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Editorial

Thinking Out Loud: CYC and Radical Youthwork

Hans Skott-Myhre

It was in 2004 that I first wrote the words Radical Youth Work and defined them as referring to young people and adults working together for common political purpose. It was a provocative piece that was met by rejoinders from Doug Magnuson and Mark Krueger wondering what in the world I was suggesting. Over the past fourteen years, the term and the conceptual framework of CYC as a political field of struggle that engages both young people and adults has remained controversial. As I have said in this journal before, I welcome that controversy and hope it has spurred some spirited thought and practice over the years.

I was very pleased then, to be invited by Thom Garfat to edit this special edition that collects some of the best writing about the thought and practice of radical youth work. This special edition of CYC-Online explores the possibilities of Child and Youth Care/Youth Work as radical practice. It collects writings from scholars and practitioners that addresses the ways that contemporary global capitalism impacts the work of CYC/youth workers in an array of domains. The writings here are utterly contemporary while drawing on the fundamental elements of ethical relational practice in the field of CYC in the 21st century.

The question for this special issue is how does our thinking and practice address and reflect the crises of young people and adults in the 21st century. These writings are true to the origins of our field, while at the same time reconfiguring the relational integrity of the foundational literature within the context of the
21st century. They explore how we as CYC/Youth Work scholars and practitioners can continue to build rich ecologies of living relations between workers and young people that are relevant to the rapidly evolving conditions of global capitalism.

Tim Beck opens the issue with an incisive analysis of the ways that care shifts and changes in a world of corporate data collection and digital technology. He helps us wonder about how this new digital frontier impacts on issues of trust and consent. What impact does the emerging world of global capital have on our social institutions? He proposes that we may need to re-think the relations we have with young people by establishing new forms of social networks built on mutual respect and trust in which young people learn to negotiate their social roles through creating value for their communities.

Scott Kouri in “Empire and Identity: The Ethics of Becoming Other than What We Are” follows with a piece that diagrams the relations between CYC, global capitalist empire and settler colonialism. He offers us a macro view of the working contexts of CYC within these networks of domination and control. He proposes that we think very seriously about the ethics of decolonization within the world of global capitalism as an integral aspect of CYC thought and practice that might allow us a way of imagining and creating ourselves outside of settler logic and identity.

Sandrina de Finney, Lena Palacios, Mandeep Kaur Mucina & Anna Chadwick offer us “maps of refusal” in “Refusing Band-Aids: Un-settling “Care” Under the Carceral Settler State.” They trace the ways in which what they term the “transcarceral social service system” promotes racialized, gendered, sexualized, and ableist violence in various state-run, government-funded colonial systems, including the criminal, legal, education, immigration, health care, and child welfare systems. Rooting their writing in their own work as Indiginous, Chicanx and diasporic South Asian scholars and activists, they propose an alternative to be found in creative and collaborative practices of refusal.

Kathleen Skott-Myhre calls for what she terms a return to the body in her piece “The Body as a Site for Revolutionary CYC Practice.” She argues that we need to
shift the values of the virtual world founded in the dollar sign and replace them with the values of living ecologies. Proposing that we need to understand the existing system of capitalist logic in order to create an alternative, she explores how we might build a system founded in the future not the past. She makes the case that such new worlds might well be found in a return to the experiences of the body.

In “Pedagogies of Care: Thinking-with and Paying Attention” Alex Berry, Ashley Do Nascimento & Veronica Pacini-Ketchabaw argue that we must go beyond the individual as the center of our work. They argue that the notion of “free choice” as isolated from networks of relational care is a false concept. Challenging current thinking in the field around issues of self-care, anxiety and burnout, they suggest an alternative to these neo-liberal incursions into our field to be found in feminist conceptions of common care.

Janet Newbury offers us “A Love Story” as a deep reflection on CYC and the importance of personal engagement in political processes. Offering a profoundly personal account of her own workings, she challenges us to avoid distancing ourselves from the actualities of decolonization through familiar western forms and paradigms. She asks the question, “how do we show up?” and “What exactly is decolonization anyway.”

The highly contentious and troubling realm of suicide is critically engaged by Cameron Greensmith and Jocelyn Sakal Froese in “Glorifying Suicide? Radical Encounters with Difficult Texts, Radical Approaches to Youth Care.” Examining the television series “Thirteen Reasons Why” they challenge conventional thinking about how CYC workers might think about teen suicide. Utilizing Bell Hooks concept of love they argue against neo-liberal discourse that centers suicide within the individual biologically or psychologically. Instead they suggest we need to account for the socio-political world that can create the world as unbearable. Using Thirteen Reasons Why, they offer alternatives rooted in radical notions of love.

Kelsey Friedrich in “The Power of the P.B. and J. Sandwich” takes us back to the importance of what Mark Krueger called having lunch. She takes us into the
mundane world of CYC practice through the lens of her own experience. She articulates the struggle that we all face between the rules of the institution and our own common sense knowledge of what is necessary to truly build relationships with the young people we encounter in our work. Showing the importance of transgression, Kelsey demonstrates both the power of breaking bread together and the values of breaking the rules under systems that dehumanize and separate us from each other.

Matty Hillman reminds us of the importance of returning to the roots of our work in community in “The Resistant Artist: Street Art as Radical Youth Work.” In his writing here, Matty takes on a short journey through a city block of graffiti art. He makes an argument for the continuing subversive power of this street based art form and suggests that there is a great deal we, as CYC workers, could learn from street art if we would pay attention. He reminds us that art as a mode of expression offers avenues for expression for those often marginalized in dominant social discourse and that street art offers that to some the most marginalized young people in our society. He offers us a “Guide to Street Art as radical Youth Work” which certainly might of considerable use in training CYC and youth workers to begin to see the power of young people’s art.

I also want to mention Kiaras Gharabaghí’s regular column this month in which he makes a radical proposal for CYC practice that I think fits nicely with this special edition.

The pieces in this special edition are broad in scope, incisive in analysis and profoundly evocative in terms of practice. It has been an honor to be the editor of this issue and I want to thank James Freeman, Mark Smith, Martin Stabrey and Janice Daley for their editorial support. I hope in reading what is written here, it opens up the possibilities for CYC as a space for Radical Youth Work. That is a space where young people and adults can work together towards the creation of new worlds and new peoples to come.
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Reclaiming Networks of Care under Conditions of Data-Capitalism

Timothy Beck

Living itself [is a] therapy that makes sense.
Donald W. Winnicott, Playing and Reality

Care is at the basis of any profession that involves working with children or those who suffer. Anyone who has served in such a position knows what a large investment of time, emotion, and energy is required to be present with others on a daily basis. And yet, care cannot simply be turned on or off at will. Rather than being a service that can be provided to someone, care must be cultivated gradually through social practices between people and things. Here, social roles and emotional investments are constantly negotiated, relationships reworked through each new challenge that emerges. Care rests on networks of support and shared value whereby those with different interests can learn to care about the world together. In a literal sense, life-sustaining social spaces are required that, at their best, highlight new ways of thinking, feeling, and acting together. This is as true, moreover, for care relationships outside of professional contexts as within.

There is certainly no shortage of reasons why much of what passes for care today does not always incorporate the relational dimensions outlined above. In this essay, I focus primarily on obstacles to networked care specific to data-capitalism (i.e., markets based on data-exchange), where social institutions have come to value the collection and circulation of data over the needs of the most vulnerable among us. To develop social networks that work for individuals and local communities,
rather than just institutions, we may well need new methods of mapping social value that encourage involvement in shared eco-systems. Here, notions like trust and consent are prerequisite to participation in networks of care. And yet, each of these values can also be easily manipulated by social institutions for their own socioeconomic purposes, making any effort to track the social values of others today quite problematic ethically as well as conceptually.

In the early 1990s, philosopher Gilles Deleuze traced some social trends he noticed in declining public trust and how consent had become progressively more wedded to capitalism. For him, these issues are connected directly to emerging information technologies. Under the conditions of late-stage capitalism, where the economic values of data and information rival that of material goods or services, professional networks inevitably support the growth of transnational economic corporations at the expense of individuals and local ecosystems. We can think about this system as a relatively new form of capitalism – i.e., data-capitalism. Deleuze (1992) describes it in terms of societies of control. Whatever we call it, however, such conditions presuppose a,

*generalized crisis in relation to all the environments of enclosure – prison, hospital, factory, school, family. The family is an “interior” in crisis like all other interiors – scholarly, professional, etc. The administrations in charge never cease announcing supposedly necessary reforms: to reform schools, to reform industries, hospitals, the armed forces, prisons. But everyone knows these institutions are finished, whatever the length of their expiration periods. It’s only a matter of administering their last rites and of keeping people employed until the installation of new forces knocking at the door* (pg. 3-4).

The primary targets of intervention in societies of control are not exactly individuals – like particular patients, students, or customers – but ‘dividuals,’ or “physically embodied human subject[s] that [are] endlessly divisible and reducible
to data representations via the modern technologies of control, like computer-based systems” (Williams, 2005, para. 4). Here, social masses are reduced to abstract “samples, data, markets, or ‘bank’ (Deleuze, 1992. P. 5). Organizational practices related to care and research (e.g., customer care, user researcher, etc.) serve increasingly broader socioeconomic demands to more efficiently collect and distribute data in the form of these groups. Scientific databases, for instance, contain more details about qualities, identities, and numbers related to human performance than could ever be analyzed within a single lifetime. Institutions like those described above (e.g., prisons, hospitals, factories, schools) operate in ways that contribute to these databases as much as possible. And as such, they can produce social value even if they no longer provide services effectively to individuals.

