

INDIGENOUS WORLDVIEWS OF IMPAIRMENT
AND RELATIONAL INTERDEPENDENCE

53

Colonialism and the Rupturing of Indigenous Worldviews
of Impairment and Relational Interdependence:
A Beginning Dialogue towards Reclamation and Social Transformation

Heather Norris

Ryerson University

School of Disability Studies

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Heather Norris, School of Disability Studies, Ryerson University, 350 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 2K3.

Contact: hmnorris@ryerson.ca

Citation

Norris, H. (2014). Colonialism and the rupturing of Indigenous worldviews of impairment and relational interdependence: A beginning dialogue towards reclamation and social transformation. *Critical Disability Discourse/Discours Critiques dans le Champ du Handicap* 6, 53-79.

Abstract

Impairment is a universal phenomenon, but it is given vastly different meanings in societies with differing cultural, political and economic structures. Understandings of impairment from Indigenous worldviews are grounded in a respect for the profound interdependency of all life in all its diversity and difference, bound together in a spider web of relations. Following Erevelles' (2011) exposition of disability as a sociopolitical construct created as a means of patrolling the boundaries of citizenship through the control and manipulation of the constructed *Other* within a neocolonial state, I show how from the time of European contact onward, a Eurocentric interpretation of "disability" as an inherent lack of production-oriented capacity (and thus a deviation from valued, normative standards) has influenced understandings of impairment and disability within Indigenous societies in North America. This has marginalized people with impairments, and also forms part of a larger colonial project of assigning negative values to all forms of diversity and difference, marking them as deviations and as essentially synonymous with "disability." At the same time, colonial relations of oppression and domination are responsible for conditions that give rise to both impairment and disability. I argue that the renewal and recentering of Indigenous worldview understandings of impairment and disability would support transformational change in our society through the power of interdependency and respectful relationships.

Keywords: Indigenous worldview; Eurocentric worldview; personalism; impairment, disability; interdependency

L'incapacité est un phénomène universel, mais peut avoir des sens énormément diverses dans des sociétés ayant des structures culturelles, politiques et économiques différentes. Les

definitions de l'incapacité suivant une conception du monde autochtones sont basées dans un profound respect pour les différences et la diversité de tout vie à travers des rapports tissant entre eux une véritable toile d'araignée de relations interdépendantes. J'utilise le concept du handicap comme construction sociopolitique que propose Erevelles (2011), créé afin de patrouiller les frontières de la citoyenneté à travers le contrôle et la manipulation de la constitution de "l'autre" à l'intérieure des limites de l'état néo-coloniale. Je démontre que depuis les premiers contacts avec les Européens, la conception de l'incapacité et du handicap des sociétés autochtones en Amérique du nord a été influence par une interpretation eurocentrique de "handicap" en tant qu'un manque de la capacité de production. Ceci a marginalisées les personnes handicapées, et de plus, fait partie d'un projet coloniale plus vaste, qui consiste à assigner des valeurs négatives à toutes formes de diversité et de différences, les marquant commes des déviations de la norme, et qui sont essentiellement présentées comme synonyme de "handicap". En même temps, les relations néo-coloniales d'oppression et de domination sont responsables de créées les conditions qui engendre l'incapacité et le handicap. Je propose que renouveler et recentrer les conceptions autochtones du handicap et de l'incapacité servirait a soutenir les changements transfromateurs grâce à la puissance des relations respectueuses et interdépendantes.

Mots-clés: conception du monde autochtone; conception du monde eurocentrique; personalisme; universalisme; normalité; interdépendance

Colonialism and the Rupturing of Indigenous Worldviews

of Impairment and Relational Interdependence:

A Beginning Dialogue towards Reclamation and Social Transformation

With generous permission from Anishnaabe writer Vera Wabegijig, I open this paper with an excerpt from her poem entitled *giinawind naaniibwiwag* (Wabegijig, 2011).

we are standing
clustered together on the land
our legs firm
as we stand
together we dig our toes
into the welcoming earth
it nourishes us
as we let our roots
go deep to support
all that we carry
our roots spread out in every possible direction
taking up as much space as it can
and our roots stretch
reaching for each other
and as we touch
we hold on
we wrap ourselves
we braid our roots
so that we become one
and this is how we stand

I present this verse not only because it reflects the nourishing connections to the land so vital for our survival as human beings but also exemplifies the relational interdependence that is naturally apart of our humanity and between all our relations. It is the recognition of this universal interconnectedness, often dismissed and ignored within our families, communities and larger society, that I feel will keep us strong in solidarity across differences and move us forward toward transforming the structural and social injustices that exist in our world today. My objective in this paper is to consider how Indigenous worldviews of relationality, governance and interconnectedness can transform the ways in which we understand impairment and disability

justice issues. I write from my perspective as an Anishinabe woman whose ancestry is rooted in the Algonquin First Nations community of Pikwàkanagàn, situated on the shores of the Bonnechere River and Golden Lake in Renfrew County, Ontario.

