

## Übersetzung k08e03

00:00:00

There are two ways to understand the theory of trilemmatic inclusion. One is very technical, littered with technical terms, and starts by introducing that it subsequently will deal with the ontological status of otherness. Then the three lemmas that compose the trilemma are presented and in a ring conclusion it is shown why one cannot affirm all of them at the same time, why every connection of two lemmas excludes the respective third lemma.

00:00:23

The second way is an experiential one - and it needs far fewer words, because it is easy to understand the trilemma if you have been affected by discrimination. Therefore, the trilemma lectures I gave to people who belong to a discriminated group always felt smoother, because then one just sorts everyday experiences into a landscape - a landscape that is one's lifeworld, a lifeworld between discrimination and inclusion, between the experience of being disabled and being enabled.

00:00:56

Today we are going to take the second way: so in the following I will speak from the disabled perspective and with disabled people, which is kind of strange because I am sitting here in a recording studio and I do not have a physically present audience, but we will manage. I am connected to you virtually.

00:01:13

For those who are not affected by the experience of being disabled, this means that the task is to comprehend what is explained in the following as good as possible.

00:01:24

In any case, the aim is to understand the figure you can see now and which we will build up step by step, by going through the respective modes of experience and timbres of otherness.

00:01:35

So we have three statements, three timbres of otherness and the corresponding experiences, and three corners: a tri-angle.

00:01:45

We need three concepts of disability and inclusion to fill this triangle. Depending on where you are on the map, the sign of 'disability' takes a different turn and the sign of inclusion, in this case understood as 'en-abling', as well.

00:02:02

So how can we put into words the experience of disability and inclusion?

00:02:08

Let's start with the first angle: E for empowerment. To be disabled, no matter what form it takes, first of all means to face barriers that make you feel powerless. This powerlessness, this exposure to structural violence in a non-barrier-free world is a reminder of why the word 'power' is in empowerment.

00:02:35

When these barriers and ableist discourses gain power over us, they move into our bodies. We are no longer just being disabled but have been disabled - over and over again - we have been made to understand that we are disabled. Therefore, even disabilities understood as

## Übersetzung k08e03

social processes are also bodily, they are incorporated, because the body bears these blows of powerlessness. The repeated experience of being disabled moves into our bones, becomes flesh, flesh soaked in defencelessness.

00:03:07

In this sense, one way of defining inclusion as 'en-abling' begins with the hope of empowerment as a recapture of agency.

00:03:19

If we were in the same room now, at this point you would already see, hear or feel that it is pervaded by dissonance. A quiet vibration would emanate from it and ask whether this was the right introduction to this topic. Shouldn't we first of all, before telling such a story of suffering again, emphasise that we are human beings? Just normal human beings.

00:03:43

Therefore, the second angle is N for normalisation.

00:03:49

This point of entrance thus refers back to the desire to be seen and treated as a normal human being, with all rights and duties, in the same way as non-disabled people. While at the first angle the experience of disability was told as an experience of powerlessness and thus as a story of suffering, albeit as a social, as a societal and not as a medical story of suffering, here we begin with a different intuition, namely the almost daily experience for some of us of not being treated like a normal person.

00:04:21

The experience of being disabled shows itself in all the moments of keeping distance, of fear, fear of encounter and fear of contact that some people have towards disabled people, but also the lack of distance in false pity, encroaching touches and other typical actions of people not affected by disability, which make it clear to us that in the eyes of some we are obviously not normal people, but aliens, maybe even monsters, you know what I mean.

00:04:49

The experience of inclusion would therefore show itself in being normalised in interactions and spaces in the positive sense of the word, so in the sense of the experience that one is treated like a normal person, that one's own presence in the space is taken for granted, that it is taken for granted that we too study here, participate in discussions in the seminars, sit in the lecture hall.

00:05:12

If we move, think or feel three steps further from there, we almost automatically end up with the question of whether the experience of inclusion must not ultimately be about the fact that it simply no longer plays a role in interaction, that the categories 'disabled-non-disabled' lose their meaning, especially as a dichotomous category 'disabled versus non-disabled', which suggests that we can divide people into two well-defined categories.

