


Wild, Indigenous, Lame, Invalid: Anti-Ableist Epistemologies of the South¹


Salvajes, indígenas, cojas, inválidas: Epistemologías anticapacitistas del Sur

Juan Andrés Pino-Morán^{a,d}

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7027-6908>


E-mail: juan.pino@uoh.cl

Pía Rodríguez-Garrido^{a,b,c,d}

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0610-4666>

E-mail: pia.rodriguez@uoh.cl

Michelle Lapierre^{e,f}

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1318-207X>

E-mail: lapierre.michelle@gmail.com

^aUniversidad de O'Higgins. Instituto de Ciencias de la Salud, Rancagua, Chile.

^bUniversity of Barcelona. Women, Health and Ethics Study Group. Barcelona, Spain.

^cInstituto Universitário de Lisboa. Lisboa. Laboratório de Estudos Sociais sobre o Nascimento, nascer.pt. Portugal.

^dMillennium Nucleus Studies on Disability and Citizenship, Chile.

^eUniversidad Católica de Temuco. Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Temuco, Chile.

^fFacultad de Salud, Universidad Santo Tomás, Chile.

Abstract

The aim of the article was to present a first approach to an epistemological proposal that reflects on and deals with the construction and legitimation of knowledge generated from abject, abnormal, or crippled corporeities geopolitically located in the South. It pays special attention to the sex-gender-ability system in the social and epistemological organization of knowledge. In this development, we identify a positionality and wasted wealth for regional social analysis and transformation as a result of a modern colonial order. Hence, this proposal is inscribed within the Latin American critical thinking to reflect on those other places of abject enunciation.

Keywords: Epistemology; Disability; Feminism; Interculturality; Ableism.

Correspondence

Pía Rodríguez-Garrido

Av. Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins, 611. Rancagua, Chile.

Código Postal: 2820000

¹ This research was funded by the Millennium Science Initiative of the National Agency of Investigation and Development (NCS2022_039)

Resumen

El objetivo del manuscrito es presentar una primera aproximación a una propuesta epistemológica que reflexione y se ocupe de la construcción y legitimación de conocimientos generados desde corporeidades abyectas, anormales o tullidas geopolíticamente ubicadas al Sur. Pone especial atención al sistema sexo-género-capacidad en la organización social y epistemológica del saber. En ese devenir, identificamos una posicionalidad y riqueza desperdiciada para el análisis y transformación social regional como resultado de un ordenamiento moderno colonial. De ahí que esta propuesta se inscriba dentro del pensamiento crítico latinoamericano para reflexionar sobre esos lugares otros de enunciación abyecta.

Palabras claves: Epistemología; Discapacidad; Feminismo; Interculturalidad; Capacitismo.

Introduction

Official history has it that Vasco Núñez de Balboa was the first man to see, from a summit in Panama, two oceans at once.

Were the natives blind?

Who first gave names to corn and potatoes and tomatoes and chocolate and the mountains and rivers of America? Hernán Cortés? Francisco Pizarro?

Were the natives mute?

Eduardo Galeano

Although various studies have related disability to the Social Determinants of Health (SDH), Tamayo, Besoain and Rebolledo (2018) criticized that they have done so in the sense of homologizing it to a condition of health or disease in the social determination model. On the contrary, these authors have proposed “to include disability from the social model, as a structural SDH, for being a situation that generates inequality in health and social exclusion” (Tamayo, Besoain & Rebolledo, 2018, p. 97). According to the above, this article recognizes that disability has been understood as a pathological condition, establishing health actions that seek normalization, medicalization and rehabilitation as the ultimate purpose of disability, even recognizing its social definition. This reveals the existence of an ideology of normality (Rosato et al., 2009) in our society, as well as the reference of a Compulsory Able-Bodiedness (McRuer, 2021) and a ableist value system (Mello, 2014).

The colonial, capitalist, patriarchal and ableist society (Pino-Morán & Rodríguez-Garrido, 2019) was established through a principle of injustice and ableist imagination, which has been permeating into classificatory, divisive, binary and hierarchical narratives and ways of *sentipensar* (feeling-thinking), in which the regimes of truth and knowledge are inscribed (Foucault, 2009). In the face of this, Western hegemonic science is complicit in subjecting certain corporeities to a particular disciplining as an object of study and systematic intervention, denying their emancipatory position as subjects of knowledge production.

