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Abstract

In this article, I identify and analyze the intersections of propaganda circulated throughout two textual objects connected to my experiences of alienation with the care agency organization \textit{L'Arche Canada}, and my subsequent assimilation into settler colonial belonging via canadian citizenship eligibility. The first textual object is \textit{L'Arche Canada's anti-racism statement} (2020). The second is the \textit{Discover Canada citizenship knowledge test study guide} (2021). In my analysis, I reveal a common policy of barbarizing racialized migrants in the interest of criphomonationalism. Specifically, I indict \textit{L'Arche Canada} as an auxiliary of the criphomonationalist canadian settler state, which valorizes desirable (read white) disabled and queer Others, on the backs of Third World care workers who are circulated as nondisabled, cishet, hateful, and disposable.
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\footnotetext{1} I lowercase the word “canada” to express my dissent towards the canadian settler state.
Introduction
In the summer of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic was in its first wave within the canadian settler state, and I experienced constructive dismissal from my role as a care worker at a L’Arche Canada care agency in Ontario. During this time of unemployment and income precarity, I also became eligible to apply for canadian citizenship, and was therefore granted an opportunity to gain security in my immigration status. I found myself grappling with the agendas of two settler colonial processes that, while seemingly disparate, were deeply imbricated. The first was exile from a Christian-rooted care corporation that I had been proselytized, via white saviourism, to consider my “community” for over half a decade. The second was the preparation I had to undergo for formal rights-based inclusion within canada’s neoliberal settler state project.

As a Mad Queer of Colour Third World care worker, I have had the privilege of taking up space in the academy as a Critical Disability Studies student, a position that differs from those of my comrades, accomplices, and kin who are denied access to ivory towers. My positionality as a care worker-scholar affords me access to works of critical theorists of colour that allow me to make sense of the strategic oppressions I have survived, continue to endure, and am complicit in. During one of my elective courses in Fall 2020, I was assigned Jasbir Puar’s (2017) monograph, The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability. Puar’s text, in concert with many other offerings from transnational Feminists of Colour, radically theorized the structural violence I was experiencing in synchronized white supremacist exclusion and incorporation. The following reflection is my attempt to affirm my analysis of my experiences to myself, and to redistribute an expression of the collective critical inquiries that I have been able to piece together for other migrant care workers in settler colonial states who may feel heard, seen, and/or felt in my articulations.

By engaging an autoethnographic approach and drawing on Feminist of Colour disability studies (Schalk & Kim, 2020), this article identifies and analyzes the intersections of propaganda that were circulated throughout two textual objects connected to my simultaneous experiences of alienation in L’Arche Canada and assimilation into settler colonial belonging. The first textual object is L’Arche Canada’s anti-racism statement (2020). The second is the Discover Canada citizenship knowledge test study guide (2021). In my analysis of both texts, I reveal a common policy of barbarizing racialized migrants in the interest of criphomonationalism. Barbarization is the white supremacist rendering of racialized people, communities, and cultures as savage, primitive, and hateful. Criphomonationalism is a portmanteau of cripnationalism and homonationalism as theorized by Puar (2007, 2017). I understand criphomonationalism to be a form of barbarization. In simple terms, it is a strategy of the white supremacist state for restoring white privilege to previously account and their analysis of the White Saviour Complex in my political articulation of white saviourism in this article (No White Saviors, n.d.).

2 I use the term settler state as informed by King: “With regard to language, we moved fluidly between the terms colonial, settler colonial, and white settler state to explain social relations in what we now know as Canada and the US” (2013, p. 201). Please see King (2013) or Snellgrove, Dhamoon & Comtassell (2014).
3 According to the government of canada’s Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada webpage, the eligibility criteria to become a citizen are as follows: be a permanent resident; have lived in canada for 3 out of the most recent 5 years; have filed taxes, if necessary; pass a citizenship knowledge test; and prove French or English language proficiency.
4 I credit the work of the No White Saviors Instagram radically theorized the structural violence I was experiencing in synchronized white supremacist exclusion and incorporation. The following reflection is my attempt to affirm my analysis of my experiences to myself, and to redistribute an expression of the collective critical inquiries that I have been able to piece together for other migrant care workers in settler colonial states who may feel heard, seen, and/or felt in my articulations.

