, A-BG, we all know that's access, space S space PR: This fiddling around with this is "access is practice" and then the possible conflict for the same shorthand is "access is appropriate", I cannot pronounce that word. We'll move on. The next one is "acknowledge is proximate". Okay. Now

we can move on. So the possible conflicts are the real kind of shows how the language used and how machine interactions are not kind of configured in a way, there's always a relationship that's been built with the dictionary, with the brain and body process too. So I have another kind of shorthand and this is um and I know that in many ways you don't have access to Kevin and I's conversation, but you will in a minute, this is you know, shorthand result of that conversation. And again, I played with the boundaries of the possible conflict. And so here we go, we have this shorthand, KAO-BGT PW KPHR-PBS: and this is "chaotic and compliance". It could also mean "correct and common sense", which I think I really when I was reviewing this earlier, and common sense came up with conflict, it would make sense when we're thinking about access and the phenomenology of access, like common sense, what makes sense. We can move to the next slide. Again I'm playing with a theme of abundance, I put it in the kind of shorthand, we have A-UBDZ: and this shorthand can mean abundance, objected and observed, the potential outcomes are different. If we move to the next slide. So, if we go back one slide, I know I revealed everything now in my last slide, I think I just want to really think about abundance for a moment, abundance and austerity politics seem to have these points of friction. And this was something that was apparent in Kevin and I's conversation. And then in this particular conversation, Kevin researched, as part of the residency in Amsterdam, what access was like for a deaf person, and a deaf and blind person, and what he found, there was a particular assignment of particular and set hours. So if you wanted to have a private conversation, meaning it exists outside of education an work, you were allocated something like 38 hours a week, don't quote me on that, but it's something like that, but a deaf and blind person would be allocated 168 hours a year. So there's this economy here, an economy of speech, economy of access. And so you know, that space between what we just explored and rather this exploration of shorthand and captioning, real time captioning, that is aside from perhaps a medium broadcasting. And if we now go to the next slide, the one that I revealed too soon. And I include this image with a poster, which is depicted on the slide of access to work, and it is a poster from 2015. And it's a protest against the cut to access work, which is a pot of money that the government provide disabled people to do their jobs. And in the drawing of this image there are two interpreters hands I think interpreting "interpreters", I think. And

in one of the hands, is Ian Duncan Smith being squeezed really tightly, and he is showing discontent on his face with boggly eyes. So I'm now going to end this with this Ian Duncan Smith description. And then we're going to bounce back and think about what abundance of access and less austerity could mean.

1:18:43 Sarah Hayden
Thank you so much, Louise, that was absolutely marvellous. In a moment, I'm going to invite members of the audience to send in their questions. So if you'd like to ask Tanya and Louise, anything, now is the time to start formulating those questions. You can pop them into the q&a box on YouTube, and they will be channeled through to me here and I'll put them to Tanya and Louise, but maybe more immediately to give all of you out there who are tuning in to the YouTube channel, a moment to gather your thoughts and put your questions together in the textbox. Something maybe that might bring together. There's so much that brings them together. But to bring together Tanya's and Louise's contributions tonight is to maybe pick up on that last point of Louise's in terms of thinking about access abundance in the context of austerity politics. And it reminded me of how in Tanya's work, Tanya talks about expense talk, and the sort of expense talk that comes into play when we come to think about access, maybe particularly in public institutions. In the question of access, Tanya writes incredibly cogently about how within the university, the student becomes instrumentalised and leveraged as a kind of economic unit that sort of qualifies for certain quantities of access. And that connects so neatly with what Louise just brought to us here. Louise's point about this last poster makes me reminds me that I must send you Louise, the poet, Sean Barney's amazing text against Ian Duncan Smith, which everyone maybe should have access to, in any case, but maybe I wondered whether Tanya and Louise you might like to think about and talk about this kind of question of expense talk, because I know that something we're going to be doing across the series, is having these workshops that are for artists and for arts workers, and when we propose this idea, and when we talk to people about these workshops, people very often sort of immediately start to talk to us about budgets. And they say, we're going to have to think about what that means for our funding applications, we're going to have to think about our access budgets, and maybe even dissolving

the idea of an access budget as being something that we hive off in that way or something we could also think about, but maybe Tanya, Louise, if either of you would like to, to think first about this idea of expense talk, and what that means for us and thinking about captioning. That'd be great. Tanya, please.