Introduction

Impairment is a universal phenomenon, but it is interpreted differently in societies with different cultural, political and economic structures. As the colonial invasion of what is now labeled as North America took place, the construction of a Eurocentric notion of “disability” as lack and deficiency was constructed and deployed to create a state of dependency or disablement. This served as a means of justifying and supporting the colonization of the Indigenous Nations of North America.

Across locations subjected to colonial rule, the Eurocentric understanding of disability has served to justify the persistent inequality of disabled people. Erevelles (2011) explains that the concept of disablement contributes to the colonial project as she contends that “‘disability’ is a political and analytical category deployed by the colonialist state to patrol the boundaries of citizenship” (p. 123). Following Erevelles, I contend that from the time of conquest to the present, the imposition of the Eurocentric concept of disability upon Indigenous people has been a tool to further the goals of colonialism in North America. Individuals or communities who did not meet the colonizer’s normative standards were deemed different, “primitive,” and *Other*. Thus, disability was intertwined with racial categorization as a means of delimiting and maintaining difference. The Eurocentric model of disability conflates impairment and “disability,” assigning negative values to difference. I argue that in North American Indigenous societies prior to European contact, impairment was doubtlessly present, but the process of disablement through which impairment is reframed as unworthiness and diminished value as a

citizen was absent. Instead, Indigenous approaches to impairment were likely informed by worldviews valuing difference and equality, and recognizing the fundamentality of interdependence (Schelbert, 2003).

At the same time, impairment is produced by the relations of oppression, exploitation and inequality that characterize colonial rule, as well as more recent neoliberal forms of rule.

Meekosha (2011) contends that the ideology of modern colonialism is central to the production of impairment among Indigenous people in the Global South. She explains that impairment is a “social product [of] modern imperial powers” (p. 669), resulting from the violence and war in which Global North countries engage for the purpose of gaining control of territories and their resources. Thus, the genesis of disablement and disability in the Global South is parallel to that endured within North American Indigenous societies.

My discussion includes a synopsis of the Eurocentric worldview and how it contributes to the meanings of difference and disability. I then discuss strategies of colonization in relationship to the construction of disability as it is contrasted with the notion of normalcy, and how this Eurocentric categorization was used to Other. Next, I consider Indigenous worldview perspectives, particularly in relation to impairment and disability. I conclude with a discussion of the radical potential of reclaiming Indigenous worldview perspectives.

Throughout this work, the term *Aboriginal* is used in the context of North America and refers to First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people. The term *Indigenous* refers to the original inhabitants of any land prior to colonialism. Today, there are over 370 million Indigenous people around the world representing 4000 diverse cultures and languages (United Nations, n.d.). Indigenous peoples around the world have been harmed by the legacies of colonialism and exploitative global economic development, which has left many groups dispossessed from their

land base, marginalized and impoverished (United Nations, n.d.). *Colonialism* is defined as a historical and ideological process, representing not only the conquest of one nation, its land and resources over another, but also “the production of ideologies that justify the theft and violent practices at its root” (Cannon & Sunseri, 2011, p. 275).

Worldviews Defined

Worldviews are the building blocks with which human cultures and societies are shaped. They are paradigms that inform the values embedded within each society, and despite their foundational nature, often go unnoticed. In his discussion of Aboriginal and Eurocentric worldviews, Schelbert (2003) defines worldviews as structures that “lie buried behind the textured forms like a skeleton composed of interrelated elements” (p. 62). Worldviews shape every aspect of life, informing “efforts to secure sustenance, to maintain bonds between peoples, to shape religious, technical, and artistic practice” (p. 61). Schelbert explains that “cradle worldviews” (p. 62), the worldviews undergirding societies into which individuals are born, are particularly difficult to perceive, and therefore are taken for granted, limiting the capability of the individual and the collective to question them. As Aboriginal scholar Little Bear (2000) writes, worldviews are “deep-rooted assumptions upon which attitudes are based” and are what allow people to say “this is the way it is” (p. 83). As such, worldviews forms the basis for systems of thought that claim truth and normativity (Schelbert, 2003).

