
Heart Berry Methodology | Annotated Bibliography

by Alisha Parks, IST-204 (Indigenous Studies: Special Projects) April 2022.

Campbell, F. K. (2020). “The violence of technicism: Ableism as humiliation and degrading treatment”. *Ableism in Academia: Theorizing Experiences of Disabilities and Chronic Illness in Higher Education*. Ed. N. Brown & J. Leigh. UCL Press. Pp. 202-224.

In her essay, “The violence of technicism: Ableism as humiliation and degrading treatment” Fiona Kumari Campbell critically examines how Critical Disability Studies reveals ways in which abled-ness is produced and maintained in society. She also suggests that ableism is not only harmful for individuals but also, “The experience of disablement can arguably be spoken of not in terms of individualized personal tragedy, but in terms of communal trauma where the legacies of ableism pervade both conscious and unconscious realms” (p.22). She further interrogates and explores the nuances of euro-western focus on the normative. Further Campbell challenges Disability Studies to go deep in its examination of the social construction of disability. She does this through bringing in elements from embodiment theory, subjectivity, transhumanism, technology and jurisprudence. She looks for areas of disability production alongside areas of resistance to ableist systems.

Clare, E. (2017). *Brilliant Imperfection: Grappling with Cure*. Duke University Press.

Eli Clare’s book, *Brilliant Imperfection: Grappling with Cure*, offers an experiential and embodied insight into critical disability. Clare examines many aspects of intersectional identity and identity politics. This is deeply relevant to critical disability and decolonial disability paradigms. Clare looks to his own experiences to reveal the multitude of assemblages then

comprise his personhood and movement through a normative ableist society. This book is incredibly valuable for its deep level of analysis concerning the kinds of systemic and institutional violence that is perpetrated on disabled individuals every day. It is also remarkable for its poignancy, poetics and deep reflexivity within the context of the lived day-to-day experience of being queer and disabled.

Ineese-Nash N. (n.d). *Disability as a colonial construct: The missing discourse of culture in conceptualizations of disabled Indigenous children*. Research Associate, Schools of Early Childhood Education and Child and Youth Care. TO: Ryerson University. p. 1-22.
<https://cjds.uwaterloo.ca/index.php/cjds/article/download/645/899?fbclid=IwAR3zDoJUA14aJHqLmEdHKP2l4w5t61N4PcEDYOgZS6470j3BC-iRUSAoDU>

In her MA Thesis, *Disability as a colonial construct: The missing discourse of culture in conceptualizations of disabled Indigenous children*, Nicola Ineese-Nash asserts that disability is a cultural construct. She states that, “Many Indigenous languages of Turtle Island (North America) have no word describing the concept of disability,” (p29) and that, “For some Indigenous communities, disability may have historically been a welcome characteristic” (p.30). Using a Critical Disability lens, she forefronts Indigenous ontologies and draws on knowledge inherent within Indigenous communities. This includes knowledge that comes from elders, Knowledge Keepers, and community members. Ineese-Nash also examines how Indigenous peoples are disabled by settler colonial social constructs. In this way, Settler colonial society disables Indigenous peoples by default of the sociopolitical normative that is inherently racist, sexist and ableist.

Jaffee, L. & John, K. (2018). “Disabling Bodies of/and Land: Reframing Disability Justice in Conversation with Indigenous Theory and Activism”. *Disability and the Global South*. Vol.5, No. 2, pp. 1407-1429.