However, in the last decades, different socio-political movements at the global and regional level are questioning this subaltern position of stratification and social organization of dissident and non-normative corporeities (Pino-Morán & Tyseira, 2019; Platero-Méndez & Rosón-Villena, 2012). This demand and cultural transition not only has an administrative legal purpose framed in the recognition of the fundamental guarantees of human rights for people classified as having a disability, but also a cultural possibility of transforming and destabilizing the ableism of our societies.

In this line, ableism will be understood in accordance with Anahí Guedes de Mello, who points out that it is:

A prejudicial stance that classifies people based on the adequacy of their bodies to body-normativity. It is a category defining how people with disabilities are generally treated as incapable (unable to produce, work, learn, love, care, feel desires, have sexual relations, etc.), bringing the demands of the movement of people with disabilities closer to other social discriminations such as sexism, racism and homophobia. (Mello, 2014, p. 94-95)

Ableism is, therefore, an ideology and a practice based on the existence of a ableist epistemology. The latter, we will understand as that theoretical, political, ethical and cultural position that denies, devalues and ignores the partiality of knowledge that are produced from non-standard bodiedness and sexual experiences or that are developed with emphasis on atypical sensory senses or emotions, which are not expected in modern science.

Considering this, we can trace an archeology of knowledge that has been absent and made invisible by official and universal history, or by the human and social sciences. Consequently, a wide range of epistemologies of ignorance and epistemic injustices were generated by ignoring the riches and sources of knowledge wasted by the hegemonic *body* of universal knowledge.

Epistemologies were historically concerned with establishing valid and invalid knowledge in a binary manner, ignoring the bodily privilege of

those who produce such knowledge, which is not free of many methodological problems. Currently, they are in a wide field of academic and intellectual discussion on the constitution of theories and schools of thought.

On the other hand, this bodily privilege mostly emphasizes heterosexual thinking, a condition from which dominant epistemologies end up oppressing differences. According to Monique Wittig (2006),

Traducción oficial en inglés: heterosexual society is the society which not only oppresses lesbians and gay men, it oppresses many different/others (...) To constitute a difference and to control it is an act of power, since it is essentially a normative act. Everybody tries to show the other as different. (Wittig, 2006, p. 53)

Thus, hierarchical dichotomies are established in an entire sex-gender-ability system which places the private world, enclosing the others: children, the elderly and people with disabilities or illnesses and, especially, women with diversity. This dichotomy between a public-male and private-female sphere also masks the relations of knowledge production that disable the whole collective.

On the contrary, the epistemologies we highlight advocate respect and recognition of diversity, dignity and differences as a minimum condition to advance towards a pluralistic and inclusive society where all people can participate in the different social spaces, including the construction of knowledge. Thus, all of this research-epistemological process can be interpreted as an expression of passion and resistance to the neoliberal regimes of truth, science and justice in order to advance in recognition and protagonism over disputed bodies and silenced lives.

Likewise, this proposal responds, in part, to the experiences, tensions and conflicts systematized by the main author and other authors in their practices and experiences embodied in social research with groups, associations and movements of people with disabilities, reflecting and making explicit

the ethical and political position of the researchers regarding the research problem.

Therefore, the objective of this article is to problematize and propose the possibility of anti-ableist epistemologies that recognize knowledges from the human diversities and differences that inhabit Latin America. For this purpose, we considered epistemologies that dialogue with anti-ableism from the perspectives of the South, a peripheral scenario propitious to a long tradition of knowledge acquired in social, political and epistemological struggles.

We draw on learnings from four theoretical currents that have accompanied us in our research processes: The Epistemologies of the South (De Sousa Santos, 2011); the Feminist Epistemologies of Situated Knowledge (Haraway, 1995); the Feminist Decolonial Epistemologies (Lugones, 2008); and the Intercultural Epistemologies (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Fernet-Betancourt, 2012) who recognize the possibility of a potential transformative project and that remains in movement among our ability.

Epistemologies of the South: A position for the recognition of alterity

Boaventura De Sousa Santos's proposal reminds us that:

The Global South is thus not a geographical concept, even though the vast majority of these populations live in countries of the Southern hemisphere. Instead, it is a metaphor for the human suffering caused by capitalism and colonialism at the global level and the resistance to overcome or minimize it. It is therefore an anti-capitalist, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist South. It is a South that also exists in the global North, in the form of excluded, silenced and marginalized populations such as undocumented immigrants, the unemployed, ethnic or religious minorities, victims of sexism, homophobia and racism. (De Sousa Santos, 2011, p. 25)

Therefore, the South is the place of the subalterns, of the omitted, of women, of indigenous, wild,

lame and invalids, and all those dissenting from the labeling of disability.