Characteristics of the Eurocentric Worldview

The Eurocentric worldview has been imposed upon the Aboriginal communities of North America from the time of European contact up to contemporary times. It has underpinned the processes of colonization, and from the time of its imposition onward, it has influenced and reshaped Aboriginal communities’ understandings of impairment. To explain the impacts of this

worldview, I review its central characteristics. Indigenous scholars Battiste and Henderson (2011) define Eurocentrism as a theory that upholds the notion of European superiority over non-Europeans, placing Europe at the centre of invention, history and progress, constructing the places and people outside of Europe as in opposition to it as marginal, and as “ahistorical, stagnant, and unchanging” (p. 11). Further, a claim to universalism rooted in “true,” monotheistic religion is at the core of Eurocentric thought (Battiste & Henderson, 2011, p. 12; cf. Little Bear, 2000). This definition reflects the characteristics of the Eurocentric worldview that I will now discuss: universalism, personalism and individualism, dualism and hierarchy, linearity, and objectivity.

Universalism

As Little Bear (2000) explains, the Eurocentric worldview promotes the notion that there is only “one true god, one true answer, one right way” (p. 82). Henderson (2000) describes universality in Eurocentric thought as “a cognitive and cultural imperialism [that] articulates a body of knowledge and values as the universal norm by which those in the periphery must live” (p. 1). As such, those on the periphery who do not subscribe to such worldviews are seen as primitive or savage and therefore different from the populace at the centre. The construction and maintenance of differences, or the systematic categorization of the Other was crucial in order for colonization to exist (Henderson, 2000). Smith (2012) argues that the systematic categorization of the Other through the process of colonialism was integral to imperialism’s development of an imagined future nation that excluded Indigenous people. Therefore it can be assumed, as Henderson (2000) points out, that “the universality of Civilization was not really sought since there would no longer be justification to colonize” (p. 1). Conquest must occur in order to put right the errant ways of the Other.

Dualism and Hierarchy

Little Bear (2000) writes that through its claims to objectivity, the Eurocentric worldview upholds a dualistic approach, an either/or scenario of “what is” (p. 82). One of the central features of Eurocentrism’s dualism is the dichotomy it upholds between *nature* and *humans*. Within this worldview, nature is divided into distinct categories, each of which is ranked hierarchically. Schelbert (2003) describes this “threefold entity” as follows: At the lowest position is the inanimate world, including physical things like rocks or water as well as forces like the wind; next are living, “non-sentient” life, like bacteria and plants; and finally, sentient beings such as animals, which have “anima” but are thought to lack souls (p. 62). Against these categories and at the top of the hierarchy are humans, who are understood as uniquely rational and self-aware. Humans are regarded as transcendent over everything else in the world, holding divinely decreed power over all. The positioning of humans as superior within the Eurocentric worldview was used to further support racist, colonialist oppression, as Europeans questioned whether non-Europeans were more akin to non-human animals than “true humans” (Smith, 2012, p. 26) as they considered themselves. In the Eurocentric worldview, hierarchies among humans are also maintained along many dimensions, with Schelbert (2003) listing the following examples: “the have over the have-nots, men over women, the strong over the weak, the learned over the ignorant, the priesthood over the laity” (p. 63). I would suggest that this hierarchical order also positions the able-bodied over the disabled.

Linearity

Related to this is the notion of linearity, which involves the idea that history has a beginning and an end, and between these, there is an ongoing progression toward “perfection.” As Little Bear (2000) writes, this way of thinking leads to what is “bigger, higher, newer, or

faster being preferred over smaller, lower, older, slower” (p. 82). When applied to social relations, this ideology results in the devaluation and exclusion of those who do not fit in to this narrative, such people with impairments and elderly people.

Personalism and Individualism

Another important characteristic of the Eurocentric worldview is its promotion of personalism, which concerns the understanding of God or “ultimate reality” (Schelbert, 2003, p. 63) as personal – and in this case – specifically as male. Gender hierarchies stem from this ideology, as does an emphasis on the absolute centrality of the individual. Just as groups of people are placed into a hierarchy in the Eurocentric worldview, so too are individuals ranked according to what is understood as their personal characteristics as well as the social roles they perform. This contributes to the development and maintenance of a class system (Little Bear, 2000), and diminishes opportunities to recognize the impacts of the structural and the relational in influencing people’s social positions. Individuals whose characteristics and social roles are devalued are subjected to labeling and stereotyping, which supports discrimination. For instance, in the case of people with impairments, individualism renders disability as a personal tragedy, with the problems that people with impairments encounter understood as resulting directly from their impairment, as a deficient individual property. This prevents the development of an understanding of disability as resulting from unequal power relations.

