

TRANSCRIPT: Broken Law, Episode 21: Disability Rights Are Broken

Lindsay Langholz: Welcome to broken law, the podcast about the law whose interests it serves and whose it does not, brought to you by the American Constitution Society. I'm Lindsay Langholz, Director of Policy and Program and your host for this episode about disability rights.

According to the CDC, one in four adults in the United States has a disability, and yet the latest American Bar Association Disability Statistics Survey shows that less than seven percent of respondents self-identified as disabled. Disabled people are consistently excluded from the workplace, and the legal profession is no exception. Disability law and policy have too often been pushed to the edges of our system, left to folks from the disability community to both shape and navigate how we interact with disability and the workplace in our home lives. And as we know, these issues actually touch on every facet of our society.

How do we retool and rebuild our systems including the legal profession to create access and inclusion for people with disabilities? To help answer these and other pressing questions is Marissa Ditekowsky, Diversity Chair of the ACS DC lawyer chapter. Marissa is Tzedek DC's 2019-2021 Gallogly Family Foundation Fellow. Her project focuses on serving low-income DC residents with disabilities facing debt and the distinct issues they experience in the process. Marissa graduated magna cum laude from the American University Washington College of Law, where she served as the president of the American Constitution Society, as well as the director of the Disability Law Society, the Student Bar Association Disabilities Liaison, and numerous other activities.

Marissa, welcome to broken law.

Marissa Ditekowsky: Thank you so much for having me, Lindsay. I'm so happy to be here.

Lindsay: Oh, we are so happy to have you. I want to start with basics, if that's okay? I would love it if you could help us define the term disability, both as the law sees it and does that differ from the way that people in the disability rights community define the term disability?

Marissa: Yeah, sure. So, the way disability is defined, I should say what the ADA is, a person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, or a person who has a history or record of such an impairment, or a person who is perceived by others as having such an impairment. And major life activities are pretty broad, but those are things like walking, breathing, eating, those kinds of things, and major bodily functions are also encompassed, so like endocrine function, gastrointestinal, those kinds of things.

But with the disability community, the word impairment, I would say is kind of controversial. I wouldn't say that a lot of folks would define their disability as an impairment. So, there's definitely some disparity there. In terms of how we would define disability, I don't know that there's necessarily one way that we would define disability in the disability community.

Lindsay: Totally fair.

Marissa: There's always, if you ask six different people, you'll get six different definitions of disability. But I would definitely say that impairment is probably not necessarily gonna be in that definition.

And I would also say that physical and mental is probably a little bit too narrow. You have communication, you have neuroatypicality. I mean, you have all these different things, you have sensory. You have all these different things that I think, the ADA certainly encompasses those things of course, but I think folks would probably be a little bit more specific in the way they define disability, for sure.

Lindsay: And the ADA, just for folks who may not be as familiar, is the Americans with Disabilities Act. Would you mind just kind of giving a brief overview of what's in that law and how it frames the conversation?

Marissa: Yeah, of course. So, the Americans with Disabilities Act was the first piece of federal legislation that broadly prohibited disability discrimination in the private sphere, and it does so in the employment space and in public accommodations, and it also prohibits discrimination by government entities as well, and that's in Title II.

Before the ADA, you only really had the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and that prohibited discrimination by anyone that received federal funds, and that's Section 504 of that Act, which many folks may have heard of. The ADA, you also have Title IV, and that deals with relay services and telecommunications. And you also have Title V that deals with miscellaneous provisions and things like that. But, most of the time with the ADA, in terms of discrimination issues, you're dealing with Title I with employment, Title II with public services, and you're dealing with Title III with public accommodations.

Lindsay: Got it? And would you consider the ADA to be something that creates a ceiling for basic disability rights or is it more of a floor? What function is it serving in terms of creating that access and that space?

Marissa: Yeah, so what we tend to say a lot is the ADA should be viewed as the floor and not the ceiling. A lot of folks will sort of use the ADA as a reason to deny folks basic accommodations, because they'll say, "Well, this is all the ADA requires me to do." But that's not the way it should be. We should be trying to go beyond the ADA. We should be giving folks what they require to access basic things.

Lindsay: I'm wondering what that might look like. Oftentimes our conception of disability rights law is pretty limited by or at least defined by these federal statutes. Should we broaden that conception and how could we go about doing that?