Psychological effects of societies of control can be felt without even leaving the house. Simply surfing the internet today requires participation in dozens – if not hundreds – of contractual agreements. Most of these agreements, moreover, are written in highly technical language that few who agree to them in fact understand. It is almost as if users of these platforms are encouraged to ignore the terms of agreement, simply to move on as quickly as possible to the next of an infinite series of online tasks. All of this supports the data-collection techniques (i.e., “data-mining”) that corporations and government agencies apply to individuals’ internet activity. Control over social groups is, for them, but a byproduct of the need to gather information that improves the machine-learning capacities of their AI networks. Companies like Google and Facebook, for instance, have amassed huge profits off such practices, with a common goal to create social platforms better able to predict the desires of each individual (or dividual) user.

For care providers today, it might not always be entirely clear how topics related to corporate data collection and digital technology are relevant to their work. But to return to what is discussed above, I suggest they are necessary points of departure because of the ways trust and consent are so easily appropriated under data-capitalism. With sociality shifting increasingly to online platforms, virtual
consent has largely replaced social negotiation as a pillar of Western society. Attention is increasingly occupied by hyper-linked media platforms, where the suffering of others is reduced to moments of public spectacle that are shared, liked, and commented upon. Children using these platforms, rather than being taught how to properly give and withhold consent, are encouraged to accept whatever conditions are necessary for data corporations to thrive. Video games are becoming more accessible through a greater variety of digital mediums, in turn giving the companies that create them access to the data of more users. A growing majority of these users are, of course, children. With gaming addiction recently declared an epidemic by the World Health Organization, social consequences here should be obvious to anyone working in youth related fields today.

Donald Winnicott, a psychoanalyst working with children in the mid-20th century, offered some potential insights about the relationship between digital media and networks of care today. For Winnicott (1953), a capacity for play is developed through transitional phenomena that occur beyond subjectivity and objectivity. These open onto “intermediate area[s] of experience between the thumb and the teddy bear, between oral erotism and the true object-relationship” (p. 2). In play therapy, for instance, a child might pick up a toy soldier and repurpose it to signify a friend, a father, a brother or sister, signifying something about herself that might not have ever been expressed before. Such experiences, incorporating both virtual and actual dimensions, are thus often where social roles relative to others are first negotiated. This is likewise where children learn exactly what it is they value and how to properly (and improperly) care for it. Over time, networks of shared value are cultivated through which relations between people, things, and places become more clearly defined.

Bernard Stiegler (2013) builds upon these insights in his book What Makes Life Worth Living. Here, transitional objects are described as the first pharmakon in the life of each person. Dating back at least as far as Ancient Greece, the notion of pharmakon was a precursor to medicine, but it would have also cut across current concepts as diverse as chemistry, poisoning, and scapegoating. Having both health
promoting and potentially addictive qualities, transitional phenomena could, as such, be considered the first periods of pharmacology. At these important developmental junctures, children learn which idiosyncratic combinations of actions and objects give them pleasure, and how other persons are unavoidably implicated in their own enjoyment. This is, of course, a more general notion of pharma than the idea of “big pharma” we have today. But it is no less relevant; especially at a time when pharmaceutical prescriptions for attention related childhood disorders are as high as ever (Woo, May 2018). The ways in which caregivers interact with children during transitional phases can fashion perceptions of self and other, ultimately constituting that about which they either do or do not care. A growing preoccupation with virtual media, for example, could engender new avenues for group imagination (e.g., through the sharing of memes). But it could just as easily reinforce cycles of immediate pleasure without a need for physical human contact. Insofar as they are invested with creative energy that transcends their assigned capacities as inanimate items, transitional objects in general could, in a certain sense, be considered the first AI – physical things infused with a uniquely human capacity to express emotions.

In these cases, new notions of social care, trust, and consent are elicited, and the social values produced along with them cannot be ignored. Beyond the obvious issues regarding where children’s attention is being invested, the current state of data-capitalism is problematic because it reinforces potentially harmful ideas about trust – specifically who we should trust and why. One need look no further than the series of abuses revealed recently in connection to U.S. women’s gymnastics. Many of the victims describe going through all available channels only to have their stories deemed invalid when weighted against the authority of their doctor, Larry Nassar. While this is one of the most heinous and popularized instances of abuse of power by those in care professions, the pattern is all too common. Those in vulnerable positions are ignored for decades only for widespread outrage and disbelief to emerge once a large enough institutional problem is finally revealed through mass media. A common refrain in such instances is “how could he have
gotten away with it for so long?”, as if abuses in all forms are not suppressed every day to preserve the reputation of one organization or another.

Felix Guattari was particularly interested in the relationship between institutional authority and care. In particular, he noted how many psychiatric care institutions he observed were organized around clinical concepts that seemed unnecessarily vague, even sterile, in relation to the lives of patients. And yet, such ideas would somehow still function to hold such institutions together well enough to subsist. Guattari (2015) called these concepts institutional objects, insofar as they are used across social contexts to organize professional practices and economic values. Guattari considered this to be an extension of Winnicott’s transitional objects to analyses of institutions. Ideas that professionals take for granted as scientific truths can be mapped as placeholders for investments of their own emotions and desire. Here, counter-transferences can be revealed through unconscious attachments to values that have little to do with caring for others.

Such a method of mapping institutional investments on the part of professionals is particularly relevant at a time when agencies funded by the American government are detaining entire families for indefinite periods of time. In many cases, infants and children have been removed from their loved ones without a reunification plan in place; recently, there have even been reports of children being administered powerful psychotropic drugs without anyone’s consent (Reuters, 2018, June 21). Here, the social risks of caring about such children is mounting, as well, with each emotional investment signifying an ideologically charged stance. Such realities place those tasked with providing care in inherently compromising positions, both professionally and ethically. This no doubt forms the basis for notions like standards of care, which could include, for example, ethical guidelines, licensure requirements, and baselines for evidence-based practice. But such standards are not self-evident truths. Like institutional objects, they, too, must be persistently negotiated. Within capitalist economies, moreover, where social resources are measured in dollars and cents, care invariably becomes structured by bureaucratic concerns often unrelated to the needs of those in pain. And in cases
where individuals are deemed unable to provide full consent – as with children – or when expertise is incorporated into the equation – as with medical care – those for whom care practices are designed are usually not even allowed to participate in the negotiation process.

Barbara Rogoff (2011) underscores the importance of enacting care through networks in her book *Developing Destinies: A Mayan Midwife and Town*. Rogoff traces the life of Chona Pérez, a Mayan midwife, whose approach to caring for youth in her community is informed by strong cultural traditions and centuries worth of success. The secret, she suggests, is quite simple: cultivate care gradually by establishing horizontal social networks based on mutual trust and respect. Children are granted high levels of individual responsibility, and in turn freedom, to, for example, go to the store by themselves, handle money, and care for others. In other words, they are taught to negotiate their social roles and create value for their communities. Perez advocates teaching children from an early age that their behaviors will be paid attention to by adults, since they are likely to have consequences in the livelihoods shared by all. Learning in such communities occurs primarily through observing others, and plenty of room is granted for mistakes. As Correa-Chávez and Rogoff (2009) note, moreover, this approach to child and youth care has contributed to capacities for attention that far exceed those observed among similarly aged European-Americans. For them, this suggests that paying (i.e., exchanging) attention, rather than based solely in biology, is heavily influenced by community norms – particularly around the reciprocation of social value, care, and trust.

On an even more general level, Stiegler poses questions about the stakes of networked care to us all, going so far to suggest it:

*haunts planetary consciousness and the planetary unconscious, just as it haunts the immense loss of trust that inevitably results from the loss of care. This question thus characterizes the economic and spiritual crisis*
afflicting the ‘earth-ark’. This crisis is therefore unprecedented, which means that it is more critical than ever (p. 5, emphasis in original).

Considering the global scale of problems facing care workers today, reconnecting practices of care to notions of trust through networks of social value and local support is a necessary point of departure. This can only happen, however, by motivating young people to pay attention to their individual stakes within the communities already formed around them. If care professionals cannot be bothered to care about these networks, why should we expect the children they work with to?
It is understandable why anyone would be worried about the kind of world we would be left with if cornerstone social institutions were rendered inoperable. Over the last couple of centuries, we have come to rely on them for almost all our basic needs. And yet, at a certain point we must ask ourselves if they are worth saving at the expense of our children – and, perhaps, even our sanity. Alternately, might we develop more supportive, and less hierarchical, networks of care after they are gone? This certainly does not have to happen all at once. But it could serve us all well to start working together to imagine a world without them just in case we lose them sooner than we expect.

References


TIMOTHY BECK is an Instructor at the University of West Georgia, where he teaches undergraduate courses in psychology. His current research explores the intersection of critical psychology, science and technology studies, and mental health care. Before joining academia, he worked in various child and youth care and mental health settings across the United States.

It also builds on the comparative efforts of Whittaker, del Valle & Holmes (2015) Therapeutic Residential Care for Children and Youth: Developing Evidence-Based International Practice. We started from an intellectual claim that residential child and youth care “places” exist everywhere – whether called homes, orphanages, schools, centres or institutions. Unlike Courtney & Iwaniec or Whittaker et al, we include private boarding schools, madrassa and other religious learning centres in our definition of residential child and youth care. Residential establishments involve any building(s) (and sometimes tents) where children or young people are brought together to live in shared community life spaces for given periods of time, whether as refugees of war, poverty, disease, abuse, famine or natural disaster.