Disability was historically understood as an object of study and purpose of expert intervention. However, it was not considered as a fruitful scenario for the generation of knowledge. Consequently, we privilege and emphasize the development and deepening of critical epistemologies that challenge the ableist, patriarchal, colonial, Eurocentric/Western dominant norm in the sciences and in culture (Pino-Morán, 2020).

According to De Sousa Santos (2011, p. 35), the Epistemologies of the South involve

a call for new processes of production and valuation of valid knowledge, scientific and non-scientific, and of new relations between different types of knowledge, based on the practices of the classes and social groups that suffered systematically from the unfair inequalities and discriminations caused by capitalism and colonialism.

Therefore, we understand the Epistemologies of the South as a theoretical/empirical proposal to make anomalous knowledge visible, on the basis of two methodological proposals. Thus emerges the *sociology of absences*, which deals with the present that we do not easily see or the past in its incomplete condition, for our interest, the concern for a perspective that tries to transform the negative representations of “indigenous”, “lame”, “crippled” people into “valid”, “present”, “included” people, from an intercultural view and deep respect for our differences (Pino-Morán, 2020).

The second question is about the future. In fact, we all act always in the present, never in the future, and that is why the form of non-compliance is produced, which is activated through the *sociology of emergencies* (De Sousa Santos, 2011) that can activate a knowledge accumulated in resistance, in militancy, in embodied struggles and in all those groups postulating for their recognizability from their diversity and alterity (Pino-Morán, 2020).

De Sousa Santos (2011) recognizes that we cannot broaden the recognition of our diversities without also broadening the horizon of understandings,

a matter of cognitive justice. Societies have not understood the value of differences, the richness of neurodiversity, the experience of non-standard women or of the social movements of psychiatric survivors, among others (Pino-Morán, 2020).

In this transition, De Sousa Santos wonders how this horizon of intelligibilities develops. The Epistemologies of the South recognize two key instances, the *ecología de saberes* (ecology of skills and intercultural translation). Both proposals are related to strategies for converging in dialogues that overcome the stativity of knowledge and of “trained”, “scientific”, “institutional” rigor, to articulate in anomalous interpretations, unexpected intersubjective encounters and abject local-global alliances, temporal and partial understandings with the knowledge of dissident bodies operating outside the linear and monolithic logic of time or outside the accumulation of historical knowledge (Pino-Morán, 2020).

Feminist epistemology: Partial and situated knowledges

Donna Haraway (1995) problematized a critical position on the exercise of truth and knowledge that supports the relationship between knowledge/power in the sciences by proposing the Feminist Epistemologies of Situated Knowledge within the critical studies of the sciences. The author “invites to take a political position in the research, without ambiguities, highlighting subjectivity as a radical position of any objectivity” (Pino-Morán, 2020, p. 107).

This makes explicit the impossibility of knowing reality objectively, hence situated knowledge is radically partial and incomplete knowledge, like all the skills that this proposal intends to make visible. Thus, each group can consider the partial perspectives of other groups without renouncing its uniqueness. Partiality and not universality would then be the condition for being heard-seen or recognized (Haraway, 1995).

For this manuscript, situated knowledge is relevant “these are claims on people’s lives; the view from a body, always a complex, contradictory,

structuring and structured body, versus the view from above, from nowhere, from simplicity” (Haraway, 1995, p. 335). In other words, the aim is to recognize the variability of our bodies and repertoires in order to learn/know beyond traditional bodily integrity.

Under this premise of embodied partialities, the bodily experiences of first-person disability dissidents are beneficial for glimpsing vulnerabilities-resistances-agencies relationships and their strategies of power and transformation. Haraway (1995, p. 324) warns “I would like a doctrine of embodied objectivity that accommodates paradoxical and critical feminist science projects: feminist objectivity means quite simply *situated knowledges*.”