1:21:32 Tanya Titchkosky
Okay, I'll go first time speaking. It's very interesting how we can commodify so much where students become in Canada, BIU, basic income unit. And every Basic Income unit has an amount of space that they take out, but an amount of resources that they use, and if anything is outside of being that basic income unit, you have to go seek extra funds to accommodate. But that sense that we have a logic that makes everybody into an expense needs to yeah, that needs I think what you were just saying, Sarah, we need to, instead of saying we're going to budget in access, I think we need to start thinking about what these these budgeting events are asking us not to think about and not to articulate and not to the all the stuff that we assume is not an act of accommodation. So for me, it goes back to what form of perception is going to depict the normal or the taken for granted, or the that's just the way things are. And I think that's what we have to try and rupture or expose. Louise?

1:23:01 Louise Hickman
Well, I was just thinking it's simple. And I was reminded, while you were talking earlier, Tanya, as well, being at conferences, where stenographers are seated in the room and kind of waiting. And then when they learned what I do what I do, and I engage in conversations and quite often stenographers say, we're just a part of the furniture, right? So the invisibility of that, how they think they are perceived in the room is quite telling. And I think it's a kind of interesting way to think about it. The kind of how I talk about this another aspect my work requires thinking about how we might position support services, and how we are often kind of positioning them in the background. And then doing that, we kind of have this frontstage backstage and I think the economy of the expense call there were kind of circling around now is really capturing what is happening in the backstage that allows us to do the work that we do on the stage. Um, I think especially thinking

I know I'm going to I'm going to be thinking about automation on Twitter on social media, we see a lot of events being advertised as Live transcription, which could mean two things, automated auto AI captions, or a stenographer. So, there's this slippery language there now it's been hidden putting into the background again, we lose sight. Oh, yeah, I know if that makes sense. But I kind of really think that there's a front stage backstage thing going on here when we're thinking about the economy of access.

1:25:31 Sarah Hayden
It absolutely makes sense, Louise, I think that sort of sense of the front stage and backstage, and perhaps the degree to which lots of arts organisations and artists right now, very possibly when they talk about access, someone is pointing them towards automated services and saying, but sure, couldn't you get Google to do that for you? Do you really need to budget for that? And I feel that what Louise has done tonight in terms of thinking about the discursive work of the captioning, and just how complex it is as a process, and how much it happens between people, between people that are working with machinery, but between people at the same time, it's not something that can be sent out to an AI that somehow exists outside of human society outside of understanding human relations. I think you've kind of brought that home to us incredibly vividly tonight, I feel like I'll be pointing people back towards kind of how you spoke just now, as a way to sort of explain the reason why we're making the kind of access provision demands that we need to be making. We do have a question from the audience for you, Louise, that I think maybe might allow you to kind of illuminate that process for us even a little bit more. So the question from the audience asked, How do automated captions do the conflict resolution that you explained in terms of stenography? So I guess you're you're thinking about what the the differences between those two processes, if you'd like to maybe describe because it's a very, very different thing, at least as far as I understand it?

1:27:11 Louise Hickman
Yeah, actually I'm just going to give you a little anecdote which just gives you the insight of the captioning world, I guess, a couple of years ago, I say recently, we've been in this COVID bubble. Recently, it

seems longer too often than it is. A stenographer that I know, based in New York, who is well versed in doing captioning for medical school, a stenographer who was like, oh, you know, I wanted to be a doctor but I couldn't do it so I caption for medical students. The reason I bring this up is medical school conference circuits have approached that particular stenographer and offered an amount of money, let's say $10,000 for their dictionary, right? This is I'm using this example because I know there is a lot of conflicts that comes up in automated tests. But I think this is a really nice story showing you how this de-embodiment of the stenographer and their work have a value, but also being devalued at the same time. So I think this anecdote in itself is really interesting because it's kind of the conflicts of real time writing become more prevalent. But the conflicts that I presented tonight, is in many ways for a deaf viewer, and I'm going to situate it from that point of view. It's better to have a conflict that is misspoken or mistyped by a stenographer than an automated text, automated by captioning. But then there might be a similarity, and also stenographers have the authority to recognise that the text is out of place, and have the ability to have local knowledge that can correct that, and so yeah, I'm gonna end it there. But I hope that kind of bring all the different threads together.