Residential Child and Youth Care in a Developing World captures some of the challenges and changes faced by residential child and youth care workers in 83 countries – places that rarely feature in the international literature. Each contributor has highlighted challenges and opportunities facing residential child and youth care in their own country’s.
Empire and Identity: The Ethics of Becoming Other than What We Are

Scott Kouri

Who we are with each other is shaped by the systems and contexts that we find ourselves in. In this paper, I will map CYC in relation to contemporary Empire, a conjunction of settler colonialism and globalized capitalism. I argue that to adequately understand how we relate to ourselves, each other, and the living world, we must consider the macro contexts of settler colonialism and globalized capitalism. I will lay bare some of the problems and possibilities of relational CYC praxis by considering the ethics of decolonization and processes whereby settlers might become other than who we currently are.

Empire as Macro Context: Globalized Capitalism and Settler Colonialism

Throughout the first decade of the new millennium, Hardt and Negri (2000, 2005, 2009) theorized a new form of globalized Empire within which systems of networked power exceeded and challenged those of the sovereign state. Empire, they argue, is highly decentralized and works through webs of globalized institutions and forces. Supra-state actors such as multinational corporations and intergovernmental agencies largely work outside any single governing institution and instead dominate over nation-states through various forms of economic, military, and political pressure. Empire today continues, as always, to differentially propagate violence and oppression through gendered, racialized, and geographic stratifications, yet also has the capacity to destratify, modulate, and reorganize.
social relations as is necessary for the continual expansion of capitalism (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004).

While capital goes global, however, sovereign states continue to exert their own spheres of influence within and outside their borders. Supported by reinvigorated racist, populist, sexist, and xenophobic politics in North America and much of Europe (Giroux, 2017; Lazaridis, Campani, & Benveniste, 2016), the repressive state form is regaining ground. Empire is both globalized capitalism and a continuation of state domination. Clearly, as is exemplified in recent tensions between multinational energy companies, different levels of the Canadian Government, trade agreements with Asia, and Indigenous nations and their environmentalist settler allies, Empire is a shifting confluence of various forms of powers. Together and through their tensions, Empire as this complex composition of globalized, territorial, and neocolonial powers, determines both the feasibility of liveable forms of life and the disposability of bodies and living systems (Butler, 2004; Giroux & Evans, 2015).

In North America, the settler colonial line of analysis has been developed by Indigenous scholars (Byrd, 2011; Coulthard, 2014; de Finney, 2014; A. Simpson, 2014; L. Simpson, 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012; Watts, 2013) and demonstrates how the state continues to perpetuate the crimes of colonization through child apprehension practices, EuroWestern epistemological domination, military and carceral institutions, recognition politics, and widespread resource extraction and environmental racism. The expendability of specific subjects, bodies, or entire groups in Empire is undertaken, not only through economic and territorial disenfranchisement, but also through the criminalization or pathologizing of resistance and of poverty.

On top of the material violence that Empire unleashes on land and bodies, affective extractivism is another layer of exploitation that applies to nearly every person in developed economies. Affective labour is inscribed as soft skills that are central to the work of managers, service providers, and sales people as they attempt to produce particular emotional responses in their employees, wards,
clients, and customers. This form of exploitation is invisible and unconscious as long as there is a normalization of subjectivity territorialized on the affects of capitalism. We find ourselves in a paradoxical system where, on the one hand, our affects, thoughts, and communicative abilities are what is most required for the functioning of capitalism, while on the other hand, these capacities are rendered as code in a machine that is distant from lived material existence that produces them (Skott-Myhre, 2015). At a time where war and environmental catastrophes have become ontological because the total destruction of human life is possible (Hardt & Negri, 2005), the Western subject – particularly their capacities to think, feel, communicate, and relate – has nearly completely come to be part of the machinery of capito-colonialism.

**Affective Labour and the Production of Subjectivity**

Whereas previous forms of labour produced the means of social relatedness through an economic image of the factory, the current tendency is toward the production of networks of cooperation, partnership, and communication through knowledge economies, affective labour, and a service paradigm. Skott-Myhre (2015) explains that affective labour, and the preparation of youth for it, alienates people from their own emotional and relational capacities in a way similar to how industrial labour expunged craftspeople from the material products of their labour. Young people who experience difficulty in subjecting themselves to the mandates of this new paradigm often have their nonconforming affects pathologized. Young people in dominant Western nations such as Canada and the United States must leave school with the appropriate social skills, cultural values, attitudes, and ways of speaking for capitalism. In a time where young people’s ability to arrive into any form of consolidated subjectivity is perpetually differed by the dictates of finance, marketing, and media, the temporalities of technology outpace the living relationships through which affects actually operate.

CYC sits somewhat on the fringes of mainstream society, engaging with young people who often have difficulty fully integrating into the machinery of capito-
colonialism. I argue that the points of breakdown in reproductive cycles of subjectivity, often coded in youth populations as troubled, deviant, at-risk, or mental ill, can potentially be an intervention point in the reproduction of Empire as a whole. Hardt and Negri (2005, 2009) argue that in Empire it is our ability to relate to one another through affect and language that is both the target of capitalism and our greatest tool for resistance. Youth embody a very specific creative force within society that is enacted through relationship, communication, and the production of culture (Skott-Myhre, 2008). It is perhaps our direct engagement with young people, particularly those who do not seamlessly reproduce Empire through their subjectifying processes, which might elicit the greatest hope for change of the system as such. Skott-Myhre, McDonald, and Skott-Myhre (2017) propose that human service work with young people might resist the fanatic individualism and consumerism of contemporary society and foster the development of new modes of value and praxis by returning to the material actualities of human relationships.

Human and more than human relationships are historically and geographically located. Therefore, there is no way to elude colonialism and capitalism as macro contextual factors which mould our current ways of relating to each other and to the lands upon which settlers have made their new homes. By directly confronting colonization as the founding exploit upon which contemporary capitalism and the Canadian state is predicated, we can outline a relational ethics for both resisting its ongoing perpetuation and becoming something different than what we currently are.

**Decolonization**

CYC has been, and continues to be, complicit in colonial practices such as child removal, centering Euro-Western understandings of development and kinship relations, privatizing and individualizing social problems, using white settler people as the standard of normal development, and mindlessly treating the symptoms of colonization such as entrenched substance use and suicidality as individual or
community problems (De Finney, 2014; Saraceno, 2012). While colonialism has shifted from an explicitly violent process that seeks to empty Indigenous lands for settler occupation and profit (Byrd, 2011; Morgensen, 2011; Tuck & Yang, 2012), Eurocentric ways of being and relating remain dominant. CYC practitioners uninformed by anticolonial theory may see their work as ethical while simultaneously preparing young people for a settler colonial subjectivity which reinforces settler relations to land, life, and one another (Kouri & Skott-Myhre, 2016). Wellbeing, for example, is often assessed in terms of young people’s ability to adapt to their contemporary environment without much thought of the overall sustainability or ethics of the systems they inhabit. Promises of citizenship, jobs, security, and opportunities to build a life and home on this land (or rather, fear of not attaining these things) are the goads in ushering in new waves of coloniality and emersion in capitalism. In other words, through our work to support normalized subjectivity, CYC practitioners can work to produce young people as labourers for the Canadian economy, consumers for the global market, and conforming citizens and land occupiers in settler democracies.

CYC, therefore, can be very much what Simpson (2014) calls “a training ground to legitimize settler colonial authority over Indigenous peoples” (p. 22) when EuroWestern paradigms are favoured and Indigenous cosmologies are ignored or appropriated. Furthermore, through psychological, developmental and family assessments based on normative Western ways of relating and behaving, CYC is complicit in practices of racist child apprehension practices, which continue to disproportionately remove Indigenous children from their homes. As de Finney (2014) explains, “newer waves of residential internment, each worse than the previous one, have targeted Indigenous children” (p. 13) and have contributed to more Indigenous children being in government “care” today than during the residential school era. While the denial of ongoing settler colonialism helps to frame many of our engagements with settler and Indigenous peoples as “helping” and “care,” a CYC approach with the capacity to accurately map and resist “the tentacles of colonization” (McCaffrey, 2010, p. 343) is desperately required.
Tuck and Yang (2012) explain that decolonization is specifically about the repatriation of Indigenous land and the valuing of Indigenous life and ways of being. These authors warn that using the language of decolonization in education, science, personal growth, and human service practice without specific links to material and existential change for Indigenous people is to do an injustice to true decolonizing struggles. Perhaps decolonizing CYC, particularly in its delivery by and for settlers, is an impossible task within this paradigm. With these standards and risks in mind, challenging the colonialism bred in and through CYC and developing a praxis more commensurate with decolonization has many already developed lines. White, Kouri, and Pacini-Ketchabaw (2017), for example, cite Sandrina de Finney, Johanne Saraceno, Shanne McCaffery, and Jin-Sun Yoon among others who are actively theorizing decolonization of CYC praxis. With decolonization specifically being about a repatriation of Indigenous lands and a CYC praxis accountable to that end requiring a new ethics of engagement, the question remains of who we are to one another in this process.

Identity and Becoming Other that Who We Are

As I work and write on colonized lands, my identity as a settler person whose family is part of the waves of immigration and land occupation from Europe and the Middle East is undeniable. Who I am has been shaped by this history and it is one of my ethical practices of accountability to acknowledge my identity and be visible in terms of my role in this continued occupation of Indigenous territory. I argue that living relationships exceed the social codings of identity as they have been stratified by colonial, heteronormative, patriarchal, and racialized discourses. Social locations are imperative for an accurate analysis of power in relationship and ethical solidarity practices. To challenge colonialism and capitalism we must also seek those aspects of ourselves that, through relationship, exceed, challenge, disrupt, or escape the appropriation of Empire (Skott-Myhre, 2006).