From this scenario, Haraway’s (1995) proposal invites us to learn from/within our bodies, with a technological vision,

validating the production of imperfect knowledge and defective bodies: lame, paraplegic, insane, deaf, etc. Therefore, knowledge with blind points of view or that travels through wheelchairs through unfriendly spaces, many times inaccessible, through stony, peripheral, marginalized or reconstructed in virtual territories. (Pino-Morán, 2020, p. 108)

We warn that this perspective does not have a victimizing, naive, and even less relativistic character, Haraway (1995, p. 329) describes it clearly when she points out that:

The alternative to relativism is partial, locatable, critical knowledges sustaining the possibility of webs of connections called solidarity in politics and shared conversations in epistemology. Relativism is a way of being nowhere while claiming to be everywhere equally. The ‘equality’ of positioning is a denial of responsibility and critical enquiry.

Therefore, we recognize that these knowledges constructed in positions of subalternity are knowledges that must be understood methodologically as tactile, olfactory, hearing

knowledges. Knowledges without reason or with cognitive slowness, proudly rare knowledges as Robert McRuer's *crip* theory would express (2021).

This knowledges:

anomalous because of their particular differences, they are power and lucidity in other senses or registers. Paraphrasing Haraway: What other sensory powers do we wish to cultivate besides vision to produce knowledge? In how many ways can we know? With what other repertoires can we learn? If we do it with other speeds and times? How can we use our own abject technologies? Our prosthesis and technical aids? If we do it using crutches and sign language? (Pino-Morán, 2020, p. 108)

Consequently,

we will construct knowledge from a counter-hegemonic, non-normative, non-standard, non-objective place. Precisely, we politically recover those bodies that modern science considers out of the norm and fashion, bodies with extreme values called outlier - isolated part - biased samples or with statistical deviation, which supposedly contaminate the universal criteria and scientific results. (Pino-Morán, 2020, p. 108)

Epistemology of decolonial feminism: how to deal with what is enunciated as abject?

The modern/colonial system configured a new order and social structure establishing parameters of "normality" as the only possibility of being, doing, feeling and understanding the world, an obligatory nature that in addition to permeating human subjectivity fragmented habitability in time-space, a fundamental issue to think about the relevance of the corporeities configured as *abject*, *invalid* or *crippled*-indigenous for the rationality of the occident.

This brought alienation and epistemic violence embodied in a differentiated manner in the

population. Therefore, the colonality of gender (Lugones, 2008), through the postulates of decolonial feminism, unveiled the matrix of patriarchal domination in biological dimorphism and compulsory heterosexuality in the social structure, so that the conquered bodies were quickly generated in response to this strategy of patriarchal-colonial oppression and domination (Lugones, 2008; Oyěwùmí, 1997).

However, this *evangelization* was not homogeneous in the entire population, the heteronorm and the process of genderization was instilled in those who had the supposed "ability" to be human: man-woman, however, all those bodies classified as animals or barbaric were left out. Thus, the corporeities considered *abject*, *non-valid*, *crippled*-indigenous were treated and disposed in sacrificial, subhuman and non-being places through torture, rape and slave labor, annulling any possibility of existing and being in time-space (Restrepo & Rojas, 2010).

Similarly, the processes of modern/colonial genderization were strongly criticized by feminist disability studies (Arnau, 2018; Cruz-Pérez, 2013). The universality of the subject of feminism and its demands, besides the non-recognition of diversity in the erotic-affective plane, as well as of the conditions and needs of those who inhabit these identities, are part of the questions and tensions that still keep occidental feminisms (white and bourgeois) reflecting from the intellectual privilege.

In this sense, the historical, epistemic and subjective reclamation promoted by decolonial feminists as re-appropriation of the body/territory can be situated within the framework of the recognition of *abject*, *non-valid*, *crippled*-indigenous corporeities. However, this discussion has not been the object of concern or further debate within the community. In addition, these bodies continue to be omitted from official and unofficial history, and the Trending Topic social movements have not incorporated them into their demands, struggles, resistances, and claims.

Before this panorama, the question arises: how to deal with what is enunciated as abject? A responsibility inherent to critical spaces of reflection implies precisely rethinking the

epistemology of subjects historically omitted from History. Marcela Ferrari (2020) proposes to speak of the “coloniality of ability” as an articulated work between decolonial feminism and the reconfiguration of disability from a Latin American speech. In this way, the coloniality of ability implies the “disarticulation, erasure and replacement by modern/colonial thought of the communal ethics of reciprocity and cooperation proper to the cosmovision of our Latin American peoples, and of the logics that correspond to their forms of organization” (Ferrari, 2020, p. 125).