Objectivity

In this the Eurocentric worldview, the only true knowledge is derived from “scientific” quantitative approaches, involving experimentation predicated on physical observation and measurement. Subjectivity is dismissed because it is not objectively measurable. Only what is material and can be quantified is deemed a valid basis for knowledge. Objectivity forms the

foundation for the medical model of disability, where impairment is objectified, quantified, and categorized. This has profound implications for disabled people, who are rendered as objects of medico-scientific inquiry (Tremain, 2001), their status as knowledge holders denied and their experiential knowledge dismissed.

These characteristics of Eurocentrism provided the justification for the colonization of Indigenous peoples, and enabled colonizers to ignore and discount the existence of diverse Indigenous worldviews. The suppression of Indigenous life and culture became the central feature of the colonizers' strategies towards the creation of a universal, Eurocentric civilization.

The Ideology of Normalcy in the Eurocentric Worldview

In the Eurocentric worldview difference is always constructed in opposition to the characteristics of normality. Davis (2010) discusses how the perception of disability as a problem is a result of the construction of normalcy rather than inherent characteristics of difference or impairment. He argues that the real "problem of disability" lies in the way that normalcy is constructed to create the "problem of the disabled person" (p. 7), explaining that despite perceptions to the contrary, the notion of normalcy stems not from human nature, but from social organization and ideologies.

The Eurocentric paradigm of normalcy is an artificial construct based on a positivist scientific approach, which categorizes certain desired and observable features as "averages" against which to measure one's social position, productivity, and citizenship. The development of the bell curve divided the population two groups: The standard, able-bodied and the non-standard disabled, with the assumption being that those who fell into the non-standard group required assistance to meet the norm (Davis, 2010). These distinctions became the basis by which to determine who was worthy of life and who was expendable, and, indeed, risked

contaminating the hegemonic body politic. Distinctions between *normal* and *abnormal* became a primary tool used by the colonizers in the production of the metaphor of degeneration taken up to promote Othering during colonization, as I will explain in the following section.

Impairment, Disability and Othering within Colonialism

Eurocentric ideologies justified the colonization of Indigenous peoples worldwide, enabling colonizers to discount diverse Indigenous worldviews and the ways of life they supported. The suppression of Indigenous life and culture became the central feature of the colonizers' strategies towards the creation of a universal, Eurocentric civilization. Persistent attempts at the eradication and replacement of Indigenous worldviews with Eurocentric thought and practices have left Indigenous people with contradictory and clashing worldviews. Little Bear (2000) explains that colonization in all its forms have left Indigenous people with a "consciousness that became a site of overlapping, contentious, fragmented competing desires and values" (p. 85). Consequently Indigenous people's ways of viewing difference, impairment, and disability have also become fragmented and tangled, fluctuating between colonial and pre-colonial perspectives on difference, impairment and disability.

At the same time, the Eurocentric worldview's conceptualization of impairment and disability as individual deficiency was incorporated into racist ideologies of Indigenous people's "inferiority" to justify domination; essentially, colonizers attributed disability to all Indigenous people, while upholding themselves as normal. Henderson (2000) points out this was part of the colonizers' efforts to construct stark distinctions between themselves and those they sought to subjugate. He states "the construction of absolute differences is important to delineate the boundary between the center and the periphery" (p. 1). As Meekosha (2006) explains, "disability collided with race ... where difference in skin color and physiognomy became synonymous with

impairment” (p. 165). By conflating impairment, disability and race, and locating these statuses on the negative end of a dichotomy, colonizers constructed Indigenous people as Other and therefore as devalued.

Baynton (2001) explains the means by which ideologies of *normality* and *abnormality* were deployed to facilitate the subjugation of Indigenous people during colonization. From its inception, normality was “implicitly defined as that which advanced progress (or at least did not impede it). Abnormality, conversely, was that which pulled humanity back toward its past, toward its animal origins” (p. 35). Such beliefs were predicated on the concept of linearity and the advancement of human civilization that animated the Eurocentric worldview. Given this, individuals deemed abnormal were also conceptualized as “degenerate,” representing a reversion to earlier and less advanced stages of development. In this way, those considered abnormal posed serious threats to the continued progression of civilization. From the very beginning of colonization, stereotypes characterizing Indigenous people (as well as immigrants from places outside of Western Europe) as “degenerate,” cognitively and physically weak, and as carriers of diseases have been used to justify and promote discrimination against Indigenous people and immigrants in settler societies (Erevelles, 2011; Lovern, 2008; Meekosha, 2006), and have served as a necessary foil for the construction of colonizers as oriented toward progress, development and health.

