

Rampe? Reicht! Season 2, Episode 2: Is this term actually ableist?

tier: ramp?

SR: enough!

tier: a 20 minute podcast about

SR: which terms belong to whom and which pain actually belongs to whom.

tier: i'm simo_

tier and am currently doing collages and zines

SR: i'm SchwarzRund and am currently working on the campaign for my new volume of poems!

tier: yey! how did it come about that we're making an episode on this topic?

SR: there have been debates and discussions online and somehow we never really took part in them because yes, there are so many exciting positions in there and there is nothing like that where you can say "that's true!" and "that's wrong!" (laugh)

tier: yes, it's not that easy

SR: it's really not that easy and that's why we thought we'd do an episode about it and we had a little problem, because actually before we talk about which term belongs to whom..

tier: yes, we thought it might be good to explain a term ..

SR: ..but then we have a problem with the 20 minutes!!

tier: yes, that's why we're doing the recommendation for this episode right at the beginning, because this time we would like to recommend the Instagram account "erklär mir mal" [explain to me]. this is a project by queer BIPOCs who explain different terms and then post a little video every week and then people can discuss and they have made a great post about the term ableism.

SR: exactly and that's basically a substitute for the explanation of one word. with the other words, if you think "oh, I don't know the term" or something then we would like to invite you to see if you can find any cool sources and we will definitely make an episode about definitions some time, but for the second season we want to start going a little bit deeper.

tier: exactly!

SR: but the terms that we have chosen for now are not complicated per se either.

tier: no, we want to keep this understandable and rather focus on these, on the discourses or the discussions about these terms, as SchwarzRund already indicated at the beginning.

SR: Exactly and then let's start with a term you introduced and that is the word dumb [bescheuert in german].

tier: oh, yes that is a term that I think many people from my generation are definitely familiar with, a term that people simply use. somehow this word was one of the hardest for me to remove

SR: oh, ok!

tier: i don't know why, probably because i just used it more than, for example, i never use "disabled" as a swear word, or "crazy" also less so, but dumb was somehow present.

SR: what is the position that says "we shouldn't use the word"?

tier: I think that is a similar position as with the word "crazy". I don't know the etymological background of this word so I think it's relatively interchangeable, with crazy. I think the word is used mainly in language among teenagers.

SR: let's talk about it: is that actually true? Because I think that's a myth that we have in queer circles, that teenagers call themselves gay and disabled and dumb, but now having our garden we have even more contact with people our age plus 10, plus 20 years, who aren't part of our social bubbles, and that's where I hear words like that quite a lot.

tier: that's right!

SR: you know? I always ask myself, there is this term of youth culture , which is also very widely discussed whether that is not always a substitute for "kanack culture is bad, black culture is bad, migrant culture is bad"

tier: yes therefore! I feel like that .. I just relate it to myself because it was somehow more difficult to unlearn the word for me and therefore I think that maybe it has something to do with the

generation?

SR: Maybe that has nothing to do with a generation, but we associate it because we used these words as young people and we, that is only we as individuals, later unlearned them. that actually has nothing to do with our age!

tier: no, that's right

SR: you didn't say: "now that i'm grown up!", but that was just that you came into confrontation with discourses .. yes, exactly, well i think, yes i think that leads to the first question: is it really a matter of "who is more sensitive to discrimination and who isn't?" or is it a question of class and access to knowledge?let's take a look! let's go to the next word!

tier: yes, when we talk about the word "crazy", is it really the same? I always think "crazy" is somewhat worse?

SR: funny, I would have said it's the other way around!

tier: ah, ok! yes but it is just not so fixed I think.

SR: I think the word "crazy" has so many facets for me: on the one hand, in the sense of "that's totally crazy" for me it is more like "that is totally different from how I perceive reality", in that context it doesn't bother me so much, but that doesn't mean that the word can be used whenever. Perhaps it is important to say briefly before we continue: the youtuber Kat Blaque said a very good thing in several videos, I can't tell you exactly which one: she often talks about, for example, not being negatively affected by terms relating to being trans and then people said: "oh my god, you can't say that!" nah, just because I don't mind it doesn't mean it's okay to do that. as a marginalized person i am allowed to learn how to cope

tier: yes!

SR: i am allowed to learn that the word "blablabla" no longer hurts me, but that is not a free ticket to throw the word around whenever! so i can say: we shouldn't use "crazy" as a derogatory word and at the same time i can say it doesn't bother me. And I think that is very, very important to allow people to do so, because otherwise we will ask marginalized people to always feel pain in order to improve our behavior and that is a big ask! exactly, that just briefly as a small insert. And I think that's how I feel about the word "crazy". it doesn't really bother me, i use it as a description for myself, my parents both used it as a description for their neurodivergences, they still use it, my dad is still alive. in spanish the word is not more positive, but more appreciative?

tier: isn't it somehow used more lovingly?