By engaging an autoethnographic approach and drawing on Feminist of Colour disability studies (Schalk & Kim, 2020), this article identifies and analyzes the intersections of propaganda that were circulated throughout two textual objects connected to my simultaneous experiences of alienation in L’Arche Canada and assimilation into settler colonial belonging. The first textual object is L’Arche Canada’s anti-racism statement (2020). The second is the Discover Canada citizenship knowledge test study guide (2021). In my analysis of both texts, I reveal a common policy of barbarizing racialized migrants in the interest of criphomonationalism. Barbarization is the white supremacist rendering of racialized people, communities, and cultures as savage, primitive, and hateful. Criphomonationalism is a portmanteau of cripnationalism and homonationalism as theorized by Puar (2007, 2017). I understand criphomonationalism to be a form of barbarization. In simple terms, it is a strategy of the white supremacist state for restoring white privilege to previously account and their analysis of the White Saviour Complex in my political articulation of white saviourism in this article (No White Saviors, n.d.).
5 I use the term Third World as informed by Mohanty, Russo, and Torres: “colonized, neocolonized, and decolonized countries (of Asia, Africa, and Latin America) whose economic and political structures have been deformed within the colonial process, [as well as] to black, Asian, Latino, and indigenous peoples in North America, Europe and Australasia” (1991, p.ix, as cited in Erevelles, 2011, p. 122).
6 The citizenship knowledge test is based on the study guide Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship.
undesirable white Others\textsuperscript{7} (white disabled people, white queers, and so forth), at the expense of further barbarizing racialized and/or multiply marginalized Others (multiply marginalized sick, disabled, queer, trans, racialized people), to maintain the operationalization of white supremacy.

**L’Arche Canada and Saviourism**

As information about the Canadian settler state is publicly available through the various webpages of the government of Canada, I turn my focus to L’Arche Canada and begin by providing a brief overview of the organization and the events that led to my severance from it. L’Arche is an international federation of non-profit agencies for people labelled with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities. L’Arche was founded in 1964 by white French-Canadian Catholic theologian and Templeton Prize Laureate Jean Vanier\textsuperscript{8}. In Canada, there are currently 31 L’Arche agencies that self-advertise as “communities,” operating group homes with live-in models for care workers. Many live-in care workers in L’Arche Canada are temporary foreign workers from the Third World. L’Arche Canada is Labour Market Impact Assessment exempt, as part of the International Mobility Program.\textsuperscript{9} According to this exception, live-in care workers are expected to work on a 24-hour basis (Temporary Foreign Worker Guidelines, 2014).

Third World migrants with closed temporary work permits\textsuperscript{10} constitute the cheap and exploitable disposable objects necessary to make live-in care models functional in the neoliberal settler state. I use the term “disposable objects” as informed by Puar’s (2017) assertion that “certain bodies are employed in production processes precisely because they are deemed available for injury – they are in other words, objects of disposability, bodies whose debilitation is required in order to sustain capitalist narratives of progress” (p. 81). In L’Arche Canada, Third World care workers know we are expendable because there are always more Third World migrants who are willing to become care workers and replace us if, or when, we get expelled by the corporation. The awareness of our throwaway status is what mediates our reticence about, and resiliency against our mistreatment by L’Arche Canada.