By the early 19th century in North America, the eugenics movement lent “scientific” support to the racist and ableist claims of colonizers, who sought to create racially “pure” societies, under the guise of promoting population health and social progress. As Meekosha (2006) explains, “disability became the rationale for eugenic policies that were destined to

become the mechanism for the exclusion of different races and religious and cultural groups from the immigration process or, in the case of [I]ndigenous peoples, bred out” (p. 165).

“Breeding out” was not the only genocidal strategy taken up by colonizers with the objective of destroying Aboriginal nations. Actions justified with reference to the “natural deficiency” of Aboriginal societies, cultures, and families and their necessary eradication in the interest of progress included the removal of children from their parents and their placement with White families, contemporarily referred to as the “Sixties Scoop” (Hanson, 2009); residential school policies; as well as widespread displacement from ancestral territories and containment upon reservations. Smith (2012) explains that actions such as these were often “clothed within an ideology of humanism and liberalism and the assertion of moral claims that related to the concept of civilized ‘man’” (p. 27). She argues that these actions comprised aspects of the “dehumanizing imperatives” (p. 27) of colonialism, which in addition to their devastating material impacts, also operated at the level of ideas, culture, and language, as my discussion of the Eurocentric worldview shows.

The conferral of the devalued Eurocentric concept of disability upon Aboriginal and Indigenous people has served to naturalize and deny the debilitating impacts of genocidal policies, as well as to maintain the valorization of “normalcy” as an ableist and racist concept. Through these Othering processes, a state of political, social and economic deprivation and dependency among Indigenous societies has become entrenched.

Indigenous Worldviews

Although they have been forcibly suppressed by the Eurocentric worldview, Indigenous worldviews are still present among Indigenous peoples the world over, and as more Indigenous people reclaim our cultures and languages, these worldviews are experiencing a resurgence.

While there is great cultural diversity among Indigenous peoples, Indigenous worldviews share in common a fundamental belief in the sacredness of relationships between people and the land and the dynamic interdependence that is required for an egalitarian and just existence. Lovern (2008) explains that the basis of Indigenous worldviews is “an understanding of the ‘wholeness of existence’” (p. 4). Little Bear (2000) notes that in the Indigenous worldview, everything is “imbued with spirit and in constant motion” (p. 77). Thus, in the Eurocentric perspective, Indigenous worldviews are non-dualistic, understanding nature and humanity as sharing a common essence of spirit and movement. Battiste and Henderson (2011) describe the world within Indigenous worldviews as a “dynamic, circular flux in which human beings participate directly” (p. 14). This is in opposition to the Eurocentric worldview in which human beings exist as a separate entity within a world viewed only as a backdrop to human existence. Because Indigenous worldviews are non-dualistic, the holistic views that they uphold speaks to, as Little Bear (2000) puts it, “the totality of creation, the group as opposed to the individual, the forest as opposed to the individual trees” (p. 79). In Indigenous worldviews, truth is not considered a fixed entity as it is within the static, objective, linear Eurocentric way of seeking knowledge and truth. Cajete (2000) explains that in Indigenous worldviews, “truth is not a fixed point but rather an ever evolving point of balance, perpetually created and perpetually new” (p. 19).

Thus, from Indigenous worldviews, human variation and disability are not static, unchangeable phenomena, but exist dynamically in balance with all relations. For instance, in a research inquiry exploring meanings around disability within the Dine (Navajo) culture in the southwestern United States, it was found that “harmony between the mind-body-spirit is considered central to personal and family well-being. Disability within this paradigm is attributed to disharmony within the universe” (Stienstra & Ashcroft, 2010, p. 194). Colonization

was and is the ultimate disruption of mind-body-spirit harmony, revealing a different understanding of the cause of disability, in stark opposition to the victim-blaming stance of the Eurocentric worldview construction of disability.

Four Characteristics Arising from Indigenous Worldviews in Relation to Impairment and Disability

The characteristics of Indigenous worldviews make their interpretations of difference, impairment and disability radically different from the Eurocentric worldview. Here, I outline four aspects of Indigenous worldviews that ground Indigenous understandings of disability and difference: Language; sacredness and relatedness; interdependence; and difference without dichotomy.