SR: exactly, yes! that's just the way the person is, the person is just crazy, and that's why it's actually closer to an identity thing, it's something one says quite often: soy loca, soy loco, soy loce, depending on which pronoun is used. and that's why I think that I've always struggled a bit with this word, that I'm supposed to find it bad and that has, I think that's just such a where we see how monolingual the discourses are on the subject of language.

tier: oh yes!

SR: which is absurd, because almost everyone in the world is connected to more than one language, at least emotionally. that's a very, very german experience that especially german (laughs) establishes the connection. I think that's my fight for the word "crazy", and then just like this idea of "diagnoses make that people are allowed to call themselves whatever" and when we say that, neurotypical - neurodivergent, is somehow a spectrum and not always a clear category, then there are also people who may not have experienced psychopathologization, but can still call themselves "crazy."

tier: yes.

SR: but we already talked about that in the last episode: who has access to the term, to the diagnosis.

tier: Exactly, I also use it and I don't think it's bad when it's used, I find it a kind of nice description for oneseif, but then this will probably not be so clear, the next step, it depends on how and who uses it and whether that is the question, or is it ok if you use it for yourself, but it is now "not ok" to say that about someone else?

SR: Exactly, unless it's agreed on in a relationship. I think what I miss about it is this idea of "being

crazy about something" which I would like to be able to say about other people, for example if I meet someone and we were having a great time talking about cooking and then I want to describe the person to you, I'd like to say: "oh, stefan / beate / peter, no idea, it doesn't matter, is super cool and totally crazy about food"

tier: yes, that's something positive!

SR: exactly! and that is what I think that opens up this spectrum of .. I sometimes think it's a problem when it comes to disability and that is what I find very exclusive for the subject of disability when we say: "No, this word is bad! " then it always resonates that the word is actually as bad as the n-word. and we can paste the discourse onto that.

tier: and that doesn't work!

SR: that doesn't work because it's a spectrum and it's something that surrounds us, but the concept of "the N" is wrong! completely! but that there are crazy people, that is not fundamentally wrong!

tier: exactly, that also resonates: there is nothing wrong with being crazy!

SR: Exactly, that's another word that I think should be discussed in a more complex way. then you introduced another term the word "sick"

tier: yes, that is, maybe we can talk a little about the pain aspect , because that is definitely a term for me which, as it is often used, is very painful for me.

SR: yes, can you give an example?

tier: well, if it is used like something that a person finds eg exciting or special or something, then using "sick". that feels kind of...

SR: which also happens quite often, this inhumanity thing, this "he killed her, that's totally ..."

tier: yes, that's terrible!

SR: that is really awful!

tier: or, yes, that's something like street harrasment? where I've often heard it said "you're sick!" and then it's like this .. (laughs) I think that was recently where I was in my wheelchair and there came the person who was so upset at the bike shop.

SR: oh god that!

tier: i think he said that. i don't know anymore, but somehow i think he did. then I'll be like: "yes obviously!" (both laugh) "I'm in a wheelchair, something is going on!" But it's just like that, that's so inappropriate, it's this ..

SR: or rather the exact opposite: you use a wheelchair and that is a symbol for disability and describing disability to generally be "sick" is kind of weird and then turn it into "I have the right to yell at you because you're sick!" is emotionally incomprehensible. i think what's in there is just a lot of ns-history

tier: oh yes!

SR: this difference between the "valuable war injured invalid" and the "sick person who's without value." we also have a plan for that, but don't reveal anything yet because we don't yet know whether this will work because of corona. but German history is not that easy, to put it mildly, when it comes to NS time and illness or back then thrown together with disabilities, and there was the idea of those who were disabled in the war, who somehow did something for Germany and who are sick or have a disability .. [a dog shakes itself] that was the dog! ... they are without value and there was also euthanasia? not euthanasia, but forced sterilization

tier:.. yes exactly and actual murder!

SR: and murder, exactly. and that has hardly been dealt with until today and this "you are sick" as a proxy, maybe the question is what is it a proxy for? it is a proxy for "you're not human."

tier: and that is such an all-encompassing word that somehow implies that something is wrong with you, is somehow with your body but also with your mind and spirit

SR: and your decisions! there is something where a decision is made, you could also decide not to be sick!

tier: yes!

SR: it's something between nazi time and instagram star! (both laugh)

tier: wow!

SR: it's your choice!

tier: wow, scary!