My experience is that power laden maps of identity and relationship make the structures and discourses that reinforce Empire visible where direct, engaged, and
ethics based relationships challenge the replication of those structures. It is specifically through our relationships to one another across our differences that help them become more than what they are now. I take my inspiration here from the feminist poststructuralist Rosi Braidotti who argued that politically informed maps of context provide matrices of resistance, creativity, and affirmative ethics.

Braidotti (2003, 2010, 2011) builds on Deleuze and Guattari’s (2004) concept of becoming-woman to push equality-minded feminism to a point of rupture in the gender binary of society. Such a move had been made previously by queer theorists and people of colour (e.g. Buttler, 1990; Britzman, 1995; hooks, 1989), however, Braidotti turned to the living world of relationship to foreground the intensities and flows of living interaction as the force which exceeds the codes of heteronormative and racialized capitalism. While arguing that identity politics are necessary to locate starting points in the struggle, she also proposes a process of becoming different than what you are by affirming what is possible in material relations. She argues that there are speeds and forces of change found within the life that come to be coded as masculine and feminine, white and black, and it is in these original forces that lines of flight out of dualistic thinking and reified identities can be found.
The proposal that I am making following Braidotti (2003, 2011) and Deleuze and Guattari (2005) is that the excesses, flows, intensities, and variations of life are always available to us through living relationships. The life of the body and relationship are primary to the abstract codes that attempt to organize them into a system appropriate to capitalism and colonialism. Even alternative or subcultural performances of identity can become coded and appropriated by capitalism and made into commodity. Capitalism has shown both incredible capacity for turning alternatives into new markets. For example, hip-hop culture, environmentalism, and various forms of spirituality have all become hot commodities bought and sold in various ways. Indigenous culture is a new site of struggle against white capitalist appropriation in the form of dress, music, and images. As a person situated in the location of a white settler male, it is my ethical imperative to understand and articulate how such appropriations happen and also find ways to relate to such cultural and creative production through living and grounded relationship.

Young people, particularly those whose social identities resemble those in power, are, in this regard, the recruits for the perpetuation of the capitalism and colonialism through appropriation, production, and consumption. When we see capitalism as an abstract composition of code (Deleuze, 1992) and consider every young person as a living being, we have a compositional difference in nature. Young people cannot truly become an abstract code, but they can be appropriated as code and act according to its dictates. Their composition as living assemblages inherently resists being appropriated as code and it is in our relationships with them that both we and they are swept up in a process of becoming that exceeds capito-colonialism. Young people who are coded as non-conforming, troubled, at-risk, or in mental health crises may be a sign that the reproduction of Empire is not happening seamlessly. If this is the case, CYC practitioners have an ethical problem of working to return young people to reified neoliberal settler identities or be swept up in a process of becoming with them. The latter requires a true assessment of the risk of turning counter to capitalism, as well as a vulnerability to change oneself in the process. To return to living encounter as an alternative to the reproduction of Empire requires both that we face the colonial
predicament that we are in together and, for settlers at least, we become other than what we currently are.
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Refusing Band-Aids: Un-settling “Care” Under the Carceral Settler State

Sandrina de Finney, Lena Palacios, Mandeep Kaur Mucina and Anna Chadwick

The [Indian] child lives with his parents, who are savages, and though he may learn to read and write, his habits are Indian. He is simply a savage who can read and write. To resolve the Indian problem, Indian children should be withdrawn from the parental influence, and put in centralized training industrial centers and schools.

Sir John A. MacDonald to the House of Commons, 1883

These words of Sir John A. MacDonald, whom the Canadian Encyclopedia (2013) calls “the first and greatest prime minister of Canada,” outlined the ideological foundation of Indian residential schools 135 years ago. Today, this ideology still drives state-funded systems that target Indigenous and non-white children. In the public imagination, residential schools are part of a flawed ideological history we can now heal through reconciliation. But in fact, thousands of Indigenous and racialized children continue to be systematically detained, incarcerated, criminalized, institutionalized, and lost by US and Canadian authorities. For example, per capita, there are more Indigenous children in government “care” today than at any other point in history (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). We are in the midst of the “millennial scoop,” a wave of government incarceration of Indigenous children, who
represent less than 7% of the population, yet make up 48% of children in
government care (Turner, 2016).

In this paper, we explore the impacts of transcarceral social services systems in
the context of child and youth care practice, policy, research, and advocacy, as well
as the kinds of creative, generative “cartographies of refusal” (Simpson, 2014) this
history calls on us to make in our field. We write collaboratively as Indigenous,
Chicanx, and diasporic South Asian scholar-activists. We are trained CYC
practitioners working, teaching, and researching in the field; we work with
communities – including our own – that have experienced racialized, gendered,
sexualized, and ableist violence in various state-run, government-funded colonial
systems, including the criminal, legal, education, immigration, health care, and child
welfare systems. These are what we call transcarceral systems. Under the settler
state, government systems are never benign instruments of care. They uphold and
implement official state policies, including those of cultural genocide, forced
assimilation, state surveillance, and the incarceration of marked, non-white bodies
(Greenwood & de Leeuw, 2012; Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada,
2015).

Where did these ideologies come from? Countries like Canada, the US, and
Australia are colonial settler states in which colonialism cannot be thought of as an
event in the past because “the settler never left” (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 5). In a
settler state, colonial rule is reasserted every day of occupation through violent
acts and policies (Amadahy & Lawrence, 2009). In Canada, for example, while they
live in one of the world’s wealthiest countries with a global reputation for
upholding children’s rights, Indigenous children and youth experience
disproportionate rates of poverty, policing and incarceration, underhousing, and
racialized discrimination, as well as “epidemic” rates of gender and sexualized
violence (Allan & Smylie, 2015; Anaya, 2013). At the same time, Indigenous
education and social services are chronically underfunded by 20–40% compared to
mainstream services (Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, 2016). Racialized children
and youth from other colonized communities also encounter systemic state
violence stemming from a long history of slavery, indentured migration, and colonial structural violence and racism impacting their everyday lives (Maynard, 2015).

As CYC practitioners, we often find ourselves working in colonial systems. We might recognize their limitations, yet are we able to intervene into the colonial structures on which they are built? Do we acknowledge how groups who have been targeted throughout history continue to encounter colonial barriers that define their worth and well-being?

**Carceral settler states and transcarceral systems**

When colonial violence is reiterated every single day of the occupation of our homes and bodies, children become a prime target of transcarceral systems. A perfect example of such targeting is how quickly the immigration systems of Canada and the United States have remobilized policies of racial profiling, detention, and separation of migrant families and children. In Canada, for instance, between 2005 and 2010, approximately 650 refugee children were detained each year due to their migratory status (Canada Border Services Agency, 2010). Migrant families seeking asylum might be detained with their children in prisonlike centers or see their children placed in detention and foster care, sometimes with little if any oversight ensuring their safety, let alone their family connections. These practices compound the intersecting racialized violence and poverty they likely experienced before arriving at the border, particularly for those fleeing conditions exacerbated by Western colonialism in their countries of origin.

Often in these cases, the immigration and child welfare systems function as pipelines to deportation and criminalization. Racialized refugee children in child protective services risk exiting the system with precarious status, placing them at further risk of deportation. Here, the image of the benevolent settler state contrasts with the realities that migrant, undocumented, and refugee children and youth confront. In addition, many of the racist policies at the intersection of the child protection, immigration, citizenship, and criminal justice systems are becoming
increasingly embedded in hypercapitalist logics as private, for-profit companies are contracted to warehouse detained children (Global Detention Project, 2018).

The medico-legal colonization of traumatized bodies

Carceral settler states deploy “carceral/police humanitarianism” (Gilmore, 2017), the strategy of portraying state-run services, prisons, and institutions as spaces for rehabilitation. Because protective services, policing, and imprisonment also debilitate and harm people, we cannot consider them benign spaces for healing, safety, and care (Palacios, 2017). Rather, survivors of these interlocking systems represent a flourishing industry for services and interventions focused on promoting their resilience and healing them from trauma. The colonial trauma families have experienced is reduced to psychologized, individualized measurements of neurological damage, PTSD, noncompliance, self-harm, substance use, complex and intergenerational trauma, and loss of culture. As described by 21-year-old Macy:

They told me ... I can actually pass on what my mom went through in residential schools through my cells, like my genetics, my thoughts, my behaviors, to my baby ... like what, actually what made her drink… I grew up in foster care so I was actually already red-flagged right when I got pregnant and the social worker was actually already on me at the hospital.

Here we see an alliance between the corporatization and bio-medicalization of research-based evidence, the state apparatus of social, mental health, and health services, state bureaucracy, and legal services. In a form of epigenetic determinism

1 The example of Macy comes from Sisters Rising, a community-based research project for Indigenous youth of all genders speaking back against sexualized violence (sistersrising.uvic.ca)
embedded in the bio-medical logics of newgenics, children and youth like Macy are made responsible for carrying the neuro-physiological imprint of inexcusable state policies such as residential schools. This pathologization in turn legitimizes further punitive interventions that perpetuate the cycle of removal, punishment, and incarceration. As Macy outlines, as a cruel irony, we mandate that children and families who have experienced severe trauma turn for help to the very systems that contributed to this trauma. This ensures an unlimited flow of “at risk” clients as these families are investigated, medicalized, and criminalized into attending programs. We measure and track their progress and capacity, rewarding them when they demonstrate resilience and, when they fail to measure up, penalizing them by cutting their funding, extending their programs, managing how and when they can see their children, and making them jump through endless administrative and bureaucratic loops.