Language

Little Bear (2000) states that “language embodies the way a society thinks” (p. 78), pointing out that European languages emphasize distinctions between categories and promote the maintenance of dualistic hierarchies (black/white, saint/sinner animate/inanimate). Eurocentric categorizations of humans mark distinctions between those considered “normal” and those viewed as failing to meet the standard of normalcy, including disabled people. In contrast, prior to colonization, the Eurocentric concept of “disability” did not exist within many Indigenous languages. Lovern (2008) explains that “many Native languages do not have words or phrases that translate words such as ‘handicapped’, ‘crippled’ or ‘disabled’ ... Instead a person’s sameness within the community is what defines the individual” (p. 5). Thus, in many pre-contact Indigenous societies, disability and difference could not be conceptualized along dualistic, hierarchical lines. Little Bear (2000) notes that Aboriginal languages enable “the transcendence of boundaries” (p. 78), explaining that everything in existence is animate. He writes, “If

everything has spirit and knowledge, then all are like me. If all are like me, then all are my relations” (p. 78).

An excerpt from Shackel’s (2008) research with First Nations Cree communities in Manitoba further supports the fact that the Eurocentric concept of disability did not exist within the language and cultures of Indigenous peoples. Shackel writes, “In Cree the word *kakanaticichek* means ‘the gifted ones, the special people’” (p. 37; emphasis in original). He quotes a Cree woman as explaining,

There is no word in our language for disability, impairment or abnormality ... The Creator put these people here for a purpose so that we will learn from them; they are our teachers. No one is considered abnormal in our culture (p. 37).

An Oji-Cree woman quoted in Shackel’s (2008) work indicates “that the word for disability on [sic] her language is a ‘general term, never used to refer to another person’” (p. 38). Instead, the word refers to a “generalized condition” (p. 38) that should be accepted, rather than defined, classified or singled out for treatment. Similarly, Meelissa Tantaquidgeon Zobel, Medicine Woman for the Mohegan Tribal nation of Connecticut suggests that “traditionally, disability is not seen as such [because pre-colonial societies] had established means of caring for and absorbing disability” (Senier & Barker, 2013, p. 126). Huhanna Hickey, a disabled Maori activist notes that “Maori with disabilities were traditionally cared for by their whanau (extended family)” (Senier & Barker, 2013, p. 126). Senier and Barker (2013) explain that in cases in which traditional communities perceived impairments as distinct, they sometimes regarded particular impairments as especially valuable; for instance, *kāpo* (blind) Maori were held in high esteem, as were Navaho people who might now be labeled as autistic.

Sacredness and Relatedness

A second concept central to how difference and disability is perceived within Indigenous worldviews is found within the concept of the sacredness of relationships, which are understood as reciprocal and egalitarian. In the Eurocentric worldview, nature is an inanimate object to be subjugated by humans in accordance with divine decree. In Indigenous worldviews, all things are animate, imbued with spirit and equal. Schelbert (2003) explains that from Indigenous worldview perspectives, “there is no such entity as ‘nature,’ all forms of being are on a similar plane, are interdependent, are ‘peoples’ surely different, yet not hierarchically ordered as in the Middle-East derived cultural sense” (p. 68). Difference, although present, is not subjected to relationships of inequality since all relations are understood as interdependent and on the “same plane.”

Schelbert (2003) describes the concept of sacredness as meaning “radical kinship and interdependence, an ongoing ‘cosmic’ give-and-take among beings large and small, creative and destructive, visible invisible ... all operating on a spectral scale of mutuality rather than in a dualistic opposition” (p. 68). All beings are understood as “formations of sacred forces,” and are seen as people:

Four legged people, as two legged people, as crawling, swimming or winged people; as people that are green, or stony, or soft. Trees are called standing people and their bark or sap is collected for human use, are approached in a sense of ritually enhanced gratitude (p. 67).

All are people, all are equal, and all are relations: Little Bear (2000) explains that relations exist in “circle[s] of kinship” (p. 79) – interconnections within families, extended families, tribes, nations, and social organizations. These circles intersect and overlap in what Little Bear describes as the “‘spider web’ of relations” (p. 79).

Interdependence

For Indigenous peoples, an understanding of interdependence between all relations is a central to existence in the world. The personalism and individualism that typifies the Eurocentric worldview is absent from Indigenous worldviews, which instead emphasize interrelation (Lovern, 2008). In contrast, in Western thought, independence is seen as a primary mode of existence, as a positive and necessary attribute for worthiness as a person. This has serious implications for people with disabilities. The disability rights movement in the Western world supports the right of disabled people to be independent, as dependency is devalued and regarded as an unworthy way of living. As Lovern (2008) points out, the Eurocentric worldview valorization of independence “requires the individual to conquer or control the physical or mental disability” (p. 2). Lovern contrasts this with Indigenous worldviews, in which the “primary mode of existence is communal, involving ‘all my relations’ human, animal, plant, spiritual and elemental” (p. 4).

