

AT: Welcome to the Infinite Women podcast. I'm your host, Allison Tyra, and today I'm joined by Dr. Sharrona Pearl, a professor of bioethics and history at Drexel University, to talk about painter, writer, educator, and activist, Riva Lehrer. So first, can you give us an introduction to her life and background?

SP: Riva is a good friend and collaborator of mine, so I come at this not only from somebody who is extremely interested in Riva Lehrer's work and contributions, but also as somebody who I really admire on both a personal and a professional level. So, Riva Lehrer is from originally the Midwest. Her early education took place at the Condon School for Handicapped Children, which is one of the first schools in the U.S. that offered standardized education to disabled children. And actually, when she talks about this experience, she talks about how unique that actually was. We don't see a lot of spaces like those anymore, to be in a fully accessible space, or at least a space that was catered to those kinds of situations. She was born with spina bifida, and she also reflects in her memoir that maybe we'll talk about that, had she been born at a different time or to a different parent, she might have been one of those kids who just didn't come home. But her mother was deeply committed to fighting for her.

So, Riva had, of course, an extremely medicalized childhood, where she had a number of surgeries to help deal with spina bifida, which is a condition where the spine and the neural tube do not develop properly in utero. That leads to physical and neurological consequences sometimes, including leg weakness, paralysis, and so on and so forth. There's a lot of different things that it can lead to. Riva is subject to some of those physical disabilities, of course, but also has had kind of a really thoughtful set of reflections around what it means to be disabled, and what it means to have the kind of body, and to inhabit space in such a way where people actually mark that on you in terms of their interactions with you.

AT: And we'll get into how her disability has impacted her work. But first, to give us a bit of context, can you tell us about her career as an artist?

SP: Absolutely. So, she studied fine art. Her main medium is painting and in particular portraiture. So, this is what she does professionally. She is an extremely well-known painter. Some of her images hang in the National Portrait Gallery in DC. So, for example, that's where her painting of Alison Bechdel is, but she's also got work that is shown in the Rhode Island School of Design, Yale University, the UN, the National Museum of Women in the Arts in Washington, DC, the Arno Museum, the deCordova Museum, the Frye Museum, the Chicago Cultural Center, and the State of Illinois Museum. So, she is extraordinarily well-known and has really thought in intense and deep ways around portraiture in particular, although not only that. One of the things that really draws me to her work and to her artistic practice is the way that she thinks really particularly about consent in the relationship between artists and sitters. So, this is one of my research interests, and I touched on it a little bit in my first book, the relationship between artists and sitters. But when someone is painting you, when someone's painting your portrait or rendering you, you're kind of putting yourself in their hands quite literally. Their depiction of you has to do with their vision, their execution, and Riva is so particularly committed to an ethical relationship between portrait and sitter that she has innovated a number of different

ways to really think critically and manifest that relationship in a consensual way around her portraiture practice. And we can talk about what some of those manifestations are, but I find that really moving.

Now, one of the reasons that's particularly important for her work is because as a person who has been very used to being stared at in ways that can sometimes feel really aggressive or violating, right? Not always. As Rosemary Garland-Thompson, the bioethicist and disability studies scholar has argued, sometimes staring can be a relief, when people actually look at you as opposed to averting your eyes, it can be a way to encounter humanity. But sometimes it can feel really violent. If people are looking at you and what they're seeing are these aspects of yourself that, and they're seeing them in such a way as to understand you as problematically different, right? So because Riva is so interested in working with and painting people whose representations have often been socially challenged, along sexuality, gender identity, or physical embodiment, she really works with people who have a lot of experience with being stigmatized, with being stared at in ways that feel really aggressive and invasive. So because those are the people who she wants to paint and whose difference she wants to portray and whose beauty she wants to make on display for other people, she's had to be really, really thoughtful or she's desired to be really, really thoughtful about how to take people who have been looked at in ways that have always felt non-consensual and incorporate consent into that experience.

AT: Well, I would imagine there's also the fact that we're adding a medium to this process. So it's not just one person seeing another person and that experience, but it's also the fact that people with different kinds of bodies, whether that be disability, whether it be race, whether it be size, even, frequently what we've seen in history is that people with those supposedly atypical body types have often been exploited most notoriously in the quote unquote "freak shows," Barnum's Circus, and all of those situations - they use those images to further exploit the people that they were putting on display. And it's questionable how consensual that experience would have been. So the fact that she's taking different types of people who in the past perhaps would have been exploited in that way through a visual medium and flipping that on its head to, I assume, re-empower people is, I mean, I would say revolutionary.