Marissa: Yeah, so I mean, I think these federal statutes, they leave out a number of disabilities, including substance use disorders by definition. It also has severely inadequate protections for disabled people of color, and other multipl-marginalized disabled folks. In our lives, every issue is a disability issue. It isn't just the issue stereotypically seen as a disability rights problem. It's

health care. It's housing. It's education. It's employment. It's public benefits. It's everything. And it's hard to separate. The law in all of these areas falls short.

So, the focus of this podcast, it's broken law, and the law is broken. And that's where I sort of see disability justice often comes in for me. And disability justice acknowledges that the law is limited, and there are mechanisms for effecting change beyond the law. It also acknowledges that these mechanisms are often upheld and created to be exclusionary by their legacies of white supremacy and other forms of oppression. So disability justice focuses on the intersections of identities as well, and it highlights the experiences of disabled people of color, queer disabled folks, and other multi-marginalized disabled folks. So, it also focuses on not just the law, but on organizing and on other ways of effecting change.

But, you know, in addition to that, we also have state laws. We have other laws that might come into effect where federal statutes kind of fail us. But I think, I think it's just hard, right? It's just hard to sort of get support for any federal law that would really broaden any of these things. And at this point, the ADA itself is under attack. You have bills that are trying to weaken the ADA by requiring notice requirements. I think at this point you've had, you know, 31 years of notice, I feel like that's enough notice.

Lindsay: When you say notice, notice to whom and by whom? What is the notice being created?

Marissa: So, the notice requirements are for someone who is going to file a lawsuit. So, and that would be to someone who's violating the ADA. So, for example, I go to a business, and you have something that's an inaccessible, like you have stairs or something, and you're a public accommodation, and I can't access your public accommodation for some reason, and that's illegal. So, I have to give you notice before and time to cure before I actually go ahead and sue under these bills. So, that would be extremely limiting for people to actually try to fix these problems. And you know, like I said, it's been 31 years at this point. The ADA was passed in 1990. So, it's just very disappointing.

Lindsay: And practically what that might look like is, okay, you serve notice, in the meantime, you're completely shut out of being able to access that building or that facility. How much time does it usually take for them to then have at least a cure period?

Marissa: I don't recall exactly how long in the bill they wanted to give them.

Lindsay: But longer than like an hour, right?

Marissa: Exactly.

Lindsay: They are given a while to go through this cure process. And so, in that entire time, folks who are unable to access that building or that establishment are completely shut out, is what you're saying?

Marissa: Right, yes. And, you know, the reality is they'd probably be shut out during the period of litigation either way, so it's just even longer.

Lindsay: This is something we've seen pop up recently in a couple different areas also. In the voting rights space, there are certain secretaries of state and local officials who use the ADA almost as a shield to deny people ability to get in and then also, you know, we're seeing the ADA thrown around as an excuse not to get vaccinated. And so, I'm wondering, as these amendments are popping up, are they coming from a place of just trying to completely gut the floor that is the ADA, or is there motivation behind these misappropriating of the ADA itself?

Marissa: So, the motivation is because of a number of folks who are filing basically serial lawsuits. So, there are folks who are kind of filing hundreds of lawsuits. And they're concerned about those folks, even though it's literally a fraction of people, and it's basically the same lawyers who are doing it and the same people who are doing it. So, they're basically worried about a handful of people who may be abusing the system at the expense of how many hundreds of thousands of other people who require the protections of the law. And the reality is, there's actually a piece that was written by Jasmine Harris and some of her colleagues about the myth of the abuse of the ADA, and I definitely recommend folks read that. But, it's really problematic, and the real fix should be, for frivolous lawsuits, punishing those attorneys and sanctions on those attorneys. It's not taking away protections from people who need them that should exist. It just seems very problematic. There's just no reason for it.

Lindsay: We've mentioned courts, and we are the American Constitution Society, so it behooves me to ask you, often these laws are interpreted by the judiciary, and they can kind of give shape to some of these large statutes. How have our courts shaped disability rights through the ADA and other statutes, and how do you see that going?

Marissa: So, there are a couple of things. Actually, the last time the ADA was amended was back in 2008, the ADA Amendments Act (ADAAA). And those amendments were actually prompted because of a slew of awful Supreme Court decisions that severely narrowed the definition of what a person with a disability is. And that includes *Sutton v. United Airlines* and *Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Kentucky v. Kathy Williams*. These cases are all specifically named in the ADAAA, in the purpose of the act as why this act was passed. So we couldn't even get to the issue of whether there was discrimination because the fight was just about whether the person was disabled, whether they were even entitled to the protections of the law itself.