Disability justice activist and theorist Mingus (2010) challenges the individualistic emphasis on independence in the objectives of the disability rights movement. She suggests that a disability justice approach that emphasizes collectivity and interdependence would be more helpful, and more honest, writing “interdependence ... embraces need and tells the truth: no one does it on their own and the myth of independence is just that, a myth” (para. 8). In societies shaped by Eurocentric worldviews, individuals perceived as lacking independence are characterized as weak, and unproductive. Within such a prevailing paradigm, the Othering phenomenon, then, becomes a central feature of control, of unequal power relations and an enforced dependency. This dynamic is further entrenched through a moralistic “judgment of [disabled people as] deserving the punishment of disability” (Lovern, 2008, p. 4). Disability is located within the individual, and care for the individual is established as solely a responsibility

of the disabled person's immediate family (Lovern, 2008). Consequentially, the basis of the exclusion and oppression of disabled people in political and social inequalities is hidden by the personalistic and individualistic Eurocentric ideology.

Difference without Dichotomy

Lastly, the Eurocentric worldview concept of absolute difference, or the dichotomy of normal/abnormal did not exist within Indigenous worldviews prior to colonization. Difference, from Indigenous perspectives, is seen as matter of degrees of representation of the sacred forces not of a person's true essence. Thus, the oppressive binaries of able-bodied/disabled, normal/abnormal are absent here. Instead, degrees of difference are as sacred as all other formations of sacred forces. Therefore, within Indigenous societies, difference is sacred, and disability is sacred. Lovern (2008) writes,

although an individual may be identified as having a mental or physical difference, the individual is not seen as 'Other' based on a disability ... the value of the person is not lessened because of a physical or mental difference ... difference only becomes one element not the defining element (p. 5).

This is in direct contrast to the negative meanings of difference and disability imposed on individuals within the Eurocentric worldview, wherein difference and disability become the defining features of the individual. As Mingus (2010) explains, disability is seen "as an individual flaw or problem ... lacking, sad and undesirable" (para. 1-2). Amongst Indigenous worldviews, there is an understanding of the commonality of difference that enriches our interconnectedness with all of our relations. Disability is a difference to celebrate, not a shortcoming or a reason to exclude people from community.

Conclusion

The production of disability and disablement within Indigenous societies, from the time of European contact to the present day, has its roots within the power relations of colonization.

The Eurocentric construct of difference and disability did not exist in pre-colonial times primarily due to an Indigenous worldview that promoted an interdependent and egalitarian society where relations with all peoples were considered sacred. The forced imposition of the Eurocentric construction of disability functioned as a justification for the oppressive legacies of colonization historically and in contemporary times. Loss of language, culture, and dispossession from the land base has left soul wounds within the minds, spirit, and bodies of Indigenous peoples as well as within whole communities, soul wounds that continue to be felt from one generation to the next. The well-publicized problems in Attawapiskat, for instance, are only one example of the exclusion and oppression facing Aboriginal people in Canada today. Gross inequities persist between Indigenous people and settlers, which perpetuate the legacy of colonialism and disablement among Aboriginal peoples and our communities today.

Acculturation has caused what Little Bear (2000) describes as “fragmented and often colliding worldviews” (p. 85), leaving Indigenous people susceptible to the continuing imposition of the Eurocentric worldviews of disability and disablement. Smith (2012) notes that for Indigenous people, knowing our history is part of the “critical pedagogy of decolonization” (p. 36). Dialogue around the meaning of disability within Indigenous societies is vital, not only for the reclaiming and renewal of Indigenous worldviews related to difference and disability but also to learn how alternate worldviews may teach and reveal for us more diverse ways of approaching disability beyond the prevailing Eurocentric worldview.

We must, as Meekosha (2011) notes, “acknowledge that there are many ways of describing and understanding disability and impairment ... and to recognize that some discourses are privileged and others excluded in disability studies” (p. 678). Taking up Indigenous worldview perspectives in critical disability studies can provide an opportunity to fully explore

constructed concepts from outside the boundaries of the Eurocentric worldview, which may lead to the development of new research paradigms and pedagogy within the field. As Erevelles (2010) writes, “Invisibility is costly. Recognition, on the other hand, can inspire action” (p. 131). I believe that recognizing disability from Indigenous worldviews can promote transformational change in our society.