In this regard, is it possible to interweave the proposals of decolonial feminism to re-define and re-construct instances of dialogue between territories and abject, invalid, crippled-indigenous corporealities? How to make these dialogues suitable for their own weft threads from the circularity of epistemes, as well as collective and articulated work from their own meanings and experiences of emancipation?

Intercultural Epistemologies: Critical Approaches from Latin America

There are several possible ways of epistemologically approaching disability in territories characterized by non-white culture and society. So far, disability studies have studied disability in racialized people from intersectional, cultural and anti-racial studies approaches, but it is recognized that this field focuses mainly on white disability (Bell, 2017; Schalk & Kim, 2020).

In Latin America, the population is fundamentally non-white, therefore, disability has always been crossed by colonization, contemporary migrations, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants and people of color (these last two conceptualizations are used because they are suggested by Latin American activism), although our academic production has not always managed to make this visible and, frequently, we adopt and adapt Anglo-Saxon proposals to our reality, a fact that should be noted with concern.

Currently, some of the most critical approaches to analyze disability in Latin America have tended

towards the crip/queer theory (García-Santesmases Fernández, Verges-Boch & Almeda-Samaranch, 2017), the critical perspective, the social model of disability and critical disability studies, all coming from Anglo-Saxon proposals. However, none of them has shown interest or sufficiency to relate the study of disability to the situation of our non-white Latin America. In the case of critical disability studies, they showed interest in dialoguing with theoretical proposals that make visible a large part of the current situation of Latin American society (Revuelta & Hernández, 2021). However, they have not sufficiently focus on issues such as the indigenous, the migrant or the territorial, all of which are relevant to understanding the epistemological complexity of thinking from Latin America. On racialization, it has been discussed mainly from intersectional approaches.

In this regard, we propose that intercultural philosophy, and especially those developed in Latin America, constitute a focusing from which we can analyze ableism and propose an approach to anti-ableist epistemologies. Today, nation-states have coapted interculturality as a functional policy in the field of health and rehabilitation (Boccaro, 2012; Piñones, Mansilla & Arancibia, 2017). Thus, services and devices have been created based on the idea of a fetishized intercultural health, which has also been applied to disability, insofar as it is understood by the state as a pathological condition.

For this discussion on the construction of anti-ableist epistemologies, we propose decolonial critical interculturality (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), as well as Fernet-Betancourt’s critical intercultural philosophy (2012). These epistemologies are a relevant theoretical framework to analyze how practices with indigenous people, mestizo Latinos, people of color and Afro-descendants in a situation of “disability” are determined by an epistemological ableism of colonial logic, in which the colonialism of existing/being, knowledge and power define the way in which we relate to them. The critical intercultural perspective allows us to stress our own actions, while challenging our medical-scientific and social-cultural rationality about what is known as disability.

There are new forms of research that we could understand as part of a critical interculturality, framed in an accumulation of critical, decolonial, feminist and intercultural perspectives that intersect critical ethnographic studies with a socio-historical and contemporary linkage of disability from a perspective of the Epistemologies of the South. These research challenges require a process of decolonization of researchers and professionals resulting in a reflection of singularity/disability in a non-white Latin America, from the borderlands and integrating the common struggles of peoples impacted by the modern-colonial world-system (Lugones, 2008; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018).

The indigenous movement has widely discussed the concept of the body as territory and as community. These elements contribute to the discussion on singularity/disability and their epistemic value can transcend their culture to generate conceptual contributions in the current and numerous discussions on the conceptualization of “disability” in Latin America, doing epistemic justice. But, especially, we recognize that indigenous persons with disabilities carry a complex disability experience, which is linked to a social-historical process of conflictive relationship with the states and with the neoliberal capitalist model, so the struggles of disability cannot be separated from this reality, and the believe that epistemological ableism, is totally related to these other systems of oppression.

In short, an anti-ableist epistemology integrating critical interculturality in its philosophical basis can contribute to an intercultural dialogue between peoples, nations, identities and bodies on equal terms, and to a system of anti-ableist practices in which people themselves lead activism on what has been called, in the occident, disability.