In February 2020, posthumous news of Jean Vanier’s serial sexual assaults made headlines around the world, including within L’Arche International’s 156 communities in 38 countries, spanning five continents (L’Arche International, 2020). Many of us in L’Arche Canada had been waiting to seize this event as an opportunity to speak out about oppression within the organization. We had been alerted to the possibility of Vanier as a white Catholic sexual predator as early as 2014, when news of Vanier’s mentor Fr. Thomas’\textsuperscript{11} history of sexualized violence was disclosed to us. We had also been waiting for this revelation because we had long recoiled at Vanier’s uncontested white saviourism, demonstrated in his deployment of Catholic beatitudes such as Blessed Are the Poor (Vanier, 1981). This white religious stratagem has historically been leveraged to justify abuse against migrant care workers in settler colonial Canada and to legitimize white saviourism-based “human and financial supports to L’Arche in the developing world” (L’Arche Solidarity, n.d., para. 2).

Those holding power and privilege in L’Arche Canada, by virtue of their whiteness, refused to

---

\textsuperscript{7} I capitalize Other(s), Otherness, and Othering to reclaim being an Other as an identity in opposition to identities included in whiteness.
\textsuperscript{8} Jean Vanier was the son of Governor General of Canada George Vanier.
\textsuperscript{9} The International Mobility Program allows an employer in Canada to hire a temporary foreign worker without a Labour Market Impact Assessment (see Government of Canada website).
\textsuperscript{10} Closed work permits are employer-specific work permits. These permits allow temporary foreign workers to work in Canada according to specific restrictions. For example, my temporary foreign work permit restricted me from working for another employer, attending an academic institution, and living out of a group home.
\textsuperscript{11} Known to most in the federation as Pere Thomas, the Dominican priest mentored Jean Vanier and co-founded L’Arche with him in Trosly, France; it was obvious to many of us that Vanier’s purported ignorance of his counsellor’s serial violence was suspicious.
trouble Vanier’s saintlike status during his lifetime. His post-obit outing as a rapist presented a crucial and finite moment that highlighted connections between white patriarchal violence and nationalistic saviourism. Relieved that the smoke and mirrors of the founder’s “sanctity” had been exposed, and believing that the idyllic illusion of the “Ark for the Poor” had finally been fissured irreparably, little fires of complaint started to combust across L’Arche Canada agencies as stories of oppression began to drip and trickle through covenants of silence. During this time, the grapevine connecting current and former Third World care workers and accomplices across L’Arche Canada agencies urgently raised questions about the absence of accountability for unchecked white supremacy in the corporation.

With COVID-19 then highlighting the essentiality of care workers, as well as the concerted momentum gained by the Black Lives Matter movement, our fires were further stoked, and our leaks began to spurt – we were all convinced that this was going to be a time of profound transformation. However, by the end of the summer, the grapevine revealed that fires were extinguished: seepage was plugged with the intimidation of nondisclosure agreements, and care workers were issued warnings, suspensions, and subjected to surveillance to the point that the only option for many complainers, like me, was constructive dismissal. The icing on the cake was the anti-racism statement the organization released amidst our resistance. Its coherence with the citizenship study guide is both disturbing and enlightening in its confirmation of L’Arche Canada as an affiliate of the Canadian settler state corpocracy.

L’Arche Canada’s anti-racism statement makes the following declaration: “For 56 years, we have dedicated our hearts, our hands and…our entire lives to ensuring that people with disabilities can enjoy their natural rights…At the heart of L’Arche is the conviction that diversity should enrich, not divide” (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 5). This rhetoric is a clear gesture to the Canadian citizenship study guide, which makes a comparable proclamation: “For 400 years, settlers and immigrants have contributed to the diversity and richness of our country. Canadian citizens enjoy many rights, but Canadians also have responsibilities, they must obey Canada’s laws and respect the rights and freedoms of others” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 3). Although those of us critical of white supremacy, and how, in Canada, it masquerades as multiculturalism, understand the term “diversity” to be a red flagged buzzword, I would actually like to draw attention to another tactical manoeuvre at play in the above. Invoking Puar (2017), the incited dichotomy of desirable Otherness versus undesirable Otherness merits close attention; the sexual/gendered/disabled other is white, whereas the racialized Other is heterosexual/cis/nondisabled. Therefore, the racialized Other is constructed as backward, bigoted, and barbaric.