I return to Vera Wabegijig’s poem, *giinawind naaniibwiwag*, here presented in its entirety, to further our consideration of the connections between people and the land, the centrality of interdependence, and the radically transformative potential of thinking from Indigenous worldviews.

giinawind naaniibwiwag

we are standing
clustered together on the land
our arms reach up to the sky
from open hands
life springs

giinawind naaniibwiwag
we are standing
clustered together on the land
our legs firm
as we stand
together we dig our toes
into the welcoming earth
it nourishes us
as we let our roots
go deep to support
all that we carry
our roots spread out in every possible direction
taking up as much space as it can
and our roots stretch
reaching for each other
and as we touch
we hold on
we wrap ourselves
we braid our roots
so that we become one

and this is how we stand

giinawind naaniibwiwag
we are standing
clustered together on the land
we are the trees
we will not fall
“our roots are dug deep
deep in the soul of our mother”
and at the core of our being
in that stillness
our breath
our words
our songs
are one.

Acknowledgements

I would like to Dr. Eliza Chandler for her feedback on an earlier version of this paper.

I would also like to thank Vera Wabegijig for her generosity in allowing me to reproduce her poem in this paper. Vera is an Anishnaabe writer, blogger, media artist and mother living in Nepean, Ontario. *Wild Rice Dreams* is her first collection of poetry (2013, Toronto, ON: BookLand Press). verawaabegeeshig.wordpress.com

References

- Battiste, M., & Henderson, S. (2011). Eurocentrism and the European ethnographic tradition. In M. J. Cannon & L. Sunseri (Eds.), *Racism, colonialism, and indigeneity in Canada: A reader* (pp. 11-19). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Baynton, D. (2001). Disability and the justification of inequality in American history. In P. K. Longmore & L. Umansky (Eds.), *The new disability history: American perspectives* (pp. 33-57). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.
- Cannon, M., & Sunseri, L. (2011). *Racism, colonialism, and indigeneity in Canada: A reader*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, L. J. (2010). Constructing normalcy. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (3rd ed., pp. 3-19). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Erevelles, N. (2011). The color of violence: Reflections on race, gender and disability. In K. Q. Hall (Ed.), *Feminist disability studies* (pp. 117-135). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hanson, E. (2009). *The sixties scoop & Aboriginal child welfare*. Prepared for the First Nations Studies Program, The University of British Columbia. Retrieved from <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/government-policy/sixties-scoop.html?type=123>
- Henderson, J. S. Y. (2000). Post-colonial ghost dancing: Diagnosing European colonialism. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 57-76). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

- Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged worldviews colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 77-85). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Lovern, L. (2008). Native American worldview and the discourse on disability. *Essays in Philosophy*, 9(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://commons.pacificu.edu/eip/vol9/iss1/14/>
- Meekosha, H. (2006). What the hell are you? An intercategorical analysis of race, ethnicity, gender and disability in the Australian body politic. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 8(2-3), 161-176. doi:10.1080/15017410600831309
- Meekosha, H. (2011). Decolonising disability: Thinking and acting globally, *Disability & Society*, 26(6), 667-682. doi:10.1080/09687599.2011.602860
- Mingus, M. (2010, November). Changing the framework: Disability justice: How whole communities can move beyond access to wholeness. *Resist Newsletter*. Retrieved from <https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2011/02/12/changing-the-framework-disability-justice/>
- Senior, S., & Barker, C. (2013). Introduction. *Journal of Literacy & Cultural Disability Studies*, 7(2), 123-140. doi:10.1353/jlc.2013.0013
- Shackel, D. W. (2008). *The experience of First Nations people with disabilities and their families in receiving services and supports in First Nations communities in Manitoba - Honouring the stories* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. MR41468)
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Zed Books.
- Schelbert, L. (2003). Pathways of human understanding: An inquiry into western and North

- American Indian worldview structures. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 27(1), 61-75.
- Stienstra, D., & Ashcroft, T. (2010). Voyaging on the seas of spirit: An ongoing journey towards understanding disability and humanity. *Disability and Society*, 25(2), 191-203.
doi:10.1080/09687590903534411
- Tremain, S. (2001). On the government of disability. *Social Theory and Practice*, 27(4), 617-636.
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Who are Indigenous peoples* [Fact sheet]. Prepared by the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. Retrieved from
http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf
- Wabegijig, V. (2011, September 20). giinawind naaniibwiwag. In *Wild Rice Dreams*. Retrieved from <http://verawaabegeeshig.wordpress.com/2011/09/20/i-see-us-solidarity-poem/>