Final considerations: towards anti-ableist epistemologies from the South – as a proposal – to decolonize knowledge

As we reviewed, the old world and the new world are modern colonial ableist meta-narratives

(Pino-Morán & Tiseyra, 2019) that installed an epistemic subordination when it comes to interpreting the world. The Chronicles of India show how Hispanic literature repeatedly has a poor understanding of the people who inhabit what is currently known as Latin America. This situation, according to what was reviewed, has historically replicated dichotomies that are periodically updated: indigenous-civilized, barbarism-modernity up to the abled-disabled subject. Therefore, all this ableist-colonial reification has been established on a principle of bodily hierarchization and inferiorization, which has also been established to delegitimize knowledge.

For example, the concept of the “seen” associated with the “lived” subordinates the “heard” historiographies. With this we want to problematize the “worldview” which is used in the West to sum up the cultural logic of a society, captures the West’s privileging of the visual. “ (Oyěwùmí; 1997, p. 4). This is a Eurocentric understanding over the order of bodies and human senses, or as it is stated from decolonial disability studies, a form of “coloniality of seeing” (Barriendos, 2011). With this background, it is explicit the conformation of the epistemological ableism that builds the current modern colonial societies.

This arbitrary discrimination of power relations and identities involves a whole group of people in contradictions and deep wounds on their activities, subjectivity and struggles. This issue is maintained by not problematizing the epistemological order in which this situation is explained.

Therefore, the epistemological positioning we propose alludes to a corporal geopolitical position, as proposed by Walter Mignolo (2010, p. 37-41), in the following reference:

It names the historical location (space and time, the historical referents and configuration of time and space, etc.) and the authority of the location of the enunciations denied and devalued by the domination and hegemony of both imperial politics of knowledge and understanding [...] body-politics is more appropriate to make visible the color, gender and sexuality of the

“thinking body”, thus making visible the white, male and heterosexual body-politics that rests, invisible, behind the hegemonic politics of knowledge in European imperial modernity.

Therefore, we understand the *Anti-Ableist Epistemologies from the South* as those productions of bodily knowledge in rebellion with the ableist, colonial, androcentric and cisheteropatriarchal world, which aims to decolonize the occidental hegemonic epistemologies. We can understand them as situated epistemologies of resistance insofar as they are a place of political dispute carried out by social movements and first-person experiences, which possess and generate knowledge from and towards a transformative praxis. They are epistemologies that recognize the existence of ableism, and stand up against it.

One of the primary tasks of the *Anti-Ableist Epistemologies of the South* is the decolonization of knowledge (De Sousa Santos, 2011). This is done by working outside the biologicist, pathologizing or clinical logics of universal standardization and/or medicalized participation produced by the disability industry. It is worth remembering that we are talking about corporeities that did not enter into knowledge and science, or often were absent from the production of knowledges, but have clearly been the object of it. Therefore, this decolonization of knowledge materializes in attention to the singularity and partiality of the alliances of dissident corporeities that move slowly or with involuntary movements, in collaboration with guide dogs or with crutch, corporeities that do not hear through the ear canal, but perceive vibrations, corporeities that do not follow the dominant reason, since they think disjointedly or with madness.

Foucault (1988, p. 25) affirmed “learning becomes madness through the very excess of false learning.” Thus, we understand that the decolonization of knowledge is executed through *Anti-Ableist Epistemologies from the South*, since it implies destabilizing and unveiling the dominant patriarchal-ableist homogenizing pattern of sciences and research, in order to counteract the perpetuation of the epistemicide of differences.

Hence, we incorporate the importance of the point of view of people with bodily differences, which, on the one hand, means to recognize the experiences embodied for the construction of knowledge in social analysis, and, on the other hand, to recognize the agencies of struggles and resistances, which invite to broaden the understandings on the production of emancipatory knowledge in social research.

This type of decolonizing positioning explicitly contains an ethical, methodological and political commitment with historically invisibilized collectives, which are not intended to give voice or testimony, but rather an epistemological commitment that transcends the binarism of the figures of logo-expert, subject-object or researcher-researched. Hence, this reflective process is committed to deconstructing the idea of scientific knowledge - objectives, specific or specialized - in exchange for an understanding of complexity, complementarity and epistemic solidarity (Pino-Morán, 2020). A commitment to a transdisciplinary approach that articulates activism, academia, art and science. A proposal that is in line with social agencies and praxis, in which skills and knowledges emerge. At this interface is where we situate the *Anti-Ableist Epistemologies from the South* as rearguard knowledges.