Championed progressive white supremacist rights-based regimes cannot exist without the invention and subordination of undesirable Others. The constructions, for example, of what it means to be a member of L’Arche Canada and a Canadian citizen produce these Others. In the words of Haritaworn (2013), this form of Othering “serves as the latest descriptor of disposable populations marked as monocultural, irrational, regressive, patriarchal, or criminal” (p. 185). In the context of settler colonialism, these Others personify diversity to cause discord and disunity, as they do not submit to Canada’s laws, and therefore fail to defer to the rights and freedoms of desirable Others. The white supremacist contradictions of Otherness are produced by barbarization.

Barbarization is a twofold approach that involves the obscuring of historical barbarization to facilitate ongoing barbarization. Take, for example, the parts of history both L’Arche Canada and the Canadian settler state edit out of

---

their individual statements. *L’Arche Canada*’s anti-racism statement opens with a lament regarding the events of 2020, which detrimentally “turned everything upside down” for the organization (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 2). These events included Vanier’s sexualized violence, the COVID-19 pandemic, and the economic recession. The statement absolves *L’Arche Canada* from any culpability in the *upside-down-ness* and positions the organization as a victim. This is most evident in how Vanier’s sexualized violence is constructed as an ahistorical and apolitical “organizational trauma” that triggered distress within the corporation (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 1). There is no acknowledgement of the organizational complicity, which sustained decades-long serial sexualized violence by a white man who held power in an international federation that he founded. The white saviourism that Vanier enacted with the collusion of white L’Arche members is a form of barbarizing Others. The power he was accorded because of his whiteness and consequent ascription to saintliness, immaculateness, and innocence is precisely what enabled the sexualized violence he committed against those he spiritually supervised and understood to be subservient to his holiness.

This skirting of accountability around barbarization is consistent with the Canadian settler state’s refusal to concede genocide and land theft in its short blurb about violence against Indigenous people, communities, and Nations of Turtle Island. The Canadian citizenship study guide merely recognizes that Indigenous children were placed in residential schools from the 1800’s to the 1900’s to be instructed and integrated into “mainstream Canadian culture” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 10). It admits that the schools were underfunded, “inflicted hardship”, and that some students were “physically abused” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 10). In this text, the settler state exonerates itself with Ottawa’s apology to “former students” in 2008 (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 10). Like *L’Arche Canada*, the Canadian settler state befogs its ongoing history of conceiving Indigenous people as uncivilized as the basis for a nation built on and through anti-Indigenous mass murder, abductions, pilferage, and imprisonment (Million 2013). It is against this backdrop of sins barely confessed, and promptly washed away by the very powers who committed them that the fabrication of hateful Others via barbarization persists uninterrupted.

Of particular interest to my analysis is *L’Arche Canada*’s and settler colonial Canada’s criphomonationalist iteration of barbarization, i.e., the production of undesireable Others as ableist and anti-queer to confer rights and membership upon desirable Others valorized as disabled and queer. The crafting of racialized Others as hateful is quite evident in *L’Arche Canada*’s anti-racism statement. It declares, “Disability has always been our entry point into the struggle for belonging” but the “global outcry against racially motivated violence” has caused the organization to do some soul searching (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 6), with the caveat that “diversity should enrich not divide” (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 5). Likewise, the citizenship study guide boasts the Canadian settler state’s defence of progressive equal rights for men and women, and gay and lesbian Canadians, with the stipulation that “Canada’s openness and generosity do not extend to barbaric cultural practices” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 9). Both proclamations of neoliberal rights-based inclusion paradigms identify those who express and/or embody undesirable Otherness as threats.