SP: I think so. I think it really is an incredibly powerful experience. And if I can talk a little bit about her technique, I really feel like she should be here because she's so remarkable in the way that she talks about her work and her process. But one of the ways that she really made this manifest was through her Risk series, wherein she would have sitters come and they would sit in her apartment and she would paint them. But part of the deal was that as part of the process and part of the sitting, she would leave, I think, usually for about two hours. And during that time, she let the sitters have complete access to her apartment. Her computer would be available, all her food. And she would say, you could do whatever you want, go through her underwear, drawer, whatever it is. The only deal was that they had to somehow change their portrait or interact with their portrait in particular ways. So they would be both contributing to it. But also she would make herself vulnerable as they were themselves being vulnerable to her gaze and to her representation of her sitters. There would be some kind of reciprocity. And all this would be negotiated in advance. And it would be this not quite mutual process, because of

course, Riva was the artist doing the representations. But it would be one in which people could contribute both to the art that was being made and also have access to her space and her privacy and her intimacy in the way that she was accessing their intimacy and their privacy through representing them.

Now, one of the ways that we tried to think about this, because I sat for Riva, but we collaborated on a project. It was during COVID. It was during the Zoom era. And I don't know if you've seen one of her wonderful pieces in the New York Times, where she talks about face hunger. As a portrait artist, it was really challenging for her to navigate a world in which faces were not available. I'm a scholar of faces myself, so I had a huge amount of sympathy and understanding for this challenge. Of course, we were both completely supportive and insistent on mask wearing and so on and so forth. And also, there was this sense of loss and difficulty. And maybe, you know, if everybody would be responsible and get vaccinated and wear masks, then we could get faces back, right? That was part of her plea in this piece. But also as a portrait artist, there were real challenges working during COVID, right? Because at the beginning, people couldn't be co-located. So we actually did a series together. Well, I sat for her over Zoom and some of the ways that we incorporated this mutuality, this consent, this relationship is that while she would be working on my image as we were sitting for Zoom, I would take screenshots of her, which she would not know about. And then the image that I liked best, she would have to represent and use in the series. So it was again, this kind of attempt at some sort of mutuality or some sort of looking back, right? And I've done some work as an artist model before, but this really created a sense of mutuality or a sense of participation. That was really powerful, particularly because we were talking the whole time and we were recording the conversations. And then we had those transcribed and included in the background. So our language, our words, our conversation are actually captured in the image as well.

So this was a really amazing experience. I was not the first of the Zoom portraits. Riva did an extraordinary portrait of the disability activist Alice Wong. So also for me to be kind of even close to, in any kind of way, these extraordinary activists is really mind-blowing because so much of the work that they have put in the world has been so important for forcing us to really encounter and take seriously our own ableism, the structural ways in which the world discriminates against disabled people, the personal ways in which people discriminate against disabled people. So to actually flip that on its head, to flip looking on its head in this very grounded and also beautiful and also artistically robust and also ethically boundary-breaking way, I think is simply extraordinary. And we haven't even gotten into her writing yet, right? So that too.

AT: Well, it is fascinating that it sounds like she's very much making it instead of the active painter and the passive model, she's turning it into a process where both participants are active and have agency and are engaged in, I believe you said, collaboration.

SP: Yeah. And again, there's a limit to that. This is certainly an expert rendering in a domain in which she has extraordinary skill, but it is a call for participation, I would say. And I think that's always powerful, but particularly when you consider that the majority of that her subjects are people who are disabled, gender nonconforming, or participatory in being nonconforming in some way or having bodies that the world has stigmatized a multiple ways. So have really been

subject to a kind of visual attention that they haven't invited or participated in to actually have the opportunity to take agency in that, I think is really interesting, and important, but also interesting because you have to think really creatively, right? The artist-sitter relationship is a pretty static one. Someone sits and someone paints and maybe you're paying them and it's a patronage situation and we're in 19th century England or maybe they're painting you and then they're selling it or maybe it's, you know, a headshot or I don't know, there's all kinds of ways, but mostly it's somebody sits and somebody renders, right? So this is actually active in a very different kind of way.