With this proposal we want to break the supposed norms of social research, that which according to Foucault (2009) circulates disciplining and regulating the theoretical and methodological body of the research that it wants to regularize. Thus, it is possible to speak of a “normalizing research” and an “emancipating research” where disciplinary norms and their counterparts, the resistances, are intersected.

Under these resistances we want to insist on the need to understand the epistemic problem that hides the cultural recognition of the experiences and future of people who have been labeled as disabled in the current order of the modern-colonial-ableist world-system, which makes invisible the knowledge produced by people with diversity.

This problem, which we have called epistemological ableism, underlies and explains, in part, the political

problem of persons with disabilities. With this we want to establish a direct relationship between epistemological ableism and the absence of social, political and cultural rights, as well as the existing difficulty in Latin American contexts to recognize them in their concrete and material reality.

For this reason, we want to recognize the different narratives that have been used to devalue and classify people living in Latin America. Thus, we reuse, from pride, the categories of wild, indigenous, lame or invalid and all those enunciations that do not conform to the normativity and productivity expected by advanced capitalism. The intention is to deactivate them from prejudice and resignify their future in practices of resistance, rebellion and re-existence, which are the result of a situated epistemological development not assumed as an alternative, but as a political counter-proposal.

In short, and with this brief review, we wanted to propose some ideas to problematize and explore, from the perspective of *Anti-Ableist Epistemologies from the South*, the construction and recognition of the epistemological bases that have been sustained for decades by the anti-ableist struggles in our Latin America. Especially paying attention to the activisms and dissident scenarios of disability in their struggles for dignified lives and their resistance to the malestrom of the colonial-ableist-capitalist-patriarchal system.

References

ARNAU, S. R. ¿Sexualidad en la diversidad o diversidad en la sexualidad? Nuevos retos para una nueva cultura sexual. *Journal of Feminist, Gender and Women Studies*, Madrid, n. 7, p. 27-36, 2018. DOI: 10.15366/jfgws2018.7.003

BARRIENDOS, J. La colonialidad del ver. Hacia un nuevo diálogo visual interepistémico. *Revista Nómadas*, Bogotá, n. 35, p. 13-29, 2011. Disponível em: <<https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1051/105122653002.pdf>> Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.

BELL, C. Is disability studies actually white disability studies? In: DAVIS, L. J. (Ed.). *The disability studies reader*. 5. Ed. New York: Routledge, 2017. P. 406-415.

BOCCARA, G. La interculturalidad como campo social. *Cuadernos Interculturales*, Viña del Mar, v. 10, n. 18, p. 11-30, 2012. Disponível em: <<https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=55223841002>> Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.

CRUZ PÉREZ, M. P. Teoría feminista y discapacidad: un complicado encuentro en torno al cuerpo. *Revista de Investigación y Divulgación sobre los Estudios de Género*, Colima, v. 19, n. 12, p. 51-71, 2013. Disponível em: <<http://ojs.ucol.mx/index.php/generos/article/view/1274>> Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.

DE SOUSA SANTOS, B. Epistemologías del sur. *Utopía y praxis Latinoamericana*, Maracaibo, v. 16, n. 54, p. 17-39, 2011. Disponível em: <<https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=27920007003>> Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.

FORNET-BETANCOURT, R. Hacia una filosofía del diálogo intercultural en un mundo conflictivo. *Logos. Revista de filosofía*, Ciudad de México, v. 40, n. 120, p. 171-186, 2012. Disponível em: <<http://revistasinvestigacion.lasalle.mx/index.php/LOGOS/article/view/2589>> Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.

FOUCAULT, M. *Defender la sociedad*: Curso En El Collège de France (1975-1976). Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2009.

FOUCAULT, M. *Historia de la locura en la época clásica I*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2018.