2 Newgenics describes “a broad range of medical, political and social practices related to ‘improving’ human kind on the one hand, and erasing disability and difference on the other” (University of Lethbridge, n.d., para. 1).
At the same time, under neoliberal “social services” systems, the responsibility for care is increasingly downloaded onto Indigenous and racialized communities. For instance, the colonial state has found that Indigenous traditional knowledge systems support our resilience. Now the state wants to teach us how to reclaim our Indigenous cultures to heal ourselves from what its systems did to us, so that our burden on those systems is reduced. An expectation is being placed on Indigenous front-line workers to provide “culturally safe” trauma-informed care. As Elder Willa Charlie observed⁴:

_They beat civilization into me, telling me I was dirty for living on the land, forcing me to study indoors and live indoors. Be a civilized Indian. What I see now is I am invited to these outdoor classes to teach these kids about our lands and our plants and our teachings because these kids are stressed out and anxious and our teachings now it’s almost lost._ (as cited in Surrounded by Cedar Child and Family Services & de Finney, forthcoming)

The rise of “culture as therapy” (Million, 2013; Rieff, 2006) is, of course, completely dehistoricized, depoliticized, and disconnected from any conversations about decolonization and Indigenous self-determination. We see how quickly sacred knowledge systems become commodified and diluted of their power by hypercapitalist regimes. We have to be mindful of how narratives of care, healing, and relational practice – while important – are constantly appropriated by carceral state systems – without the self-determination of the nations who protected these knowledges from hundreds of years of colonial genocide.

---

⁴ We gratefully acknowledge the community participants who shared their stories and perspectives in the NONG SILA project on urban caregiving traditions.
Desettling the appropriation of “care”

As CYC practitioners, we hope to disrupt romanticized feel-good narratives and the “benevolent” human service interventions (Palacios, 2017) they engender by pointing out the deep ethical fissures at play in our work. Sara Ahmed (2012) reminds us that dealing with others’ pain involves complex, slippery relations of power. As she argues, “the West takes and gives and in the moment of giving repeats as well as conceals the taking” (p. 22). This “giving as violence” is at the root of transcarceral systems. Sherene Razack (2007) describes how “politics of rescue” constitute “stealing the pain of others” as another way of binding pain to create tropes of settler benevolence. These tropes, wrapped up in politics of reconciliation, have the long-term effect of constructing us as “inherently broken, in need of fixing and rehabilitation” (Dhillon, 2017, p. 152), thus rendering our resistance immaterial (Chadwick, forthcoming).

We urgently need other ethical frameworks by which to understand our practice and professional ethics. We are interested in exploring how trauma, healing, justice, and decolonization can be mobilized beyond depoliticized, individualistic, Western-centric lenses. Understanding how Indigenous and racialized children, youth, families, and communities embody healing, dignity, and self-determination invites us to move beyond EuroWestern psycho-social notions of relational practice to foreground the political, economic, and sociocultural inequities that produce ongoing colonial violence (de Finney et al., 2018). Our resurgence-building interventions should therefore focus on unsettling settler systems. Otherwise, as CYC practitioners, we will continue to apply relational band-aids onto practices and policies that deliberately target us. Going beyond band-aids calls for seeing practice not only as individualized care, but as interventions into systems that colonize and harm our communities.

This project implicates us all – children, youth, families, communities, Elders, front-line practitioners, students, academics. Vibrant, transformative, generative frameworks for anticolonial practice and ethics are already being used in and by communities and practitioners around the world. We are deeply inspired by the
diverse perspectives enacted by Indigenous, antiracist, anticolonial, critical disability, queer, 2spirit, and trans, gender and critical feminist theories and practices. These ideas have much to contribute to child and youth care.

Taking imperfect action in what Shotwell (2016) calls “compromised times” brings us face to face with the reality that our very presence and advocacy on Indigenous lands and in settler states might reiterate this violence as much as unsettle it. This incommensurability (Tuck & Yang, 2012) requires critical, deeply situated, collectively produced relationalities. In bringing various frameworks to light, we do not mean to render diverse Indigenous, Brown, Black, migrant, and racialized settler bodies as homogenous or easily comparable (Palacios, 2017). Indeed, these critical distinctions should be the topic of another much-needed paper. What we hope to do is make ourselves accountable to engaging both private and public intercessions that extricate Indigenous and racialized bodies from damaging colonial relations of exploitation and dehumanization (de Finney, 2017).

A decolonizing relationality is fostered by making everyday practical, political and economic choices that support the safety, well-being, integrity, and sovereignty of Indigenous, racialized immigrant, and migrant children and their families. It means raging against carceral logics that see marked non-white bodies as dangerous, offensive, and disposable (Mucina, 2018; Palacios, 2017). It entails upholding the rematriation of Indigenous homelands and resources, and the rehoming, respiriting and rekinning of our communities (Surrounded by Cedar Child and Family Services & de Finney, forthcoming). Beyond workshops for “reconciliation,” it demands that we show up for political work with all of our humility, courage, resources, skills, and networks. As committed CYC practitioners, this vision invites us to work in what Linda T. Smith (2005) calls “grounded intimate sovereign spaces” where we can enact actions that defy “the manifests of vanished lives” (p. 87).

---
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As a feminist scholar and a woman, my work has always begun with the body. After all, it is the body that has been historically the contested terrain for productions of the subjectifications of modernity; class, race, gender, sexuality and so on. As a gendered subject, my lifeworld is saturated with an almost infinite array of micro and macro definitions of who I am, centered in the practices and beliefs about my body that I have been inducted into since birth. Like many of us whose bodies have been marginalized by the valorization and centrality of the male, phallic body, and its logic, I spent years simultaneously uncomfortable with my body in its alterity and glorying in its radical capacity for difference.

Of course, this ambivalence has a particular force and energy that leads to what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) write about as molecular lines of social production. For them, the term molecular refers to those elements within the social that unsettle, disturb and possibly pervert the dominant logic of the status quo. In much of my writing as a feminist scholar, I have attempted to trace these lines of disturbance across time, space, culture, and modes of subjectivity. I have been interested in the ways that the female body opens specific capacities for ruptures in the logic of patriarchal structures. In this short piece, I am interested in suggesting that, if we are to propose a genuinely radical youth work, we need to begin with the body.

To some degree, this is a historical necessity because the current mode of production, global virtual capitalism, is increasingly separating itself from the material actualities of living bodies. As capital becomes increasingly engaged with
abstract systems of code and algorithms, it shifts away from its dependence on living ecologies. With a field of production that includes the expansion of artificial intelligence and robotics, the virtual abstract network of surveillance and control appear to be less interested in exploiting and appropriating living bodies, and more interested in creating simulations of living form that can be utilized without all the messiness and unpredictability of life. Under the coming system, we become what Gilles Deleuze (1992) termed "dividuals" or just bits of data fed into the proliferating web of code that transmutes the value of material relations into abstract forms of monetary equivalence.

The logic of such a system is largely impersonal. Of course, there are human beings embedded in the machinery, driving it forward, but, like addicts, they are not really in charge of the system of value they are perpetuating. The system is driven by a logic that inducts human consciousness into itself, but that logic has little or no regard for the subjects that enable its ever-expanding field of production. Indeed, we might say that our lives are now entirely mediated through abstract categories produced and disseminated by various forms of media. This mediation has profound effects as our material, phenomenological experience becomes distanced from the system of representation we use to express ourselves. We tend to become dislocated and disoriented from the material actualities of our lives, and this can produce dystopic affective responses such as depression, anxiety, murderous rages, schizoid breaks, and cynical forms of sociopathy. All of this creates pathways for corporate psychoactive intervention that can produce vast amounts of capital in its own right. Contrary to popular discourse, the current panoply of dysfunctional subjects is anything but socially deviant. Instead, they may well be the next mode of subjectification and of considerable utility to capital.

I argue that the antidote to this abstract system of domination and control lies in something quite familiar to the field of child and youth care: the engagement of living material relations. I do not mean some reactionary refusal of the virtual environments of phones, computers, social media platforms and so on. Instead, I would call for the implementation of an alternative logic that turns the current set
of relations on its head. In short, we need to replace the valuation of the virtual world as ultimately monetary, with a valuation of our digital world as measured by its capacity to expand global networks of healthy living ecologies. I would suggest that we need to interrogate the current logic of capitalist relations to conceive an alternative that is not rooted in the past but begins to imagine an impossible future. I use the word impossible here advisedly. What I mean to say is that everything that is possible is already in play in our current historical logic. The impossible is those ways of organizing society we have not thought of yet. I argue that we will find the hints of such new worlds in a return to the experiences of the body.

I make this argument premised in the Spinozist idea that it is the body that gives rise to thought. Spinoza (2000), unlike the majority of western philosophy, argues that the body comes first. After all, it is the body that perceives the world and without it, there would little to think about. Western philosophy from Plato to Descartes, to Hegel, reverses this logic and places the mind above the body. In doing so, I argue, it opens the gate to capitalism's ability to invert the relation of the wisdom of the body and to give preeminence to the realm of abstract form that I have been describing above. It is only through the omission of bodily wisdom that society could become premised on the perverse premise that abstraction gives rise to living form. When we separate ourselves as a global society from the realm of actual physical material relations, we are inducted into the kind of logic that tells us that profits should come before the well-being of living things in such matters as health care or ecological balance or the argument that without money we would all die. Of course, this is not the case unless the system pre-sets its logic so that money becomes the mediation between living surplus and the survival needs of living beings.

The good news is that we are in fact living beings, not abstract algorithms. In fact, the realm of abstract capital is radically dependent upon us. Without our participation, the logic of the system collapses. So, the advantage that we have is that we are composed of the infinite and unmediated force of life itself. The question becomes, how are we to access and deploy this force as an alternative to
capitalist relations? For CYC, I suggest we begin with the fact that our work is saturated with anomalous bodies.