1:30:08 Sarah Hayden
It absolutely does Louise I feel like I should disclose to everybody that at the weekend I spent a very pleasurable time secretly reading Louise's PhD dissertation. And I think genuinely everyone should be excited about this. This manuscript in process, I'm really keen to read it now. I feel like I need it now. We all need it now. But I'm excited about that. I had a question I was thinking about sort of that's really for both of you. But maybe Tanya could speak to this question to begin with, that some of the people that I'm sure who are tuning in tonight, will have come across the work of the art critic, Emily Watlington, who has been really crucial in terms of bringing together and bringing to the fore and to sort of wide audiences, the work particularly of Deaf artists who are using captioning. And Watlington writes about the sort of, I guess, the resistance that there can be in museum and gallery contexts against the captioning of video work, and particularly against the captioning of historic work. So video art, early works of video art, it's a really compelling argument for how these works were sort of radical from the

start, they were deliberately meant to be accessible. They were meant to be relayed, kind of in the broadest possible way, often via television, and that by refusing to caption them after the fact, the curators involved, I suppose, are sort of undoing something that is inherent to and integral to that work. Watlington writes about a kind of aesthetic distaste that exists in the art world against captions. And so I wonder, Tanya, if you might think about this kind of idea of what that aesthetic distaste might signify? Where does it come from? Maybe not specifically in terms of captions, but these kinds of aesthetic distastes, that stopped people making what could be made accessible, accessible? Where does that come from?

1:32:08 Tanya Titchkosky
That's a beautiful question, provocative question, an aesthetic distaste that seems to be so prevalent, that there's just this even if it's possible, if it's cheap, if it's easy, it's still this No to alternative. Well, I guess that's the issue. That the reality built, or the ecology of the house has been built. White settler economy that has power that has a form of embodiment. And that, you know, that's the house that's been built, any even you know, even the easy alternative is a disruption. And then becomes distasteful. But how do we get from, we're going to disrupt the status quo to that's distasteful. And I guess it's, I guess, a common way of protecting the ordinary, the expected, the man in the house, or the version of the house and who it was built for, that doesn't need to be unsettled. So we need the stakes. That's a really interesting, that's more than I need to think something through. That's just distasteful. But you know, that changes my sense of pleasure, or my sense of ease. So I think that's why the artist as the incorrigible disturber of the peace, quoting Baldwin there the peace it might be that house that doesn't want to question who belongs or what fit looks like or what, you know, what, what did we, How did we come to build the world that we built? And it seems to me, it's, it's been for a very narrow version of the human, that we need to find ways and the artists and creators can do that to disrupt the conception of the human, but then we get a disruption and we think, oh, that's far enough. The rest is distasteful. I just think distasteful is really an interesting term too, because it's an embodied experience. Like you think it's not coming from our culture, but you know, I don't know that's just, almost as if it's objectively given and not subjectively

arranged from a culture and taken for granted versions of who belongs or what, what fitting in means.