---

13 Million (2013) prolifically examines the ways in which the impacts of colonial violence on Indigenous people are pathologized as trauma by settler states, “creating a policing rationale for their further colonization” (p.150). In this analysis, Million speaks to multiple settler state contexts including Australia, the United States, and Canada.

See also Waldron’s (2018) work on environmental violence against Indigenous and Black communities in Canada. Waldron critically examines the ongoing disproportionate impact of colonialism, white supremacy, and patriarchy on Indigenous and Black women in settler Canada.
to disability, gender, and sexual inclusion, and canadian citizenship. To illustrate this further, below I share three episodes of criphomonationalism as a genre of barbarization that I have experienced as a racialized migrant live-in care worker under L’Arche Canada’s employ.

Episode one: Accessibility and Disablement
In one L’Arche Canada agency, we had to physically lift and transfer a person and their wheelchair in and out of non-wheelchair accessible vehicles. We did this on a regular basis for years. Maneuvers such as this were avoidably back breaking. In the interest of the collective safety of Third World care workers and the person experiencing risky physical transfers, we would ask for the provision of a wheelchair accessible vehicle to alleviate these safety concerns. However, upon asking, we were met with disapproving stares and told that there was no money available for one for years before an operational wheelchair accessible vehicle was eventually purchased. We also found ourselves framed as careless for complaining about supporting disabled residents14 with these manual transfers. This discursive framing is a form of barbarization that causes disablement. I use the term disablement, as referenced by Puar (2017) and theorized by Gorman (2016), to identify an “assemblage of political-cultural-economic processes” that disable racialized Others while simultaneously obstructing their access to a disabled identity (p. 258). In these instances, the agency was lauded for making experiences accessible to its wheelchair users through travel, but neither they nor the wider white public paid any attention to who was paying the price for this form of accessibility.

Indeed, the wider white public refused to consider the realities of working under L’Arche Canada agencies.15

14 L’Arche Canada uses the term “Core Member” to refer to people labelled with intellectual or developmental disabilities in its agencies. I, however, have opted for the word resident, as it is a word that more accurately describes my relationship with the people labelled with intellectual and developmental disabilities living in group homes in L’Arche Canada agencies.

15 I learned the term “anchor baby” from white people at a L’Arche Canada agency. The term describes babies born to non-citizen parent(s) in nation states with birthright citizenship.
literally breaking, with many experiencing temporary and ongoing disablement. In response to this, we were being offered, not safer working conditions, but body-mechanics workshops advising us to “lift with our legs.” It can be concluded that white supremacy renders Third World care work a grossly inaccessible system of labour that is deeply embedded in transnational racial capitalism and border imperialism. Contra to the mission statement’s advocacy for a relational model of interdependency that aims to “create a world where everyone belongs” (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 6), Third World care workers are actively mined in the production of belonging, and strategically barbarized into compliance within the criptonationalist agenda of L’Arche agencies and the white settler state.

**Episode Two: Accommodation and Debility**

Live-in care workers with and without permanent immigration status would frequently become unwell in the L’Arche agencies that I worked at because of the unsustainable nature of the work. However, the distribution and recognition of unwellness was “differential and uneven” (Puar, 2017, p. 72). Unfailingly rendered as non-disabled, Third World care workers were tasked by white management to do the work of accommodation, evident in the ways that we often had to take on this labour for those white care workers who identified as having mental disabilities or disclosed becoming mentally unwell because of care work. Many times, I had to accommodate and support white care workers to the detriment of my own health. I would be tasked with doing emotional and cognitive labour for white disabled care workers in emotional and mental distress by holding space for their trauma outside between the two” (p. 8).