AT: Well, there's an interesting conversation around selfies where people say, particularly young women. "Oh, they're so vain" because they take so many photos of themselves. Like, well, yes, but if she were sitting still for hours on end 200 years ago and the man in her life was paying someone X amount of dollars to paint a giant portrait of her that was going to hang in her own house, that's not considered vanity. But when particularly young women are taking that power for themselves or they are making themselves the artist as well as the subject, then it becomes vanity, then it becomes something to mock and ridicule. So that's obviously not exactly this conversation, but I do think there are interesting similarities there in, when you involve the subject with the process of the creation and how people look at that differently, particularly through the lens of, that's a young person, that's a woman, or in this case, people who are disabled or who have other physical differences. And something we've actually talked about before on the podcast is throughout history, the stories of marginalized people, whether they are disabled, poor, enslaved, etc. Those stories have often been told by people with privileges and often with an agenda. So that gets us into why it's important for people with disabilities or other differences or other marginalizations to be able to tell their own stories, whether it's through her writing, through her art, or through other media.

SP: Yeah, you know, and it's one of the central principles of disability rights, nothing about us without us. And I think it speaks both to the fact that there was so much "about" without, people deciding what's best for others without consulting them, which is profoundly infantilizing. It's a problem both because a lot of people actually know best about themselves, what's best for themselves, but also because the people for whom we tend to make decisions also tend to be people whose opinions we think don't matter, who we don't think are mature enough, sophisticated enough, developed enough or equal enough to make their own decisions. So it speaks to a fundamental oppression and discrimination against disabled people. I think when it particularly comes to visual representations, there's an even stronger impetus, obviously, not stronger than in the policy realm, in the medical realm. But I think there's something uniquely important about people being masters of their own representation when for so long, the ways in which they have been seen and understood has been outside of their control, both because those have been used for really violent ends, but also simply because when people are masters of their own agency and own representation, it's an autonomy question, right? If we look through history, and I'll be quite specific here, every attempt to remove somebody's autonomy is an attempt to dehumanize them. That's just a fundamental historical trend. If you take away people's right to be treated as an end in and of themselves, rather than a means to an end, let's

say, a means to economic development, right? If you treat them not as agents, if you enslave them, then you are taking away their agency and thus their humanity and it's violent in multiple kinds of ways, but it begins with the loss of autonomy. So too, if you take away people's right to control their bodies around reproductive health care, this is a fundamental attempt to dehumanize, right? If you take away people's autonomy around their self-representation, then this is an attempt to dehumanize that is consonant with the ways in which disabled people have been treated historically. So I think that allowing people to tell their own, like, "allowing" - who am I to **allow** anybody to tell their own stories, right? It's creating space for multiple voices, not assuming that one kind of voice ought to be the only one that can tell a story, right? And I think in the history of disability, like so many other minoritized and oppressed communities, it's not that anybody's allowing them because the oppression didn't provide the space. It's people insisting on the right to be heard and the right to be seen on their own terms.

And I think if you look at Riva's body of work, it is a body of work around that kind of insistence. And she talks a lot about the importance of connecting with other disability activists and artists. There was a real community there. And for a lot of folks, that's a process to see yourself as part of a larger community, especially because there's so much pressure on normalization. For so many folks who are born disabled, there's so much pressure on "fixing" this body as though it were wrong. And that's different than creating, having interventions that support accommodations and giving people greater range of motion, access, alleviating pain. I mean, all of those are great things, but the idea that your body "ought" to look a certain way often or sometimes completely disaggregated from all those other kinds of accesses that can be granted. The access that's granted by looking the right way is that people believe you look the right way. But perhaps that labor shouldn't be on disabled people. It should be on people to not have categories of right or wrong when it comes to bodies, when it comes to health. And again, that doesn't speak against the importance and prevalence of providing accommodations and medical intervention and support that can really be incredibly beneficial and important and valuable and sometimes lifesaving. But I would say that the insistence on determining your own representation is hand-in-hand with autonomy, which is hand-in-hand with what should never have to be fought for, which is humanity.