SR: very, very scary combination! I think there is another aspect in there that I find exciting and when we say sick is a substitute for a lot, the question of fatness is also included for me. because this idea of you could, if you did the right thing, you would not be sick, which has also been reinforced from the Nazi era. if we pretend that these are all bad choices made by us, or by the genetic combination of our parents, or whatever, then we also add: "Because you are fat, you get sick!"

tier: yes.

SR: thank you ICD10 (irony)!

tier: exactly, and what resonates a lot with me is this "if you eat this and this and this, you will get sick

SR: or just stay healthy, depending on the recommendations

tier: exactly exactly, ugh!

SR: "good food , bad food!" there is somehow a lot of stuff in it that actually has terribly little to do with actually being sick, because most diseases do not come from choices, but almost always have a genetic component, a stress component, or a situational component

tier: yes or infections

SR: exactly. yes, here you have this question about morality and being sick! being sick is actually a violation of the morality of the national body. that's why it's not so nice to use it as such a broad word when saying "I don't like that your dog barked. (laughs) then it's better to say" I don't like your dog barked!" and then you can say "then don't live in the city" (laughs)

tier: (laughs) or that yes!

SR: exactly. so that's what we had to say about the words sick, crazy, and dumb. and then I picked out a word that as become among you whities (laughs) he marker word for the good anti-ableist!

tier: oh yes!

SR: what does the good white anti-ableist do, which word don't they say?

tier: they don't say stupid!

SR: Exactly! because the word belongs only to disabled people (irony) and there was a bigger discussion and maybe now that we have already discussed a few other terms, you notice that it is always about a connection between "what is the word's history, who was oppressed by it" and the word stupid is difficult to categorize.. ok, where do we start? Let's start with the word "reclaim" can you describe what it means to reclaim?

tier: yes, to reclaim is something like "take back something for yourself" which is often used with such discriminatory terms, for example we can now use the word crazy, people can say "ok, that word was used to" pathologize and discriminate against me, but I find the word somehow .. but it just explains what I am and that's why it's a positive word for me now and I use that as a describer for myself."

SR: Exactly, so there is the word crazy and then there is, for example, a very good example with the word queer. I think that's a nice example, because I think many "youngsters" don't even know that it was a word we had to reclaim. But that was also a word that was attributed to LGBTQetc. by others and it was also used, for example, against communists, so it was much, much broader. and what such terms are, they are actually always external attribution. so if someone says, for example, in German history inter people, trans people and gay people were sorted in one group for a long time and then depending on how the legal situation was, one pgroup was always picked out, but there was still a discriminatory term for it, although the experiences

tier: were very different.

SR: are totally different! it's actually like, it is like with the word, with the n-word, or with the self description black, it's actually a construct! if we look at each other's genetics, the people on the African continent have less in common with each other, that is, they have more in common with europeans in a specific country than with each other, because the genetic diversity is so great. And to make a genetic group out of it is just a very absurd decision, that's just how we have been trained

to view it: we now see being black. you could just google "egyptian person" or and then google someone from ethiopia and then you will see that there is actually no overlap! people are really wrongly thrown into a group and our view is now trained to think: "ah yes, that's blackness, that's being black." but actually there is no such thing as "being black".

tier: yes

SR: and to reclaim is like saying: "we are not the same, we are actually completely different nations and ethnic groups and cultures and language blah, but you treated us as the same. that's why we are now having the same experience in relation to racism and that is why we call ourselves black!" that's why i never like it when people say: "because of the color of the skin, or black because of the color of the skin" because that's just not true! There are just a lot of features that identify being black because it is actually bullshit, so there is no such thing as "being black" like that.

tier: and how exactly, how would you tie that to the term "stupid"?

SR: Exactly and that is so interesting with the word stupid because that is what has been used for a lot of groups of people! It was said that roma and sinti, for example, were stupid, then in the generation of guest workers [in germany] that turkish people and all guest workers weremore stupid. if we look at contract workers in the former GDR [east germany]

tier: yes, exactly

SR: they said: "these are our comrades but the dumber ones." then in the catalogs of the nazis that was the reason why black people were forcibly sterilized, that they were supposedly more stupid. So if we look at the word stupid, that's what is being negotiated so incredibly broadly and I think that when society keeps telling you: "You are stupid" it is often a substitute for: "I assume that you are stupid because of a disability, race, gender .."

tier: so often based on external features, or something like what comes to mind is language, so from a migrant perspective if a person does not speak perfect german, then that is often a trait to say "the person is stupid" or to act as if the person is stupid.

SR: exactly, exactly! this person does not understand you because the language is not the same and you speak louder and slower

tier: yes, exactly!