When I raised concerns about not being able to support both residents and white disabled care workers, particularly under constant conditions of austerity and crisis, I was cautioned about discriminating against (white) care workers with disabilities which, in effect, barbarized me as sanist. I was reprimanded by members of the white management for not prioritising self-care which, according to them, compromised my ability to accommodate other (white) care workers. One year, while I was still holding temporary immigration status on a closed work permit, I was given an ultimatum by a white long-term member and a white leadership team member to either seek psychiatric intervention for my “mental health” or relinquish my supervisory role in the group home. As I have shared, white care workers were not subjected to similar contingencies. Rather, they were provided accommodations in the form of Third World care workers, like me, taking on their work for them. Further, the consequences for such stipulations were materially different for care workers holding citizenship in settler and western states, the majority of whom were white, versus us Third World care workers who held closed, temporary work permits.

Finally, no one was acknowledging the maddening conditions of the unsustainable amount of care work I was expected to perform. As a result of the ultimatum I was served, I ended up being medicated with a combination of psyche drugs with compromised agency in the matter. During this time, I was not offered any accommodations, or provided relief from embodying white care workers’ dumping, lightening their workload by adding to mine, and by facilitating more time off for them, while sacrificing my own.

16 I use the term “transnational” in connection to racial capitalism, as informed by Erevelles’ (2011) emphasis on the transnational dimensions of capitalism. I use the term “racial capitalism” as informed by Melamed’s (2011) reading of the work of Cedric Robinson: “because “the development, organization, and expansion of capitalist relations [have] pursued essentially racial directions [in modernity],” racialism is to be considered a “material force” and a “historical agency” of capitalism, with no

17 I use the term “border imperialism” as theorized by Walia (2013), describing “an analytic framework. [which] disrupts the myth of western benevolence toward migrants. In fact, it wholly flips the script on borders…depicts the processes by which the violence and precariousness of displacement and migration are structurally created as well as maintained” (p.8).
accommodations. This resulted in my debilitation, as I was driven madder behind a mask of competence. I use the term debilitation as theorized by Puar (2017), to describe “the slow wearing down of populations instead of the event of becoming disabled” – i.e., the suspension of racialized Others in a state of perennial, compounded traumatization (p. xiii-xiv).

To survive in such an environment, and without being identified as mentally unfit, I worked on adapting and finding ways to grind throughout brain fog, panic, and ongoing dysregulation while doing care work for both the residents and my white peers. I was commended for fulfilling my role. The message was clear – I could keep my job if I was an uncomplaining, hyper-able, warm body that supported white disabled people. If I raised any objections to this role, I was simultaneously barbarized as sanist and regarded as too mad to work. By silencing my disquiet through debilitation and obscuring my madness through barbarization, the agency was able to sustain its cripnationalist status quo in which the only people worthy of care were white.

**Episode Three: Queerness and Racialization**

I remember a group of East African migrant care workers who would verbalize statements transliterated as anti-queer by white queers and allies in a *L’Arche Canada* agency. White queers and allies were openly wary of these assistants and their “homophobia.” As a Queer of Colour who was not working through my anti-Blackness at the time, I too struggled when queerness came up in conversations with these workers. One day, one of the East African care workers had me watch a documentary about US imperialism in an East African state via evangelical Christianity and the anti-queer propaganda it constituted. Before we parted ways, another East African care worker bought me a book authored by Noam Chomsky discussing U.S. imperialism. This unpaid labour18 by my East African care working comrades caused me to be reflexive about my anti-Blackness, my own complicity in white supremacy, and the ways in which my positionality as a Brown care worker privileged me.

Whatever their views on same sex intimacy and gender identities, these care workers were cognizant of the historical material conditions that resulted in anti-queer politics in their home state, yet were essentialized as anti-queer in the Canadian settler state. None of the white queers and allies at the agency, all of whom were racist, were ever identified as racists or held accountable for their racism, including their constructions of the East African care workers as endemically anti-queer, and as having attitude problems. For example, a white queer member of management once described African care workers to me as “culturally lazy”. The white queers and allies did not pause to consider the anti-Black and anti-African racism informing their negative labelling of perceived attitudes and behaviours of my co-workers. Rather, white queer members of management continued to understand and render these care workers as anti-queer or indolent. Finally, no one seemed to question the conviction that these care workers were automatically and inherently cishet. Unsurprisingly, many of the same white queers and allies responsible for harmfully stereotyping these East African care workers as anti-queer were also the ones making sweeping and weeping statements of solidarity with Black Lives Matter.