And so then you have the issue of, you know, to access accommodations, they must be "reasonable," and they must not place an "undue burden" on covered entities. And those phrases are extremely vague and ripe for court interpretation. And one judge could easily interpret something as reasonable while another does not. And that's exactly what happens, consistently. Judges may not be educated on disability issues or understand why a certain accommodation is necessary or reasonable. It happens all the time.

And right now, you have a circuit split in determining what's considered a covered public accommodation, particularly when it comes to websites and digital spaces. Some circuits are more lenient than others as to what kinds of websites and digital spaces they'll consider a public accommodation that's covered. So, a covered public accommodation would have to be accessible

to disabled folks. So, if it's not covered, then it doesn't have to be accessible to disabled folks, which is extremely problematic.

I also want to note that *Buck v. Bell* has never been formally overturned, although it's not necessarily good law. It doesn't interpret the ADA of course, but it's extremely influential in disability rights.

Lindsay: Could you explain, just for folks who may not know *Buck v. Bell*, could you give a quick explanation of that case because it does loom large, but I think people may not know necessarily where it comes from.

Marissa: Yup. So, *Buck v. Bell* was a Supreme Court decision that, on the record, says it's okay to involuntarily sterilize a disabled woman. So you know, it basically upheld a law that permitted the state to involuntarily sterilize a disabled woman. And a Supreme Court Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes, wrote the words, "Three generations of imbeciles is enough." And that is on the record. So you know, this has still not been formally overturned. So, this is in our history.

And we talk about the importance of diversity on the bench. Having disabled judges on the bench is so important. Who is making and influencing the decisions matters. And a fun fact, Justice Sotomayor has diabetes, so there you go.

Lindsay: There you go. Are there right now, in terms of our current court, are there folks on the bench who you think are setting a really great precedent of their lived experiences informing their view on disability laws? Maybe Justice Sotomayor, but others as well? Or is there more room that we have to go for that to really mirror our lived experiences among the American public?

Marissa: Yeah, I think there are a couple of, you know, disabled judges who are doing a really great job, They're out there giving talks and doing all that, but I think we have a long way to go. And I also think there are a lot of judges who may have lived experiences but aren't necessarily out or they may not identify as disabled. You know, some folks might have a chronic health condition or something to that effect, where they may not identify as disabled. So, there's that as well. So, I think we definitely have a long way to go. But there are good judges out there. They're just fewer and farther between.

Lindsay: I would love to pivot for a second. We are recording this episode in October then it's going to come out in early November. October is National Disability Employment Awareness Month. You wrote a really great ACS Expert Forum post for us on this issue and in the legal profession. As you mentioned in that piece, less than seven percent of respondents self-identified as disabled in the 2010 ABA survey. What do you think is driving such a low number of self-identified disabled people in the legal profession?

Marissa: It's a multifaceted issue. So, there isn't just one reason for such a small number of disabled lawyers in the field. So, first of all, there's a pipeline issue. And that's starting at even K through 12. But you have that and then you go into college, and then there might be issues getting into college, and then there might be issues in college with accommodations, and doing

well and succeeding in college. And then getting through to law school, and then you have testing barriers with both the LSAT and the bar exam. And then you have barriers within law schools and academia itself. The environment might be one that's not very inviting to disabled law students. You have issues applying to the bar with overbroad character and fitness questions and expenses. You have employment barriers and environments again that are not necessarily super inviting to disabled attorneys. And you have issues with accessing the courts for disabled attorneys, and you have a bunch of other concerns as well.

And the other thing is that it's not just about a lack of disabled folks in the field. There may also be more disabled people in the field than we know, but there are also issues with stigma about disclosing disability. There's also the issue of people not necessarily viewing themselves as disabled, even if they would be protected under the law. Or they could identify as disabled, but, you know, they might have a chronic health condition or not necessarily view themselves as disabled. So, there are all of those kinds of factors that might be playing into those low numbers.

Lindsay: Got it. And I used a term that I didn't define so I'm going to do that now. The ABA is the American Bar Association, which leads me to ask who are the groups in the legal profession that are doing this work of trying to create greater opportunities and or eliminating some barriers that you just detailed?

Marissa: So, I would say that there are a bunch of organizations that are doing that work. The National Disabled Law Students Association is certainly one of them. And just as full disclosure, I'm one of the leaders of the National Disabled Law Students Association, so you know. Just so you know.

Lindsay: You're allowed to toot that horn. Don't worry about it.