FERRARI, M. Feminismos descoloniales y discapacidad: hacia una conceptualización de la colonialidad de la capacidad. *Nómadas*, Madrid, n. 52, p. 115-131, 2020. DOI: 10.30578/nomadas.n52a7

GARCÍA-SANTESMASES FERNÁNDEZ, A.; VERGÉS BOSCH, N.; ALMEDA SAMARANCH, E. From alliance to trust: Constructing Crip-Queer

- intimacies. *Journal of Gender Studies*, Abingdon, v. 26, n. 3, p. 269-281, 2017. DOI: 10.1080/09589236.2016.1273100
- HARAWAY, D. J. *Ciencia, cyborgs y mujeres: la reinención de la naturaleza*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1995.
- LUGONES, M. Colonialidad y Género. *Tabula Rasa*, Bogotá, n. 9, p. 73-101, 2008. DOI: 10.25058/20112742.340
- MC RUER, R. *Teoría Crip: signos culturales de lo queer y de la discapacidad*. Madrid: Kaotica libros, 2021.
- MELLO, A.G. *Gênero, eficiência, cuidado e capacitismo: um análise antropológica de experiências, narrativas e observações sobre violências contra mulheres com deficiência*. 2014. 262 f. Tese (Mestrado em Antropologia Social) - Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2014. Disponível em: <<https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/123456789/182556>>. Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.
- MIGNOLO, W. *Desobediencia Epistémica. Retórica de la modernidad, lógica de la colonialidad y gramática de la descolonialidad*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo, 2010.
- MIGNOLO, W.; WALSH, C. *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2018.
- OYĒWŪMÍ, O. *The Invention of Woman. Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- PIÑONES, C.; MANSILLA, M.; ARANCIBIA, R. El imaginario de la horizontalidad como instrumento de subordinación: la Política de Salud pueblos indígenas en el multiculturalismo neoliberal chileno. *Saúde e sociedade*, v. 26, n. 3, p. 751-763, 2017. DOI: 10.1590/S0104-12902017169802
- PLATERO-MÉNDEZ, R.; ROSÓN-VILLENA, M. De la parada de los monstruos a los monstruos de lo cotidiano: la diversidad funcional y la sexualidad no normativa. *Feminismo/s Revista del Centro de Estudios sobre la Mujer de la Universidad de Alicante*, Alicante, n. 19, p. 127-42, 2012. DOI: 10.14198/fem.2012.19.08
- PINO MORÁN, J. A. *Cuerpo(s) en luchas: itinerarios disidentes de la discapacidad en Chile*. 2020. Tesis (Doctorado en Sociología) - Departament de Sociologia, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, 2020. Disponível em: <<https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/670160>> Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021
- PINO MORÁN, J. A.; RODRÍGUEZ-GARRIDO, P. De-generadas: la violencia institucional capacitista hacia mujeres con discapacidad en Chile. *Revista de Estudios Públicos*, Santiago, v. 5, n. 1, p. 1-13, 2019. DOI: 0.5354/0719-6296.2019.50904
- PINO MORÁN, J. A.; TISEYRA, M. Encuentros entre la perspectiva decolonial y los estudios de la discapacidad. *Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Sociales*, Medellín, v. 10, n. 2, p. 497-521, 2019. DOI: 10.21501/22161201.2893
- REVUELTA, B.; HERNÁNDEZ, R. Estudios críticos en discapacidad: portes epistemológicos de un campo plural. *Cinta de Moebio*, Santiago n. 70, p. 17-33, 2021. DOI: 10.4067/S0717-554X2021000100017
- RESTREPO, E.; ROJAS, A. *Inflexión decolonial: fuentes, conceptos y cuestionamientos*. Popayán: Editorial Universidad del Cauca, 2010.
- ROSATO, A. et al. El papel de la ideología de la normalidad en la producción de discapacidad. *Ciencia, Docencia y Tecnología*, Concepción del Uruguay, v. XX, n. 39, p. 87-105, 2009. Disponível em: <<https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=14512426004>>. Acesso em: 21 dic. 2021.

SCHALK, S.; KIM, J. Integrating Race, Transforming Feminist Disability Studies. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Chicago, v. 46, n. 1, p. 31-55, 2020. DOI: 10.1086/709213

TAMAYO, M.; BESOAIN, Á.; REBOLLEDO, J. Determinantes sociales de la salud y

discapacidad: actualizando el modelo de determinación. *Gaceta Sanitaria*, Amsterdam, v. 32, n. 1, p. 96-100, 2018. DOI: 10.1016/j.gaceta.2016.12.004

WITTIG, M. *El pensamiento heterosexual y otros ensayos*. Madrid: Egales, 2006.

Contribution of the authors

Main idea: Pino-Morán. Study design, data analysis, writing and critical revision of the manuscript: Pino-Morán, Garrido, Lapierre.

Received: 12/25/2021

Approved: 12/5/2022