As I have argued elsewhere (Skott-Myhre, 2016) young people constitute a liminal social space in which they are not yet fully assimilated to the configurations of adulthood. In performing their developmentally assigned role of indeterminacy in which they are always becoming, young people constitute the literal manifestation of living capacity. Provided we are not driven to enclose and contain this force to the ends of a teleological imperative that condemns them to adulthood, young people’s bodies constitute openings to an infinitude of passages to worlds not yet thought and known.

This is also true of "adult" bodies that are constitutively incapable of fully integrating with the social conventions of adult identity. It is important to note that the behavioral terms by which we set the standard for adulthood are riddled with patriarchal modernist colonial imperatives to simultaneously and seamlessly enter the vernaculars and habits of whiteness. The constraints of "adulthood" on speech, dress, bodily comportment, and limitations on creative thought are profoundly entangled with dominant prescriptions of colonial discourses on proper etiquette. The constraints and prescriptions mentioned above are a particularly complex relation under current regimes of postmodern capitalism that obscure whiteness under thin veneers of acceptable multiculturalism, polysexuality, and discourses of aspirational gender. The actual material alterity that constitutes each of these minoritarian modes of subjectification is carefully emptied of any inflection that would challenge the logic of the money form and blended algorithmically into a smooth surface of alterity as representation.

But child bodies, gay bodies, women’s bodies, trans bodies, indigenous bodies, immigrant bodies, teen bodies, and bodies of color, all have the living capacity to form relational matrices that exceed the prescriptive boundaries delineated out of the centering of the white male adult as the phallic definitional center against which all else must be measured. It is the living actuality of alternative modes of physical deportment, speech, dress, and creative thought continually unsettling the certainty
of who we must become that opens the possibilities of new futures. And it is in our work, as CYC workers, that we see these bodies in full on collision with the systems in which we work. That could well mean that it in our daily living relations with young people, we have the moment to moment opportunity to change the world through our encounter with the micropolitics of an unimaginably powerful entanglement of bodies occurring right in front of us.

Rosi Braidotti (2011) proposes this as an ecological configuration of living force. She suggests that it is in the complex relations of all living bodies that the world emerges and re-emerges in a constant expression of living force. All systems of domination and control seek to contain and restrict this ever-surging field of creative capacity towards their own ends. However, it is not possible to fully contain or control living subjects. Anyone who has attempted to run a residential facility for young people knows this. No matter how many rules there are, or how well young people are surveilled, there will be inventible breaks in the imposed order. On a broader scale, capitalism's attempts to control and contain life through its series of abstract apparatuses of capture is having disastrous effects on the global ecosystem. It is simply suicidal for social systems from group homes to global economic systems to fail to take into account the desires and capacities of the living bodies, human and more than human, that comprise our world.

Healthy ecosystems are composed of a rich array of material living difference with a multiplicity of genetic variation and infinitely complex patterns of networked capacity. Such networks and systems of living capacity are not abstractions articulated in binary descriptions like taxonomies, where we try to describe difference as merely this and not that. Instead, living systems are entangled sets of relations in which difference is kaleidoscopic rather than binary. It is the pattern that shifts as a multiplicity. There are no single points of decision that create the world as we know it or even our lives as we live them. There is no center which commands the trajectory of the future. Our bodies are entangled with all animate and inanimate bodies in ways that exceed any conscious apprehension.
The thoughts that we have that emerge from this highly intricate and extensive web of continually mutating world of form do not determine in any explicit way the world as we see it. Nor is it possible to imagine that the mind can somehow simplify the infinitely complex wave of heterogeneous input washing over and through it micro-second to micro-second. To a significant degree, it is the ecological relation of bodies in collision with one another that composes and decomposes our thoughts and our actions. Who we are becoming, as a process operating at speeds beyond our comprehension, might well form a better basis for conscious reflection than any limited idea of figuring out who we are. From my perspective as a psychologist, a radical youthwork might center its points of engagement around precisely these questions of how the body is shaping who we are. How are we being subjectified by the full ecological force of our collective creative expression?

Braidotti (2011) describes this as a random confluence of virtual capacity through which a transformation of subjectivity opens new vectors of possible acts. As CYC workers, I argue that such an approach might offer us a way forward as we struggle with the devastating impacts of 21st-century capitalism. Braidotti provides this kind of exploration of capacity as what she calls a radical ethics of transformation. This radical ethics of transformation is a gradual warping and drifting away from conventional binary conceptual frameworks. Like older traditions such as women’s ways of knowing and shamanic traditions, "it shifts the focus from unitary rationality-driven consciousness to process ontology, that is to say, a vision of subjectivity propelled by affects and relations" (p 323).

These living relations are not formed through the generosity of corporate training in affect management or schools who teach mindfulness as a disciplinary technique, nor in assertiveness training or non-violence workshops. Subjectivities, premised on radical ethics of transformation, are propelled by the necessities of a contingent relational encounter. It is the cathexis of a web of unconscious desiring production not yet overcoded by capitalist simulacra. It is not a copy. It is the seminal but never completed set of relations. Such relations are defined by bodily
encounters that give rise to thought and then acts. They are diagrammatically transversal and highly mobile. In Braidotti’s words, they are nomadic subjectivities. She tells us that this is a process that “attaches subjectivity to affirmative otherness – reciprocity as creation, not as the re-cognition of Sameness” (p. 323).

To work fully within a corporeal ethic of transformation is to engage in what Braidotti refers to as dis-identifying oneself. To become a nomadic subject is to embrace what she defines as "the cruel messy outside-ness of Life itself" (p. 305). It is to open oneself beyond the formations of historical binary taxonomies and hierarchies of the self to engage in the flow of virtuality that is all that moves through us. I argue that such work needs to begin with the body. Suzanne Bost (2008), writing on Gloria Anzaldúa, centers the work by quoting Anzaldúa as stating,

*In our very flesh, (r)evolution works out the clash of cultures … Nuestra alma el trabajo, the opus, the great alchemical work; spiritual mestizaje, a ‘morphogenesis,’ an inevitable unfolding. We have become the quickening serpent movement” (p. 350)*
Bost notes that the passage references Anzaldúa’s reading of the mother goddess, Coatlicue, and through embodying the transformation (serpent movement) who we imagine ourselves to be is constantly created and destroyed. Coatlicue “devours” the self to allow for “evolution” and new “germination,” “kicking a hole out of the old boundaries of the self and slipping under or over, dragging the old skin along, stumbling over it” (Anzaldúa, 1987, 46–47, 49). Bost tells us that this is a process that is both painful and productive. What we draw from it is the constitutive enfleshment of revolutionary subjectivities capable of bringing about new worlds and new peoples. To work this way is to open a passage to the body as the kind of transformative capacity we have in our work as radical CYC practitioners and scholars. The path is challenging, but the stakes are too high to abandon hope.
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Care in Late Capitalist Times

In a time of late capitalism, the ethics of care in child and youth care work can no longer be viewed as a purely individual, human pursuit. Extracted from its relational origins and appropriated as a tool for managing and regulating bodies, care within contemporary global capitalist structures is located as an isolated, moral choice. This conceptualization of care ignores the socio-political constellations which frame ‘free’ choice. Sole responsibility of ethical work is placed in the bodies of individuals amid systemic discourses of production and progress which instrumentalize care and perpetuate oppressive conditions to which CYC work aims to respond (Do Nascimento, 2016). Problems well known to our field such as anxiety, ‘burn out’ and self-regulation are examples of how these discourses are manifested within individual bodies. Cultivated by neoliberal logics of individualism and competition, deployed through institutional frameworks, and maintained by child and youth care practitioners, care is easily appropriated as a commodity in the service of individual well-being and autonomy.

In the 21st century, caring in the field of child and youth care requires a radical shift in how we as practitioners situate ourselves within an increasingly precarious global landscape. Linear pathways to ethical rationalities well known to our field, such as policy documents and handbooks, offer us an illusion of stability and control that is no longer sustainable, nor has it ever been. Thinking beyond individualist logics of human morality and the codified binaries of right/wrong which so often govern our practice, in this paper, we aim to disrupt neoliberal affirmations of
quick-fix, homogeneous solutions to heterogeneous problems that have been rapidly growing since the beginnings of scientific reason and euro-western colonization. Following Puig de la Bellacasa (2012), we argue that care is too important a concept to be reduced to hegemonic ethics. Rather, care is fundamentally relational, and requires attentive (Tsing 2015), situated (Haraway, 1988) thought that is in dialogical response to/with a practitioner’s particular location among dynamic, heterogeneous ecologies.

The worlds in which we live are made of multiple overlapping and interdependent forms and processes that exist only in their relation to others. Thus, “to care for something, or for somebody, is inevitably to create a relation”, in movement (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2012, p. 198, emphasis added). Such a definition of care leads us to wonder what kind of worlds might child and youth care practitioners make possible if care is an act of creating? Conceptualizing care as an act of creating suggests that care moves beyond a purely human-centered process of epistemological productivity, where practitioners center self-reflection and teach others to self-care, toward responses which are co-composed in ‘common’, unequal collective spaces (Latour, 2004). Thinking through the commons, we imagine care as a way of being together with others, human and more-than-human, where vulnerability to alterity puts old habits of thought into question. We attune to our relations in difference, where “something in the world forces us to think” (Deleuze, 2004, p. 139). This vulnerability aims to notice, enhance and sustain our interdeterminancies with/in lively, dynamic ecological realities. In this way, if the realities we live with/in are not static, but rather as Haraway (2003) writes, are ‘active verbs’, then our conceptualizations of care must become ontological, rather than solely of the self, or epistemological in nature.