AT: It is interesting when we're talking about visible versus invisible disabilities and the different experiences that people have because, for example, someone with fibromyalgia or chronic fatigue might have a good day and then people assume that they're healthy because "you don't look sick." And then when you are having a bad day, they are less likely to believe you because it's an invisible disability. And I was actually thinking the other day, because I have autism and ADHD, that these are almost ultra-invisible because so many people don't even know that they have it, which I'm hoping is something that ends with my generation. Because you hear so many people with stories about not getting diagnosed until they're in their 30s or 50s or even later. So it's so invisible that we don't even realize that we have it. But that is something that when we're talking about the stories in particular, Ms. Lehrer herself has actually said, "for so long, we've been absent from movies, art, and books, save for the occasional ableist trope." So what she's pointing out there is, when we're saying all these stories, when they are told, are being told by people who don't share the marginalizations of the

subject, but that's on the rare occasion that they actually are told in the first place. So often they're just completely ignored and overlooked and left out.

SP: Yeah, 100%. And representation matters, right? Representation always matters. But again, nothing without us without us, representation on your own terms by people who have experience and can really be the authors of their own stories, I think, is a real game changer. And I want to cycle back a little bit to what you were saying. And I think there's a lot to unpack there around invisible disability, neurodivergence, which of course is different than mental illness to be really clear. But both of them are not visible, right?

AT: There is actually a big overlap because neurodivergence is not well, it wasn't well recognized when I was younger, it is hopefully getting more well recognized. But there is a huge overlap between actual mental illness and neurodivergence. And so I think that may have contributed to people conflating it, but it's things like, "well no that person probably wouldn't have had anxiety and depression, or at least not nearly to that extent, if their neurodivergence had been properly recognized when they were younger." And so I think there's definitely some correlation/causation happening there.

SP: Sure, totally. And also to distinguish as categories in particular ways, right? I totally hear what you're saying, absolutely. And one can be a contributing factor to the other. But some of that has to do with external factors in particular ways that hopefully we can support and change and contribute to. But both of them share this invisibility feature, right? And I do think, as you said, there's been a lot of development and movement with this generation. But I think disability studies has struggled as a field to make sense of invisible disabilities, invisible differences in particular ways. And the kind of iterative experience of certain kinds of disabilities also can be really challenging. But I think that's changing. I think disability studies is also making sense of pain as a field in a different way. So like so many of these theoretical activist, intellectual movements and disability studies is really a combination of all of them in a particular way that might be different than some other spaces. First, there's a real reaction, a response against a medical model of a broken body that needs to be fixed by a heroic doctor, usually male, who always knows what's right, to the more social model of disability, wherein the world is disabling. You might have impairments, but the world is disabling and the world can accommodate. We can change things. We can make curb cuts and then somebody can access the streets better. Which I think is incredibly powerful, which is why it has been so effective. And now saying, yes, that is absolutely true. And also there are challenges. Pain is really challenging. Accessing a world when you are feeling really depressed is really challenging. So to find a way to accommodate things that are not immediately obvious while at the same time not forcing people to communicate these things or constantly have to go through the labor and challenges of making clear what it is that is not visible about them. I think it is a tricky challenge, especially when some disabled folks don't get to choose whether they share their disabilities, right?

AT: Yeah, there's definitely, I would say as someone with invisible disability that I have definitely benefited from the fact that I can hide my autism and my ADHD. I usually don't bother anymore

because it's exhausting. But that is definitely a privilege. Not all disabilities are created equal.

SP: And that's okay, right? Like, these are good and important conversations and don't undermine allyship, right? And I think, again, I can't speak for the disability community as an able-bodied person, but - and even that term is problematic, right? Because it's not just about being able of body, right? As we've just said. But I try to bear in mind in other cases and identities that I inhabit that any attempt to undermine allyship by creating these hierarchies of experience are imposed by those who wish for us to not stand in solidarity with one another. I think we can acknowledge the differences in experience and even the differential stakes for experience and still stand in allyship with one another. And I think the disability community is a really powerful model of how to see that enacted and how that can work. And I find it very moving. My mother's disabled. I am not. So I've had a little insight into these experiences, but I myself do not inhabit them. I think through a lot of my conversations and work with Riva, I have learned a lot more. And of course, through my own research, I have learned a lot more around some of these questions. But I find what you say really moving and really powerful, because I think that allyship is the way to resist a lot of those kinds of challenges.