1:34:59 Sarah Hayden
Absolutely. I think that the attention that you draw to that kind of degree of like embodied somatic response that's kind of encoded in the idea of distaste, is almost that sort of something embarrassing has happened in the proposal that this could be captioned. Something has happened that makes everyone queasy, that makes everyone uneasy, and it's best kind of pushed under and forgotten, I suppose that maybe what causes it to be pushed under is everyone's recognition that everything else around it hasn't been captioned. And to sort of to point out one aspect of the house. And to sort of to acknowledge what's there that makes it inaccessible is to also make everyone look around the rest of the building we need, you know, it's almost as though what the system needs or what the house needs is, for us never to see the house is there at all, for fear that we'll start kind of recognising everywhere, all of its kind of material components, we need to kind of experience it as immaterial, and not be conscious of that. And I suppose that's where you're kind of thinking about access, as perception allows us also to kind of, there is an education of the sensorium, as you describe that in the act of reading you and kind of thinking with you, with both of you, in terms of kind of reimagining how we start in thinking about access and sort of on a first principles basis, what that might mean, how it might be done, and kind of what it is to bring it into question at all. I think that early on in your talk, Tanya, you talked about how there were all of these provisions that we kind of that the generality of people working, maybe in arts institutions considered to be givens, consider to be kind of obvious things that need to be there. And I know an early conversation that Hannah and I had was very much about sort of the architectural space of the gallery and what's presumed to be essential there. And Shannon Finnegan's work is really significant in that too. And we talked about that, the sort of sense of what is understood to be necessary to the viewing of the artwork, the fact that there ought to be lighting in the room, and the fact that there needs to be a way to get a clear view as such, of the work that's installed on an opposite wall. And I suppose that maybe what we, what we need to do to start thinking differently about access and differently about captions, is to start paying attention to all

of that provision that we presumed to be a given that doesn't require an additional budget doesn't require extra access, but is instead just kind of part of the furniture, this, all of these architectural furniture interior just kind of they're coming back upon us over, over and over.

1:37:48 Louise Hickman
I have a comment that, it's really interesting thinking about the aesthetics here because I think this really came out when Shannon and I were doing the editing of captioning on captioning. And there's this section where I'm quite, I'm quite sentimental, and I described something being beautiful. And I remember watching that back and being like, I can't use that you know, it's stepped outside the professional persona that I want, right? But what's really interesting about that kind of move in my realisations is, when we initially went into the project, we wanted to document failures of captioning. We wanted to show those moments. But actually, what we ended up with, there was this close alignment with our own speech as well, like there's this tendency to want to edit out those moments. Because they're not quite right. And so in many ways, we've purposely left moments like that. And because I think that kind of gesture towards automation as well, you know, we, like this process of kind of flattening language and the becomes a medium of moving information from one to another.

1:39:31 Sarah Hayden
It does feel like that the the work of the artists that we're going to show besides your own and Shannon's work tonight, Louise, but also the work in the next screening event that will be on the 14th, I think does something to unflatten that language and to kind of to think differently, as sort of as Tanya's talk started out with to think differently about what captions can be and sort of what creativity and what sort of richness and what kind of aesthetic and linguistic and poetic thinking can be happening through captioning and through the relation between language and image, language and sound in that work. I feel that maybe what it kind of behoves me to do at this point is maybe just before we finish up as a very last question is to ask Tanya and Louise, if they'd like to ask each other anything, it seems wrong to bring two such just wonderful and two such I don't know how even to say it, two such collegial and connected thinkers and speakers together without giving

you a chance to ask each other a question. So if either of you has a question, maybe we could ask that last question. And then we'll wrap up and, and say goodnight.

1:40:49 Tanya Titchkosky
Louise this is Tanya speaking, at one point in your presentation you talked about, it's not really the same. And there almost sounded like there was a lament, but then you went and said, you know, captioning is like, it's a conversation. It's an understanding, and I got the sense that it's a language, which would definitely mean, the captioning is not trying to get at a sameness. If captioning is its own language. I wonder what it's being is about, you know, I don't know what my question is, except to say, I love how you moved from conversation, understanding, language.

1:41:39 Louise Hickman
Well, actually, I think, there is a grammar of accessibility. And I think there are scholars out there who study the linguistics of sign language. And I think the same could be said, for captioning. When you work with a particular writer, and the person who is writing tonight, Andrew, we have worked together in other meetings, in my prior job, we have an understanding that there is the existence, but I think I flag that in the audio description of the film, the two indexical, kind of greater than signs, are really kind of interesting, because they do signal a new speaker, right? And you think, well, that's quite straightforward right? But a captioner can move to a new line because they're signalling a change of conversation or change of a pace of a conversation or a pace of stream of consciousness. And so it's not a new speaker, but it's like a new moment, it's a new arrival. Right? And so I think the new work I presented tonight about thinking more about the abundance is actually looking at the conflicts where we can potentially go and how does one train a dictionary, again rested on that idea that there is a grammar of accessibility. And I think that really speaks to your work Tanya and I'm thinking about the kind of I have it in my notes here you know, the kind of politics of wonder and I guess you know, if I being with your work for so long, I wonder how does your kind of work resonate with new technology? Can you comment on that? And like thinking about it doesn't necessarily have to be captioning but even just thinking about you mentioned earlier about Zoom, but you know, yeah.