Relying wholly on institutional frameworks and human reason as the source of ethical work is increasingly inadequate if child and youth care practitioners are to respond the complexities our time. Yet, shifting practice requires more than critique. As Moss (2018) tells us, it is not enough to change the story, we must enact the stories we want to tell. In this way, child and youth care must extend its
narrative beyond deconstructive epistemological stances that continually ‘unpack’ and ‘problematize’ the institutions we so often bump up against, toward stories that are not only challenging, but are composed in-relation and in-the-making with others. In this article, our response, then, is pedagogical in nature through acts of creating that are formed in relational doings. In other words, we not only put care into question, but call upon child and youth care practitioners to compose theorizations of care through situated acts of creating/making/doing. In taking up this ethic, we ask ourselves: What is care for and what does it do? Taking up a feminist ethic of relationality with more-than-human worlds, we move toward pedagogies of care that ‘stay with the trouble’ of this question (Haraway, 2016) and dare to move slowly in a hurried culture (Stengers, 2018). We offer this response not as a confrontation or dichotomous alternative to the critical theory so prominent in the field of child and youth care, but rather as a layered thread that is already entangled and informed by a long history of highly important and revolutionary writing in child and youth care.

Care-full pedagogies are inherently messy, co-constitutive and becoming. Pedagogies of care require a particular way of noticing our implication with/in webs of indeterminacy, where humans are no longer the sole agents of intentional change. Pedagogies of care call on us to ‘pay attention’ (Tsing, 2015) to our relationality, the ways we practice care, and how notions of care affect our mutual becomings with those whom we encounter. Our consideration highlights the appropriation of care by 21st century capitalism and aims to create spaces that are ontologically composed with/in encounters. Encounters, Tsing (2015) suggests, transform us. They are about contamination rather than self-containment: “Self-contained individuals are not transformed by encounters” (p.28). It is within encounters that we aim to cultivate and sustain spaces that foster collective, relational ecologies of care in CYC practice, and ultimately, that challenge capitalism’s instrumentalization of care. In the rest of this paper, we aim to provoke dialogical responses in the field which reconfigure and recompose ‘care’, in times of
extraction and appropriation, toward pedagogies of care that think-with and call on us to pay attention.

**Pedagogies of Care that Think-with**

As noted above, Puig de la Bellacasa (2012) proposes that care must center co-compositional *doings* to consider the interconnected spaces with and to everything in order to create relations. She posits that “…care is somehow unavoidable: although not all relations can be defined as caring, none could subsist without care…even when caring is not assured by the people or things that are perceptibly involved in a specific form of relating, in order for them to merely subsist somebody/something has (had) to be taking care somewhere or at some time” (p. 198). Care then is seen as an “ontological requirement” (p.199) of interconnected worlds. In CYC, these interconnected worlds are what is currently under threat in the 21st century. Subsequently, our responses to problems within these worlds cannot be individual, instrumentalized or generalized. To do so would be to fall back into Cartesian myths of human reason, superiority and control which create and uphold both the structures framing these problems and the illusion that humans have the sole power to consciously fix them.

The multifaceted and human-induced effects of global capitalism including mass consumption, pollution and climate change are problems beyond a human’s control, yet neoliberal discourses of progress and production simultaneously generate and respond to these problems with quick-fix, comprehensive solutions. In the field of child and youth care, the rationalization of social efficiency and behaviour management perpetuate the formations of isolated subjects who view the world through this solution-focused lens. Practice is often framed by particular management rationales, including self/behaviour regulation, crisis intervention and cognitive therapy. Within these logics, individual mental wellness, development and autonomy form the basis of what it means to live well - and the goal of child and youth care work. These extractive, instrumentalized ways of thinking about and ‘treating’ individual problems come from a particular theoretical vantage point
whose structures actively frame current global crises and child and youth care practice. What is particularly troubling is that these structures have become so normalized within the field of child and youth care that our work is often viewed as humanitarian ‘good-will’, and as seemingly a-political. Discourses of efficiency and management are intricately woven into the practical essence of child and youth care work, and have profound social and ecological implications, limiting our relational accountabilities and capacities for living with others.

Rooted in colonial systems of accumulation and state governmentality via self-monitoring, ‘care’ in child and youth care is utilized to uphold particular ways of being in the world which have become so familiar, their processes are often invisible to those who benefit from them. Unfortunately, many of our engagements, conversations and interactions are enforced by developmental frameworks, where “[t]o care for others means to make sure that they are happy, which translates into compliance with the corporate dictates of what looks like emotional satisfaction” (Skott-Myhre & Skott-Myhre, 2015, p. 584). Kathleen and Hans Skott-Myhre (2015) provide us with ‘an’ (not ‘the’) alternative. They remind us that it is our affective, mutual entanglements that allow us to be relational in our practices. Thinking-with requires that child and youth care practitioners build upon these entanglements in ways which add meaning instead of only challenging pre-existing categories (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2012). Thinking-with calls us to come together in relation (Stengers, 1993) as opposed to falling apart in differences. Similarly, Puig de la Bellacasa (2012) notes that “thinking-with should always be a living with, aware that relations of significant otherness transform those who relate and the worlds they live in” (p. 207). In this way, an ethic of care moves toward relations that shift from the question “what does it mean that we are different?” towards “what can we do because we are different?” (Grube, 2012, p. 41, emphasis added).
Pedagogies of Care that Pay Attention

When we think about what it means to ‘care’ in the light of child and youth care practices, Skott-Myhre and Skott-Myhre (2015) highlight capitalism’s appropriation of our individual capacities to care. Current global capitalist regimes indoctrinate our thoughts, inform our actions and control our labour by making us believe that the individualist, self-fulfilling and money driven societies are the only ways of living well under the current system (Pignarre & Stengers, 2011 as cited in Skott-Myhre & Skott-Myhre, 2015). The current systems of domination want to isolate us and make us feel insecure, so they can control not only our bodies but our minds (Skott-Myhre & Skott-Myhre, 2015). In order to understand and, in turn, loosen a capitalist hold over caring relational practices, we propose that CYC practitioners engage in the art of paying attention (Tsing, 2015).

Looking to our relational encounters with others, what exactly does it mean to notice? To pay attention? Does it mean to acknowledge what we are visually able to ‘see, or something we can ‘hear’? Tsing (2015) calls us to pay attention to the assemblages, the “… open-ended entanglement of ways of being …” (p. 83) that are continuously coordinating themselves. To do this, she calls us to “… unravel its knots” (Tsing, 2015, p. 83) attending to the different ways in which something is put together, taken apart, and reconstructed. But in paying attention, we must also attend to other possibilities, looking beyond what something is toward what something could be. Similarly, Stengers (2015) claims,

What we have been ordered to forget is not the capacity to pay attention, but the art of paying attention. If there is an art, and not just a capacity, this is because it is a matter of learning and cultivating, that is to say, making ourselves pay attention … making ourselves pay attention in the same sense that attention requires knowing how to resist the temptation to separate what must be taken into account and what may be neglected. (p. 62)
So, as something presents itself, we must look further than what the eye can see, and what the ear can hear. This is true of CYC practices- we must look to the other possibilities of what caring relations could be in the 21st century.

Skott-Myhre and Skott-Myhre (2015) propose that we attend to love. For them, love is “where feelings happen in between people, not within people” (p. 586). Love, they suggest, is something that happens both with those persons and others closest to them and with those furthest from them. They challenge practitioners to collectively move towards a rejection of the system that suppresses the very type of loving relations that are critical to our ecologies. As current 21st century capitalism exploits these very notions of love, separates and pulls us apart, we are called to reinforce the need for CYC practitioners to think-with others. We are also reminded, drawing on Puig de la Bellacasa (2012), that love in caring relations is not neutral or easy and often entails dissension. This dissension from within comes from a desire toward “a shared urgency manifested in the need for unity of people trying to resist world-wide intensification of domination…” (Haraway, 1991, p.154).

Through this conceptualization of love, we might create spaces where practitioners come together in a simultaneous hunger that is satiated by collective practices with others, human and more-than-human, where other ways of being may be created. These practices create spaces that move beyond anthropocentric notions of epistemological care to reconfigure what constitutes love, beyond the self. Through the art of paying attention to our encounters with others, seemingly mundane events that often fall beneath mention are put into focus and something provokes us to notice, to think. Creating relations, then, is enacted in the happenings of an encounter where love for another is the result of a non-neutral, unknowable and often contradictory coming together, where those involved move beyond singular ways of doing toward engagements that are propelled in multiple trajectories.
Thinking *with* and Paying Attention to Care

In consideration of the ways in which capitalism appropriates care, we call on CYC practitioners to *think-with* and *pay attention*, to challenge and actively respond to the ways in which our practices are ontologically composed with/in capitalist frames. For example, respond to how care has come to matter in current times and what it does when deployed in the pursuit of individual well-being. As we have discussed, care is not a pure or humanitarian act of good-will. Rather it is contentious, contradictory and manifested in encounters with others where the unknowability of the other in spaces of collective vulnerability is the location of difference, and of love. Thinking-with others, with/in encounters, may encourage us to consider our positionalities with/in complex, messy, interconnected ecologies and to create spaces to artfully attend to possibilities that extend beyond the current realities of 21st century capitalism. Drawing on feminist notions of care in our relationalities with others, our capacities for caring may be cultivated through common spaces and collective theorizations, where practitioners move beyond codified ethics of care in isolation and come together to create new modes of subjectivities that invent otherwise collectives.
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A Love Story

Janet Newbury

“Where common memory is lacking, where people do not share in the same past, there can be no real community. Where community is to be formed, common memory must be created.”