00:05:38

Having arrived at the third angle, one asks for D as in deconstruction, that is for a destruction of these binarisms, this thinking in dichotomies, these categorisations. But it is also part of everyday life that these moments in which you are thinking 'Here I am just a

## Übersetzung k08e03

human being, here I can be', that they are fleeting, that you can sometimes be torn out of this illusion quite harshly - by a stupid comment, a barrier or label. To dissolve such categories in the long run, therefore requires a striking shift in discourse. Deconstruction does not happen overnight. After all, it refers to powerful imagery and discourses, stereotypes, that are sometimes centuries old. Unlearning these is difficult and requires a change in society as a whole.

00:06:29

The experience of disability shows itself at this point in being subjected to these ableist discourses, in being affected by stereotypical image productions that put us into the same categories again and again - victim narratives, stories of suffering and then again hero narratives that pretend to be 'cool' but are actually just as wrong - you know all these stories.

00:06:49

The experience of inclusion, in turn, would consist of a deconstructive shift of these powerful discourses, images, stereotypes and categorisations.

00:06:57

The three angles of the triangle are now complete: It is about three forms of demand, not to be discriminated against, not to be disabled, namely first the desire for empowerment, for self-determination as a disabled person who has been denied this right to self-determination, second the desire for normalisation, to be treated as a completely normal person, as a natural part of the seminar group, the university, humanity, and third, the demand to break open rigid image productions and discourses about disability, to have space for one's own version of history, to gain interpretative sovereignty over one's own life and not to be put into dichotomous categories in the process.

00:07:43

The three timbres of otherness, which we will discuss in the following, result from the connections between two angles. Before we go through the terminology, let me briefly summarise in everyday language what is meant by this.

00:07:57

Imagine someone asked you or us 'Are you different? Are you (as a group) different?' - what could we answer? One option would be to say: No! I am not different. I am a human being. An individual. This would be about the demand not to have otherness attributed to us.

00:08:16

The second option would be to say: Yes, I do many things differently and I am certainly different in some ways because we live in a world that is not barrier-free. So yes and no: I am different because I am treated differently and have to do some things differently - but that does not always have to be the case nor is it the case at all times or everywhere.

00:08:40

So this is about the demand that it is recognised that in some aspects we go other ways, wheel other ways, need and use other means than those that are considered normal.

00:08:52

The third option, on the other hand, answers straightforwardly: Yes, I am different and that

## Übersetzung k08e03

is a good thing, because after all, it cannot be about pretending that normality per se is something desirable. Rather, we could also turn it around in such a way that the point is precisely to say that being different is not worse and not negative, that therefore there is also no reason not to affirm your otherness.

00:09:16

So that was the pre-empted conclusion in the language of lived experience. All that remains to be shown is exactly how the trilemmatic tension between this affirmative yes, this accentuated no and this swaying yes and no is composed. So let's go through it again step by step:

00:09:33

E plus N: What happens when we try to connect the first two angles, empowerment and normalisation? This line is about the demand as an 'Other', as a disabled person to participate in a normality without barriers - from the smallest everyday normalities like riding the tram and going shopping to the big magic words like education or democracy.

00:10:00

How do we fight for this right to participation? What could empowerment mean for us? Since it is a political process, I have to speak of us - in the plural, because empowerment is not a personal feel-good thing, not a ball-bath, but a question of political self-organisation.

00:10:18

So now we write – in the words of Gayatri Spivak - on the margin: strategic essentialism. Essentialism because the word 'us' sticks us, pulls us into a collective, claiming that we can speak meaningfully of a "we" because we exist as a group.

00:10:34

After all, this always happens when we build a sentence in the form "We disabled people demand our right to participate". But even if we leave out the political pathos of "we", a category still remains. After all, the sentence "Disabled people demand the consistent implementation of the UN CRPD" suggests that we are such a fixed group that speaks and can be addressed in the plural.