In the article, “Disabling bodies of/and land: Reframing disability justice in conversation with indigenous theory and activism,” Laura Jaffee and Kelsey John examine settler colonial disablement of Indigenous ontology, body, community and relationship with land. They further link ecological destruction, resource extraction, cultural genocide, forced removal, erasure of language and place, by settlers invariably wreaks havoc on the land, spirit, livestock, and bodies of Indigenous peoples creating a condition of disablement from land and disabling the land itself. They suggest this is a primary settler colonial strategy that is ongoing, amorphous, and able to shift as required. As such, they assert “there is no disability justice without decolonization” (p.1424). Furthermore, John and Jaffee posit three areas of connection between Decolonial Studies and Critical Disability Studies:

1. A eugenic logic of elimination is used to justify genocidal practices against both non-Indigenous disabled and (disabled) Indigenous peoples.
2. Self-determination and sovereignty offer potent political frameworks that both peoples have effectively mobilized in struggle.
3. Imagining alternative futures- ones which refuse the ableist-settler state’s projected futures devoid of disability and Indigeneity.

Kress, M. (2017). “Reclaiming disability through *pimatisiwin*: Indigenous ethics, spatial justice,

and gentle teaching”. In A. Gajewski (Ed.), *Ethics, Equity, and Inclusive Education*. Vol. 9, pp. 23–57.

In her essay, “Reclaiming Disability through *Pimatisiwin*: Indigenous Ethics, Spatial Justice, and Gentle Teaching,” Margaret Kress Looks to Indigenous Knowledges to deepen understanding and support for Indigenous students with disabilities. She suggests situating *Pimatisiwin*, which can be translated as Gentle Teaching, as a foundation on which to build self-determination and inclusion that will assist educators and students. Kress further reveals deeply embedded relationships between education, ableism, normalcy, eugenics and white privilege. These embedded facets permeate throughout settler colonial society and perpetuate marginalization and injustice. Kress appeals to those in the field of education to shift their perceptions about diversity, inclusion and wellness through Indigenous understandings such as *Pimatisiwin*. This will assist them in becoming more attuned and sensitive to the needs of Indigenous students with disability. Significantly Kress suggests that inserting Indigenous paradigms into education can allow for an interaction with disabled ontologies and a social model of disability. She asserts, “For allies, the acceptance of the social model of disability creates a shift from “fixing” a disabled person to encouraging a move in transformation (p.32).

Mucina, D. D. (2010) “We Exist because They Exist” *Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, Vol. 16. No. 3 <https://www.academia.edu/3638220/>

In his essay, “We exist because they exist,” Devi Mucina draws from his own Ubuntu understandings, Critical Race Theory and Critical Disability Theory to examine the social model

of disability. He suggests that Eurocentric societies and social norms pave the way for sites of disability such as dyslexia to be present and problematic in an everyday context. Through storytelling, Mucina suggest that norms and status quo are false and can act as traps in which deficits are formed and disability arises. A person with disability may find themselves pulled into trying to achieve the unachievable rather than finding their own success within their capacities and inner balance. He asks, how can our stories help us “do disability differently?”. By sharing stories creates an interconnected network of commonalities between people with disability and can highlight embodied experience and knowledge.

Schiefelbin, W. (2020) *Learning Disabilities and Methodologies of Harm: Indigeneity, Pathologization, and Ambiguity in the Psychological Disciplines*. Department of Educational Psychology and the Faculty of Native Studies
University of Alberta.

In his MA Thesis, *Learning disabilities and methodologies of harm: Indigeneity, pathologization, and ambiguity in the psychological disciplines*, Wyatt Shiefelbien looks at how western Eurocentric disciplines such as psychology have their foundations in pathologizing disability as a detrimental embodiment. Schiefelbein feels this subject would be better examined through Critical Race Theory and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from land. He calls this Indigenous Critical Disability Studies (I-CDS). He further calls for a radical shift in methodologies used to understand psychology, mental phenomena and learning disabilities and shift away from pathologies of deficit. He suggests that Indigenous peoples and communities should work towards incorporation of Indigenous worldviews to their own research and practices. As Shiefelbein states, “If we conceive of the body as a relationship set, then we

commit ourselves to the conclusion that bodies necessarily give rise to knowledge themselves when ‘knowledge’ refers to kinds and qualities of relationships. In this way, it becomes important to discuss the knowledges that come with bodies as bodies” (p.33).