1:44:38 Tanya Titchkosky
With the politics of wonder, yeah, I have very many personal tenuous relations with technology, including this computer which could kick me off zoom at any moment if it gets too hot. But politics of wonders is a way to slow a person down, I wish it would slow my computer down a little bit too. And try and say, you know, what grounds the possibility of this technology? What version of the humanness of interaction, Louise as you were saying like, who are we supposed to be? And what kind of relationship are we supposed to have with each other such that this technology works, or this new accessibility practice works or doesn't work? So the politics of wonder is a chance to just pause, slow down and figure out what we've already produced. And in that act, I think there is creation, there's a new story to be told there's a new depiction to be had, there's a new narrative to be released, in trying to confront what we've already done and what we've already thought and what we've already made of each other. So I that's I hope that's my relationship to technology, other than getting really anxious about it and wanting to do something nasty to my computer, or it wants to do something nasty to me, to try and wonder like, who did it expect? What sort of relationship did it want? Could I re-narrate that, retell that in a way that might open up possibilities for something alternative? A better world?

1:46:32 Louise Hickman
I think, I really like that you signal slowing down there. I think that's a really interesting pace that we are familiar with in disability studies. And you know, and perhaps I would say we should actually sit with mistakes more, human made mistakes. You know and be okay with the fact that when we're watching 24 hour news, that the captions are not quite on point, we should kind of celebrate those mistakes and stick with those mistakes as a way of recognising labour, human labour, in that desiring this kind of technology that becomes frictionless is not necessarily the best outcome. So I really kind of like that nod to slowing down, as a way of reflective moments.

1:47:43 Sarah Hayden
Thank you, Louise, it's Sarah speaking again, I realise as you speak about these human made mistakes, Louise, that in spite of having

written numerous notes for myself on the desk, I have not been reminding everyone of who I am as I begin to speak throughout the night. And I think that this call that both of you have brought to us at the end to slow down and to reflect on how we've been doing and how things are going, on what this process is and the experiment that we're engaged in. And we will be doing that we will be thinking back on tonight, how this has all worked, what hasn't worked and what we'd like to do differently. And one thing I'll be doing is letting everyone know who it is that speaking when I start, but I'm going to stop speaking now and instead I'm going to thank everyone so much for being here tonight for making this possible. It's been absolutely magic. I want to thank my co-organiser of beyond compare, Hannah Wallis to thank everyone at Nottingham Contemporary, but especially tonight, Catherine Masters has been handling this complicated tech setup, to Canan Batur for handling things behind the scenes in public programmes to Jim Brouwer in live programmes too for handling things in tech, to Ryan Kearney no longer with Nottingham Contemporary, but much much involved in this programme in its preparation to date and to Sam Thorne for enthusiasm and support for this project and our collaboration. I want to thank very sincerely and enthusiastically our BSL interpreters, Rebekah Spencer, and Sarah Perks, particularly for handling the contingency and the sort of reality of an ill colleague at the last moment, and for managing to deal with that in an extraordinary way tonight, we really appreciate that, we are all bodies being together in doing all of this and thank you for that, and to thank Andrew for his captioning. And I love the fact that Louise and Andrew have this behind the scenes sort of intimate access relationship that we weren't aware of before but that I think is again meaningful and means something to our audience tonight. We want to thank the AHRC for supporting Voices in the Gallery and to thank Louise and Tanya for being in every way absolutely tremendous tonight - I'm going to be scrutinising my notes, but I'm also going to have access in the future as will you all to the video of this event that will be edited and put back on the Nottingham Contemporary site in future and we will make sure to let people know when that goes out. And thanks all everybody. Thanks for tuning in, for your time and do get in touch if you have any thoughts. Thank you. Bye bye.

Nottingham Contemporary

Colophon

Curators: Hannah Wallis and Sarah Hayden
Technicians: Jim Brouwer and Catherine Masters