Marissa: So there's a little bit of bias there. There's also the National Association for Equity in the Legal Profession that focuses on diploma privilege. There's also the Community Fund for Black Bar Applicants, which focuses on sort of raising money for folks who are trying to take the bar and get admitted to the legal profession.

And those are some of the big organizations that are trying to do this work and trying to really make things better for folks. But there are a lot of diploma privilege orgs trying to do this work. I think there's a lot of great energy, especially from a lot of the recent grads really trying to make things better, and it's really great to see.

Lindsay: And one last question on this before I move on to a different area. Could you define diploma privilege because I'm not sure for the non lawyers listening, I'm not sure that they know what that is.

Marissa: Yeah, sure. So, right now, what you have set up is, the way that you become a lawyer is taking the bar exam. And so you take the bar exam, you either pass or fail, and if you pass and everything is good with your character and fitness, they don't find anything sketchy or anything like that, then you can become a lawyer. With diploma privilege, you would not necessarily have to take the bar exam. There might be some other way or some other requirements for you to

become a lawyer, like they might have some sort of class credit requirements, some sort of clinical education requirement, something like that that's an alternative to taking the bar. That would be what diploma privilege might look like. It's just something that's an alternative to taking something like the bar exam.

Lindsay: Perfect. Thank you. I would love to turn our attention a bit to a point that you made in a post for us on how disability can often compound marginalization. It is one of those areas of identity that can layer upon themselves to further marginalize someone, which I thought was such a great point. And I would love if you would mind explaining that a bit for those who haven't had a chance to read your piece yet, which we will include in the show notes, so people should, but if you wouldn't mind explaining that a bit and then just how that plays out in real life.

Marissa: Sure, so disability is often just one aspect of a person's identity. So, race, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and other aspects of identity can all compound to affect a person's experiences. So, a queer black disabled woman will not have the same experiences as a cis white disabled woman, like myself. That woman is likely to experience marginalization based on multiple aspects of her identity, and not just marginalization as a queer person, or a black person, or a disabled person, or a woman. But marginalization based upon all of those aspects of her identity. So, her experience will be unique. Disability simply adds a layer to that experience.

Lindsay: I'm wondering if you could speak a little bit to your experience, as both a law student and now a legal professional, and how your identity as a white cis disabled woman has shaped how you approach the law and how you approach your practice.

Marissa: Yeah, so, white cis disabled woman, and a young woman of course. And, I have had to sort of continuously advocate for myself and with others. And I think a lot of times women have to struggle to be taken more seriously. And I've definitely felt that as a young woman in my advocacy. Women may sometimes be seen as complaining or over exaggerating, and it's a balance. I think you kind of feel that imposter syndrome. Like am I ready to be doing this work? But you don't really have a choice. You either do the advocacy or you can't get accommodations, and you can't do it, and that's it.

And I'm also, as a white cis person, that informs my work and how I go about it, because it just means that I need to continue to educate myself, listen, and learn from folks with lived experiences. It's extremely important. Because if I don't then I'm not doing it right. So there's that.

And then, in terms of, other experiences as a disabled person, you know, as a law student and a lawyer, I mean, I've had so many, so many different barriers that I've faced. I mean, even from the start of law school, before I even set foot on campus, I had to sort of fight to make sure that I got the accommodations that I needed. My school wasn't initially going to give me the accommodations that I requested, and I had to send a strongly worded letter, stating why I believed that it was my legal right to get those accommodations, and they did back off. They did give me those accommodations eventually. And I used that letter to help other folks. I guided folks going through the process later.

And that's when I created the Disability Liaison position at my law school, through the Student Bar Association, which is the student government at my law school. So, I used that to try to help other folks who are going through the same thing and lost in that process, which shouldn't be a thing, but it is a thing.

And, I've talked about issues with the bar exam. Those are things that I experienced as well. I mean, it's a difficult exam, and regardless of how much extra time I got to take that exam, I get that extra time because the exam causes fatigue and pain, and I need dictation. And it was an exhausting, excruciating exam for me to take and having that extra time made that even worse. And so, you know, people talk about how accommodations “level the playing field,” and for me, it doesn't even do that much. It just makes it a little bit better for me, but I'm still just trying to do my best. If having a long exam like that, or any exam like that, it just, it's never going to be the same. It's never going to be leveled.

And when court was in person, I couldn't access the court the same way as everyone else. The Court steps, I couldn't go up them, and that was the main entrance to the court. The accessible entrance was an employee entrance, and the only way to get in was with an employee key card. Otherwise you had to wait to be let in, and they just were not consistent about letting people in. And so there were times when I'd be waiting like 20 minutes or whatever to be let into the court. And it was just ridiculous. So, there are things here and there that you have to experience that just remind you that there are things that still need to be sort of worked on and put into focus.