AT: Well, and you mentioned earlier, the social model of disability, which is essentially that the thing that disables a person is not their condition. It is that society does not accommodate for their condition. So the fact that someone is in a wheelchair is not the problem. The fact that buildings are not wheelchair accessible is the problem. And I think that's something that comes through in a lot of works that are more recent. So rather than looking at a body as "the body is the problem," it's saying, "no, the body is just the body." And I was reading an article that Ms. Lehrer wrote where she talks about the Mutter Museum and the fact that their collection of bodies, primarily different types of bodies from what would have been considered the norm, are on display and how they're displayed. And referring back to the fact that in her book, she talks about a very life-altering experience that she had when she was much younger, going to the museum. But also when we're talking about how things were being displayed even as recently as last year, how presenting these bodies without the respect that you would give to a **person** is inherently problematic and impactful on the people who are visiting, whether or not they are abled.

SP: Yeah. And so I think one of the tricky things about the Mutter, which is in the middle of a lot of controversy and reevaluation right now, is that for some folks, it has been really important to go into that space and see bodies that look like theirs displayed, right? That has felt like a really important intervention. It does a lot of labor for folks who don't have to constantly explain themselves because there is a place where that is explained. But if that which is displayed was unethically obtained or displayed in such a way that is incredibly disrespectful, then that has to be dealt with. If bodies were stolen, then that has to be dealt with. So I think that it's pretty clear that there ought to be a balance between finding space to celebrate the diversity of the bodily experience, but to do so in such a way that is consensual and respectful. I think it's possible. But the Mutter is it's currently configured and manifested is not achieving that.

AT: We see this as well with colonialism and people of non-European backgrounds where the whole person alive and presumably well at the start of it were taken from their homes and put on display when they were still living. So even today you've got fights with museums primarily in Europe and I'm sure several others in the US, that Indigenous communities are still hundreds of years later fighting for the return of their ancestors. And that is just deeply messed up. So this dehumanizing that you were talking about earlier that we do it to all sorts of different people. Anyone who is seen as other and anyone whose humanity we do not see as equal to our own is subject to this lack of bodily autonomy.

SP: Absolutely. That's the case. And I'm just thinking of a classic example there, which was that Saartje Baartman's body was only repatriated from the Musee de l'Homme to her home in the Western Cape in the early 2000s, I think. Maybe it was a little earlier than that. But it was a decades long battle to take this woman who left under extremely uncertain means and was displayed throughout Europe through the 19th century and then her body was displayed in a museum in France, to get her buried.

AT: Seems like the most basic form of decency that we can give a person.

SP: Indeed, yes. And you would think, OK, well fine, but we're doing better now. But of course, a very recent case here in Philadelphia was, the bones of somebody who was killed in the MOVE bombing when Philadelphia bombed its own citizens. That's a whole other story in a really violent and horrific moment during the 1980s, I think. It was discovered that the remains of one of the victims of this bombing, a child, one or potentially two, were actually being used in a teaching collection shared between University of Pennsylvania and Princeton. Now, bones are used in teaching all the time, but in the case where the family is alive, did not consent to this and wanted to bury their children. This is incredibly violent. And once it was discovered, the bones were returned and buried appropriately, but only once it was discovered, right? So these are ongoing battles. And there is a law in the US that museums that hold the bodies of indigenous people have to return them to their communities. So a lot of museums are in violation of that law. They are now currently doing audits to try to figure it out and be in compliance, including the Mutter. But that is certainly the case all over the place. And then when you start thinking about that, you start thinking about the fact that museums hold a lot of bodies that maybe ought to be buried appropriately. And then it gets really complicated, right? It gets really, really complicated because questions of consent worked really differently in the past. It's certainly the case that a lot of these bodies on display, a lot of the bodies that were used for dissections and so on and so forth were paupers who were not collected by anybody when they died. And you know, in Philadelphia, a lot of paupers' bodies, formerly incarcerated people or people who died in poverty were then automatically donated. This is a painful and difficult thing to think about should poverty deprive you of the right to determine what happens to your remains.

AT: I think we can all agree that four people are in other category of frequently dehumanized people even today.