00:10:58

Hence the term essentialism. And we put 'strategic' in front of it because we should only commit this presumption for strategic purposes, so to stand up for our rights, to make ourselves representable in political discourses. In doing so, we refer to a shared suffering, a shared powerlessness - but as already said, not the medical suffering, but the socially created suffering of a non-barrier-free, ableist world, in order to make it speakable that we are cut off from said participation in normalities that others take for granted.

00:11:33

So why cannot I be deconstructive at the same time? Well, because you cannot write a UN CRPD, for example, without using the word 'disability'. I cannot deconstruct the category at that moment and I cannot delete it, on the contrary, I am using it and I am using it firmly for strategic purposes.

00:12:10

But then, of course, there are also those among us who would like to run away from any

## Übersetzung k08e03

“us”, and this feeling is located on the next line in the triangle map: N plus D, normalisation and deconstruction.

00:12:25

This line is about the demand to be considered as an individual, as a human being, without the attribution of otherness, without being caught up in dichotomous categories such as 'disabled-non-disabled' or 'healthy-sick'.

00:12:38

This can only succeed through a deconstruction of those powerful ideas of normality from which the attribution of otherness originates. If this were to succeed, i.e. not only momentarily, illusory, but actually, we human beings would either be equally normal or all different, which ends up being the same thing, since the meaning of the distinction 'normal versus different' would then be undermined.

00:13:04

So I am writing here on the border of the triangle 'de-essentialised individuality', every attribution of otherness, every othering, is revoked on this line.

00:13:17

If you pull this off, you can no longer call up the category 'disability'. All the needs I have are becoming individual needs, and in fact all people have individual needs. Once again, a dissonance appears: the empowerment point is excluded, because it is then no longer possible to raise the 'Other' voice in the emphatic sense just explained. Moreover, if we only see individuals and only think in terms of the individual, the very common fate that unites us under the sign 'disability' slips away.

00:14:11

Last line: Deconstruction and Empowerment, EN.

00:14:18

When I first read the words “Krüppelbewegung” cripple movement and “Irrenoffensive” (crazy offensive), I cringed. Not because I am not crazy, but because it took me personally a lot of time to understand, really understand, what the political joke is in speaking the sentence that we are proud to be cripples or to be crazy.

00:14:40

But that is exactly what this third line is about. It is about a deconstructive game for interpretive sovereignty, as it is now being continued, for example, under the sign 'Disability Pride' or 'Mad Pride'. What is being articulated here is a counter-narrative, something that is unspeakable, unimaginable in the dominant discourse, namely that disabled life can be just as beautiful, just as valuable and also joyful.

00:15:07

Contrary to the projections of suffering and reductions of disability to pain, a picture is painted here that decouples itself from these normalistic ideas. The third angle, the normalisation angle, is therefore excluded precisely because it is about not allowing oneself to be normalised, but defending a resistant or radical otherness, emancipating oneself from prevailing notions of normality and imperatives.

## Übersetzung k08e03

00:15:34

The timbre of this otherness retains its stubborn sting, which is capable of alienating others, irritating and upsetting because it runs counter to the prevailing discourses on disability.

00:15:48

This line is politically significant above all in the fight against all forms of forced inclusion, in which we are told which normalities are desirable and which we must participate in.

00:16:13

In summary, we can see that with every connection of two angles, the respective third angle escapes. This is why any demand remains just as dissonant and numerous as the respective articulation of inclusion or "en-abling" - a trilemmatic indeed.

00:16:31

From this trilemmatic situation it follows that there can be no fixed rule or recipe for how inclusion can be implemented. Anti-discrimination or diversity or inclusion, whatever label you use for it, I personally do not care, cannot be technologised or transferred into a fixed set of rules. Therefore, it needs continuous reflection that always refers to situation-specific power relations and articulations of demands.

00:17:00

It helps to have means of orientation, and one such mean of orientation has always been the map. In this sense, the map theory of trilemmatic inclusion helps in sorting, both within oneself, on the subjective level, as well as in the political arena and in movements of thought, because said timbres of otherness can be found on each of these plateaus.