Lindsay: Absolutely. The literal courthouse doors being closed feels like quite a metaphor, as well as a reality. I'm wondering if you have thoughts on ways that listeners or others could engage in this process. Oftentimes, certainly within the legal profession, disability law is treated as an insular topic. It's kind of over here to the side. And I'm wondering if you have thoughts on ways that people can bring it off the edges and into the center because, as you mentioned so eloquently earlier, it touches on every aspect of our legal system.

Marissa: Yeah, and I think that's a really interesting point because, even my fellowship and the work that I'm doing, I work at a consumer rights organization. Tzedek DC focuses on consumer issues and debt. And I decided to do work that focuses on the ways that disabled folks are disproportionately affected by debt and consumer problems. And so, making sure that you're not seeing disability as just a siloed topic is really important and bringing that expertise into your organization, bringing that lived experience into your organization is so vital no matter what you're doing. It's really important.

So, whatever your organization is, whatever kind of law you're doing, whether you're at a law firm, whether you're at a corporation, whether you're at a nonprofit, whatever you do, hire disabled lawyers. It is so important. Change the environment at your workplace to make sure that it's universally accessible, welcoming, and inclusive for disabled folks. Hire disabled consultants if you need help with that. That's important. But you know, that'll help you if you want to hire disabled lawyers. I think that's really important.

And you know, for other things that you want to do. You can advocate for diploma privilege. You can check out the National Disabled Law Students Association and all the important work they do. You can host events on these issues that feature disabled folks. There are all kinds of things that you can do to sort of get involved. You can use your influence as attorneys and alumni to affect change at your alma maters. All kinds of things that you could do to bring about change and to keep the energy and momentum going.

Lindsay: And that goes for non lawyers too. We have some folks who are listening who are interested in legal issues but may not be lawyers. Folks in their workplaces or in their communities can certainly dig in on these issues as well, right? It doesn't require a law degree to be an advocate.

Marissa: Absolutely, and I think that's even more important, right? You have power in numbers. The more folks who are interested in doing the work the better, and that's just so important.

Lindsay: I'm wondering if you wouldn't mind talking for a second about your work and how you have brought your personal perspective into that work and talk a little bit about what specific challenges people with disabilities face when it comes to debt. And explain how disabled people experience consumer protection in a different way?

Marissa: Yeah, one of the things that happens is that, if you're a disabled person, you are more likely to be unbanked and underbanked. You're more likely to experience unemployment, or discrimination in employment. You're more likely to be on social security or some sort of fixed income, and that fixed income is not likely to be enough for the cost of living. For example, Supplemental Security Income is like \$794 per month, which is just not enough. And disabled folks may be paid subminimum wages, that's still part of the law. That's the Fair Labor Standards Act. There are some states that have gotten rid of it, but it's very few and far between. So, disabled folks can still make below those subminimum wage in many places.

Lindsay: So, I want to take a second, if it's okay, just to highlight that because I don't know that that's a widely known fact. That there are these exceptions for people with disabilities to make below the legal requirement. And I just wanted to highlight that because it's so egregious.

Marissa: Yes, it really is. And that's because there's just this assumption that they're less productive, and they basically base it on that, which is ridiculous, because literally anybody at any point could be less productive for any given reason. It doesn't matter. It's just so ableist. Anyway, it's a whole thing. You know, we've tried to amend federal law, and there have been bills that we've tried to push through, but nothing yet.

There are all kinds of reasons why disabled folks disproportionately experience debt. And those are kind of all of them, and there are more as well, but those are kind of the main ones. And then in terms of other consumer problems, I mean, you have issues with scams that disabled folks might experience, issues with signing contracts or predatory lending that disabled folks might be more susceptible to. There's all kinds of things that come up, that we see all the time. And then there's also the issue of discrimination and lending. That is a possibility. And so there are all

kinds of things that might well pop up, and so that's the sort of thing that I work on. And I also deal with social security overpayment issues and those types of things too.

Lindsay: Anybody who's had a family member or maybe themselves work through these systems like the social security system, applying for benefits, or navigating that system, knows that it is complicated and time consuming. And so, as you were referencing earlier, if you have a disability, if you have limited time because of your job requirements, these things can compound. So, I just wanted to highlight the work you're doing in bringing the disability rights or justice lens to something like consumer perception, which impacts lots of people, not just disabled people but certainly disabled people. You bring a unique perspective. That can be true with lots of other places, and folks should try to bring that lens to their work.