SP: Indeed, yes. So I guess we got a little far afield of the of the main discussion, although I think these are really trenchant and valuable questions that I also think about a lot. And there's actually a wonderful volume coming out called *Do Less Harm*, edited by Courtney Thompson and Kylie Smith, that thinks a lot about these questions of the ethical obligations of historians and also thinks about this question of display of human bodies in that context, along with a number of other key questions. So if folks are interested in that, I'll point you to that wonderful edited volume coming out at some point, academic publication timeframes are long. But getting back to the way that Riva Lehrer has intervened in these ways, she really does insist on the display of bodies being as human as possible through her work and her painting. So this is a fundamentally humanizing process of consent and autonomy. And she actually teaches at Northwestern, she teaches anatomy, painting anatomy to medical students and sees that as part of this, or I shouldn't say what she sees that or not, but her practice there certainly reflects this process of humanization in deep and meaningful ways. And if folks are interested in her work, both in the painting, I'll point you to her website, but also in her writing, which is evocative and powerful. You mentioned pieces that were published, but there's also her memoir, *Golem Girl*, which is beautifully written and tells a lot of her story in her own words, which I certainly should not do. So I'm here to just comment on her as an interesting and fantastic and important woman, artist and activist, but you should certainly go read her story.

AT: Yeah, she's described it as saying that it is quote, "about my life as a monster. This is how I've been treated most of my life, including too often by the medical establishment." So again, we're getting into that context that, that's not how she would have self-identified if that wasn't how she had been treated by everyone around her, including the professionals who were meant to be caring for her.

SP: Right. So it speaks again to the experience of having other people see you in a particular way and how that can be internalized. So I think her work is actually resisting that, is giving people the right to imagine how they are being seen and manifest that.

AT: And in addition to being an instructor at the Art Institute of Chicago, she is also an instructor of medical humanities at Northwestern University. So she's actively influencing how tomorrow's doctors view disability and disabled people. And so she is being the change that she wants to see in the world. And I love it. I was reading about a particular course that she teaches called *Drawing in a Jar*. It's using what she calls non-normative fetuses in Northwestern's collection, which does have similarities to the Mutter's collection. And I don't know what they're doing to make sure that they're being as ethical as possible, but I'm sure that she has opinions on that as well. But essentially, the technical demands of drawing gets these students used to looking at these fetuses, gives them time to work through how they're reacting to it. And she says they're often surprised by the beauty of these entities. And then the final assignment is to present a 15-minute biography of a person who has had the same condition as the fetus they've drawn, and who has lived within the last 25 years. So the person has to have a public presence, whether that's a career, a documentary, a memoir, a biography, and no more than five minutes, so about a third of the presentation, can be about the condition. So the majority of it has to be

about the **person**, it has to present them as an individual with their own story, not just the condition that they have. And she says “too often med students are taught that the disabled are tragedies to be eradicated.” So again, we're getting back to that fundamental question of she is teaching people to humanize others.

SP: Yeah, I think this is an incredibly powerful intervention. It reminds me a little bit of the work of Adria Imada, who has written a wonderful book about indigenous Hawaiian culture under medical incarceration due to leprosy. And she works with this, it's called Archive of Skin, Archive of Kin. And she works with this really powerful collection of photographs and thinks about the forms of kinship and community that people who are violently separated from their family is formed within these communities. And one of her stated goals is to deeply humanize people who live under conditions of disease, disfigurement, and medical rule.

And I think there's a lot of resonance with this course that Riva Lehrer is doing in which she is forcing people to look, but to look in order to see humanity, not to look in order to gawk, not to look in order to make a joke, not to look as a form of disgust or entertainment, but to look as part of a process of seeing the human.

AT: And was there something in particular that when I contacted you about coming on the podcast, made you say, “yeah, we got to talk about Riva”?

SP: She is an extraordinary person, but I also think that she's really an innovator in this space. And we talk about, that sounds like I'm going to now show you her app. But people who are innovating around ethical relationships ought to be the ones that we're elevating as change people who make change in the world.

So I just want everybody to see this beautiful work and also to be a little more thoughtful about what how representation can be more ethical, particularly, as you said, in a moment when we're inundated with images and images where there might perhaps be some agency around how those are communicated, but also with just a tremendous amount of pressure on particularly, as you said, young people, young women, to look and be a certain way. There's this kind of what Jia Tolentino calls Instagram face, the sort of deviation to the norm. So this huge amount of images that we are exposed to isn't actually creating more diversity. It's weirdly creating less. So I think then you have people who are making art, who are doing representations that actually increase the diversity of what and how we see. And I think Riva is really a leader.

AT: Join us next time on the Infinite Women podcast and remember, well-behaved women rarely make history.