I am also cognizant of the fact that I was coded a “white queer approved” Queer of Colour at the time. This was because of the ways in which I embodied white queerness as a medium-brown skinned, educated, fluent English speaking, genderqueer presenting care worker invested in neoliberal queer rights. Such embodiments were seen in opposition to my “backward” homeland and my “non-progressive” people especially, and Third World care workers more generally. All of this was evident in the preferential white queer

---

18 It is important to note that my accessing and benefiting from this unpaid labour from Black women and femmes, in this context and beyond, is, itself, a form of anti-Blackness and extraction. This admission is not a demonstration of accountability, which exceeds the scope of this footnote.
endorsement I was extended in comparison to care workers from India who were darker skinned, less educated, did not speak English as a first language, and were assumed to be cishet. My sexuality was often a topic of gossip among white queers and allies without my consent. While this was disconcerting, it also granted me social capital as a Third World care worker with desirable Otherness. These circulations of Black and Brown care workers as anti-queer, with exceptions afforded to Third World care workers aspiring to white queerness, constitutes the barbarization of racialized Others as anti-queer and queer antagonistic in antithesis to the white sexual Other (Haritaworn, 2013; Kanji, 2017), in the interest of homonationalism (Puar, 2017).

Concluding Thoughts
In trying to speak up about some of these experiences in L’Arche Canada, specifically since February 2020, my comrades and I have been warned by ‘good’ white L’Arche members – those claiming to be in solidarity with us – to consider what is at stake. The possible loss of funding and security for white disabled residents in the corporation was raised as a potential issue that was often coupled with suggestive, chastising questions such as, “Do you really want people to lose their homes?” The overtone in these cunning questions is clear: by demanding accountability for our criphomonationalist barbarization, and consequent disablement and debility, Third World care workers and our comrades are acting barbaric and hateful towards the care corporation and the desirable Others it represents and serves.

L’Arche Canada’s anti-racism statement asserts its mandate of “a vibrant structure that respects diversity across Canada” with a mission to “build a more human Canadian society where everyone belongs” (L’Arche Canada, 2020, para. 9). The Canadian citizenship study guide invites newcomers to “build a free, law-abiding, and prosperous society” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 3) in the tradition of “generations of pioneers and builders of British origins” (p. 12). These societies, envisioned by the care corporation and the settler state, are clearly white, colourized with, and sustained by Third World people. Through the works of scholars like Puar (2017), I indict L’Arche Canada as an auxiliary of the criphomonationalist canadian settler state, one which valorizes desirable Others as white, disabled, and queer. Such valorization occurs on the barbarized backs of Third World care workers who are marked as undesirable Others, circulated as nondisabled, cishet, hateful, and ultimately rendered disposable. In the words of Puar (2017), we are disposable because we are the “necessary supplements in an economy of injury that claims and promotes disability empowerment at the same time that it maintains the precarity of certain bodies and populations precisely through making them available for maiming” (p. xviii). In cohesion, the canadian citizenship study guide boasts the building of a “prosperous society in a rugged environment” (Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, 2021, p. 18), shamefully erasing the Indigenous and Black life it violently builds on, and the racialized lives it extracts from. In resonance with the master’s toolkit, L’Arche Canada’s anti-racism statement declares, “2020 has turned everything upside down…And yet, we’re still here. And we are standing” (L’Arche Canada, 2020, paras. 3-4), a proclamation which wilfully omits the reality that the standing is happening on the backs of Third World care workers.

19 I use the word “master” as informed by Audre Lorde’s contention that “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House” (2007).
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