Marissa: Absolutely.

Lindsay: I would love to ask just a couple more closing questions. One is, are there specific things that you think can be done to rework our legal system or even just the legal profession to create greater not only accessibility but inclusion and try to bring folks into the profession?

Marissa: So, a couple things. I think, number one, I definitely think that getting rid of the bar exam is a big one. And reworking the way that we license folks is certainly a big one.

Lindsay: For non lawyers, the bar exam happens after you've completed three years of law school. It's not like we're just sending people out to be lawyers without any type of training. It comes after three grueling years of law school, right?

Marissa: Yeah. And then, you know, obviously, law school itself is not the most accessible either. You have issues with accommodations and accessing them, and you have an environment that is not necessarily the most welcoming for disabled folks. It's a little bit hostile. So, I think it's such, and that's the case for a lot of employment as well. I think there just needs to be such a shift in environment and such a shift in perspective throughout the profession that needs to happen. And I'm hopeful that that's starting. I think there's a lot of chatter, especially with the newer attorneys who are starting to enter. I just don't know how long it's gonna take.

But I just think it's gonna require a big shift in our understanding of what it takes to be a lawyer, what's required, what's healthy. There's just so much that I think people view as necessary or expected that just isn't and shouldn't be, that actually perpetuates ablest notions and not only ablest notions, but with it, racist notions, sexist notions, oppressive notions in other respects that are marginalizing. I think it's going to come time, and I hope it comes sometime soon, but it may take some time. And I just, I don't know if there is one specific way or a few specific ways, I just think it's going to take a really big shift in perspective. I hope that we are going to keep pushing for that shift in perspective. I just don't know how long it will take, or how.

Lindsay: I so appreciate your earlier call to action to bring this into their lives and to make sure that folks are taking action in their day to day, in their employment, in their social circles. I think you're right, it's such a huge project that it's going to take us all. It can't just be left to folks organizing in the disability rights community.

I'm wondering if there are any final words that you want to leave us with, and it's okay if not. You've done such a great job of laying out so much and giving us so much to think about, but I wanted to give you one last opportunity to chime in.

Marissa: I just want to thank you all so much for having me today, and to sort of think about accessibility. I just want to make sure that when you think about accessibility, you think about a couple of things. You're not just thinking about accommodations. Accommodations are individual exceptions to the rule or the norm. It's making changes so that one person can access the environment, and that should not be the goal. The goal should be universal design. The goal should be access for all. That won't always be possible to do. People do have conflicting access needs, and sometimes it's unavoidable to individualize accommodations. And, what I mean by that is, for example, some people may need a service animal, and other folks may have severe allergies to dogs, or an anxiety or other conditions that lead to a phobia of dogs. However, the goal is to get as close to universal access and to taking those needs into account.

The other layer is ensuring that when we think about accessibility, we are thinking about accessibility in all of the ways. We are thinking about race. We are thinking about economic accessibility. We are thinking about gender and gender identity. We're thinking about sexual orientation. And we're of course thinking about disability. And we have to have a broad definition of accessibility to have true access for all disabled people. And of course, access is important beyond the disabled community. It's important for all marginalized folks. We just need to make sure that we are not leaving anyone out of the access conversation, and I often see disability left out of the access conversation. And in disability spaces, I often see other access left out of the conversation as well, and we can't have that. Taking access into account and making sure it is as broad as possible is so important. So I just want to leave you with that, and challenging notions with what access versus accommodations look like is so important.

Lindsay: Thank you, Marissa, for that and such a fantastic conversation and for the work that you do to lift up these important issues. We're going to make sure to include a link to your most recent Expert Forum post in our show notes, and I encourage everyone to read it. Marissa has been a great ACSer and contributor, and so anytime you can read her work, I highly encourage you to do so.

Thank you to our listeners for finding Broken Law. Now is a great time to follow and subscribe so you don't miss an episode, like our upcoming series on the State of Democracy.

If you're listening to us on iTunes or Apple podcasts, please consider giving us a five-star review so we can bring Broken Law to more listeners.

You can find details and show notes about today's episode on our website, ACSLaw.org.

If you have ideas for a future episode, let us know. You can email us at Podcast@ACSLaw.org or find us on social media @acslaw, and at #BrokenLawPodcast.

Together, we'll speak truth to power about the law, whose interests it really serves, and whose it does not!