SR: So okay, but if the person doesn't understand the word "where is your place of residence" because these words are just bullshit, then it doesn't help to shout the words, it doesn't make them more understandable! and there we see that this term "stupid" somehow always refers in its construction to disability and so-called mental limitations, but still quite a lot of groups are marked with this term and that comes from the fact that intelligence and being healthy are always being constructed on the white body. you can only reach this level of health and intelligence if you are white. and not migrated. and I think that's what I'm totally missing in this discourse, the construction of health is just not only the body that is free from disease and disability, but also free from non-Aryan white ancestors, and that bothers me that it's being discarded. and then it's said: "these ignorant Kanacks are using the word stupid"

tier: exactly! An example that I also think of a lot are indigenous groups, people who were forcibly assimilated , especially on the american continents, but also in europe through schools and education and stuff

SR: that's a very important point. an important colonial and power structuring tool is to say yes: "I have now generated this knowledge system and it's the only right thing. everyone who manages well in it is smart and everyone else is stupid!" But that's not only about how you are mentally or physically positioned or about illness, but also: maybe you just have a different way of dealing with knowledge? oral history, or patterns, and how history is inherited

tier: oh yes

SR: and knowledge is passed on and spread

tier: also which knowledge!

SR: Exactly: what kind of knowledge is very versatile and then to say: "only this one knowledge is valuable!" I think it's really good to talk about when we call things stupid, dumb, or whatever, but also important to know it is not that easy with who can reclaim that for themselves.

tier: yes!

SR: and in my life I was called stupid very, very often, and in the same breath very, very often, extremely intelligent, and I know exactly that both refer to: "because of her race and her gender and her fatness she is something: especially stupid, surprisingly intelligent ..." it always has something to do with it. and i think that bothered me a lot during this discourse because i think both sides are right. I think it's right to think about it, about when to use this? i'm always a bit unsure of the difference between stupid and foolish. I keep using "foolish" because that just means bad for me. but "stupid" is actually like intelligence word for me. that might make the germanists roll around angry on their sofas, but at the same time it's also a ban of lower class language and expressions. if we are only allowed to say: "this is explicitly unfavorable for my condition!"

tier: yes, or only then to use "good" and "bad" for things, that's not strong enough for me! I actually like it, that's something we do when we talk to each other: I like to use the word stupid for some, let's say privileged white people who somehow do totally nonsensical things. I can't think of an example, but if we're talking like "I was outside and a person threw their mask on the ground" or something like that "and they got on the bus without a mask!" and so on and yes.

SR: totally, and I think that's a bit of my problem, often with language discourses in the German language, and that's what I say as a gender studies major (both laugh)

SR: I'm the core of the problem! (laughs) that it is often the case that we actually try to be less violent and thus become extremely violent because we try to create such a white European, de-emotionalized, situation-describing language and then we are actually back at schiller and his common sense shit and yeah, we can't end this topic because it is simply, it should be a complicated conversation! I think that's actually my concern!

tier: yes exactly, and actually that is now more of an impetus to continue these complicated conversations and not an explanation of the terms on our part.

SR: Exactly and maybe an impulse not to explain, but if a black person uses the word and you are a white disabled person then maybe don't say: "The word belongs to me and you are not allowed to use it" because that is very ahistorical!

tier: oh yes!

SR: an invitation to not always take your pain as a motivator to take possession of something, because that is a white pattern!

tier: that's colonial action.

SR: my foot hurts! this is mine! (both laugh)

SR: ok, context? (sarcasm) that was our episode to the question: which terms belong to whom and which pain belongs to whom?

tier: thank you for listening and you can support us via our patreon account, you can choose an amount that you pay us monthly, or if you only want to donate something once you can do so via paypal, via our address rampreich@gmail.com, the patreon is also rampe reicht.

SR: And there is something new: we have now set up an account and you can find the IBAN in the shownotes and on our website rampereicht.de if you fancy setting up a standing order.

tier: that is also possible! and with this support you help us to keep this podcast alive we would like to invite guests and we want to pay these people and we are also happy to be paid for our work ourselves.

SR: Precisely! and technology, internet server, etc... Exactly, so that about the payment options. You can also write to us at rampereicht@gmail.com if you have any questions or suggestions for topics!

tier: the next episode will be back in two weeks as usual and you can find out about it here on our youtube channel or on social media.

SR: for example on instagram, we have our own account that is also called rampereicht, everything is the same everywhere! Like with me by the way, you can find me everywhere as @SchwarzRund

tier: and you can find me everywhere as @simo_

tier

SR: we are:

tier: crazy
SR: disabled
tier: sick
SR: queer
tier: trans
SR: black
tier: migrated
SR: and this podcast
tier: is it as well!