Georges Erasmus, Dene Nation, co-chair of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (The Blanket Exercise script, n.d.)

There has been a great deal of awareness raised in Canada in recent years about the damaging impacts of residential schools and related policies and practices (Fast & Collin-Vezina, 2010; Hatala, Pearl, Bird-Naytowhow, Judge, Sjoblom, & Liebenberg, 2017; Talaga, 2017). Many individuals and organizations are working hard to respond to the 94 calls to action put forward by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada in response to consultations with and testimonies from residential school survivors and their families (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015). This is all incredibly important work, particularly with regards to Child and Youth Care (CYC) policy and practice.

And yet, I am worried that we may be veering off path and – in reference to the quote above – I am concerned that we’re trying to build community without the common memory required to do it well. I’m also feeling shame.

What worries and shames me is not that we don’t have the information or resources to establish this common memory, and in turn, build community … It is that settlers – and the settler-colonial state – are co-opting what could be a meaningful reconciliation process and perpetuating the status quo. They/we are
using the language and tropes of reconciliation to move forward with Indigenous partners and allies, but using those precious friendships and relationships to further entrench existing systems and practices that continue to privilege settlers over First Peoples.

This is both disingenuous and dangerous. And worse, it reflects the dishonesty of early settlers who engaged in treaty relationships as a ploy to enrich themselves at the cost of Indigenous lives and ways of being.

“The treaties agreed to share the lands and resources with the immigrants. ... Under existing legislation, treaty people are “sovereign” nations. ... Today, the sons of the immigrants have the largest treaty rights in Canada. The Indians have become the poorest peoples in Canada.”

Chief Pascall Bighetty, Pukatawagan First Nation (The Blanket Exercise script, n.d.)

In the field of Child and Youth Care, we have a responsibility to face this painful truth. Let us not forget that the child welfare system (or, as I recently heard it described at a conference, the ‘child apprehension system’) was a major tool in fragmenting Indigenous societies in order to perpetuate the dominance of the settler-colonial state (Hackett, Feeny, & Tompa, 2016). And let us not overlook the fact that this is continuing to this day (de Finney, Dean, Loiselle, & Saraceno, 2011; Gerlach, Browne, & Elliot, 2017). Our systems, as they are currently designed, are not only failing Indigenous children and families, they are violent towards them (Clark, 2016; de Finney, 2017). We have a responsibility to not just tweak existing systems; they need to be actively decolonized (see the work of Barker, Goodman, & DeBeck, 2017; Bird-Naytowhow, Hatala, Pearl, Judge, & Sjoblom, 2017; Chino & DeBruyn, 2006).
Given the current (and immense) imbalance of power in this country (Talaga, 2017), the focus reconciliation places on building relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people inevitably privileges settlers. By uncritically engaging in this type of ‘reconciliation’ process – focusing on relationship building while still entrenched in inequitable systems and power dynamics – it seems to me we are more likely to perpetuate the violence of colonialism and capitalism than promote Indigenous sovereignty and rights. For these reasons I am, at least in this particular historical moment, much more interested in conversations about active decolonization and disruption.

“I really am hoping that we can create a social movement so that we can raise a generation of First Nations children who never have to recover from their childhoods again.”

Cindy Blackstock, Gitxsan, Executive Director of the First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada (CBC Radio Canada, 2016).

*

I stop writing.
I have been exposed to amazing work by Indigenous scholars, and have an idea of where this should go on the basis of what I have been learning from them. I have taken notes. I am prepared to keep writing.

...But I don’t.
I recall the words of Dr. Ed Connors (Kahnawake Mohawk), in relation to a project we are involved with together. I find the notes I scratched out during a recent phone call with him. They say:
“It is not enough for the content to be informed by values and principles that are consistent with Indigenous worldviews … We need to relate to one another in our organizations in a way that is aligned with these values. The ways we work together cannot be based on a Eurocentric hierarchical model. This is an inconsistency that leads to discontent and problems for workers in programs that are trying to promote our teachings. We need to create an organizational structure that is also based on our values and principles. That is the missing piece.”

Indeed.

And for me now - here - too. I can’t write about decolonization from a distant, scholarly stance. I can’t write about decolonization by quoting and centering the words and work of others; hiding behind generalized critiques and recommendations. I can’t simply insert ideas from Indigenous leaders and scholars into the familiar, western, academic form - and let myself off the hook.

Decolonization requires a different organizational structure. As a settler myself, it requires that I show up in this somehow.

And what is decolonization, anyway?

*

It is October 20, 2017. The C3 ship is just about to start the last week of its coast-to-coast-to-coast journey around Canada. I am at Willingdon beach with my husband, my friends, my community. We sing to welcome the visitors ashore, and then make our way over to the canoes.

Carvers here in traditional and treaty Tla’amin territory are being mentored by master carver Joe Martin (Nu-Chal-Nuth) in the art of canoe carving. They have been working hard for several weeks already by the time the C3 ship shows up. It is a celebration, although there is also some healthy skepticism around this Canada 150-themed voyage. After viewing the canoes, the visitors are being invited over to the Tla’amin governance house: there will be discussions, a feast, and lots of singing and drumming.
But first:
At the canoes, the visitors gather around to hear some words from people involved with the project. The carvers are invited to speak. Sherman Pallen is a friend and a very talented artist. He carves paddles and masks, and paints as well. He designed the sea wolf that appears on the side of the canoe we paddle in together. And he’s also our skipper. With all of these talents, he is rarely one to speak in public. However on this occasion he does.
He speaks in Ayajuthem. He speaks clearly and at length. He really takes his time, as the things he has to say to these newcomers are all very important.
And he doesn’t translate his words into English.

* 

*And what else is decolonization?*

*

I am interviewing John Louie. He’s the Men’s Support Worker at Tla’amin Community Health, and I think his perspectives could benefit students in my online class about ‘Change Theory’ in CYC. We meet at his office, and video record our 20-minute conversation.
In it, I ask questions about his approach to supporting others through change. He sometimes answers them directly, and sometimes doesn’t. He shares with me and my students what he thinks is important in relation to this work. I have shared that video with several classes over the last couple of years, and it is always a highlight for many students. They often reference it in their papers later in the semester. He talks about being on the land; he talks about dignity and respect. He talks about a lot of important things.
But when the camera goes off, he asks me what I have planned for the rest of the day. I tell him about it, and surprise myself by becoming emotional as I am about to head into something difficult.

He doesn’t ask questions. He doesn’t need to know the details. Still sitting on his office desk chair, he rolls over towards me, pauses, looks at me, and inhales deeply. Slowly exhales. Again. And again. And again.

He helps me find my breath before I leave.

*

I hear Ed Connors again: We need to find a way to relate with one another that is aligned with our values and principles.

As a non-Indigenous person, I try, and fail, and try again to learn these real-life lessons in decolonization. I teach in a Child and Youth Care program. I know that education has been – and continues to be – a colonizing system. While John did a great job of talking about his work, and my students gained a lot from his words, what he did afterwards showed me. My interview forced him into a structure that wasn’t aligned with his values and principles. Once the interview was over, he was free to work in his way.

I need to keep paying attention to these moments. They are everywhere.

*

I am riding the ferry, on my way to Victoria to teach. My friend Koosen Pielle shows up and joins me at my table. I put my computer away, and she tells me about the trip she is making to Homalco for the day. It is part of the language project she’s been working on for the past couple of years. She and her team are working hard to preserve and make accessible the Ayajuthem language for future generations – for her daughter. This is a challenging task, as the number of speakers is shrinking. Those involved in the project are working hard to get as
much done as they can. On this particular trip, they have a group of linguistics students from UBC joining them.

We continue sharing stories about the various things we’re involved with and I finally notice the flash of light from her left hand: an engagement ring! I am so excited for her and ask her all about their wedding plans.

She tells me about a film she just saw, featuring carver Beau Dick. In it, he said, “The most powerful act of resistance is potlatch.” This inspired her. She’s going to have a big, traditional Tla’amin wedding in her own community.

*

These moments are everywhere.

*

When I first met Kymo Van Oers, we used to go fishing a lot (well, we still do). I remember that first summer, being out in the boat with him. Engine off. Not a sound. He’s at the front and I’m at the back, and we’re jigging. For hours.

Peaceful and beautiful, yes, but I remember wondering if there was a subtext I was not picking up on. My mind didn’t want to settle in at first. Being together in silence in this way was new to me. It kind of forced me to get comfortable not only with him, but with myself.

It got easier. And it became a way of life. We now live together in the bush, with no screens or signals, and the crackling fire is our companion. Yes, I’m now comfortable with myself, and with him, but now I know it wasn’t just about the two of us in those moments. I was just not attuned enough to the rest to notice.

We are not alone out here. We have relationships with the woodpeckers, the squirrels, and the mice. The trees, the inlet, and the frogs in the springtime. The sound of the cabin itself as it adjusts to the changing temperatures. The running
creek. The light of day climbing over the bluffs to greet us. The swoosh of wings. The smell of cedar.

I never feel lonely here, and in fact I have come to crave this time – seemingly removed, it is in fact where I feel most connected to the rest of the world.

*

*I’m feeling hope and possibility. I’m seeing how new ways don’t have to be invented. There are so many opportunities already before us, and so much wisdom being shared if only we’d pause long enough to notice.

And yet, there is a tension working on me:

These lessons from Ed, Sherman, John, Koosen, and Kymo … They give me the chance to continue to unlearn what is most comfortable to me.

*

I have just arrived at the Quality Forum conference in Vancouver, the focus of which is health care. The first session I attend is a workshop on Indigenous cultural safety and cultural humility in health services. It is so powerful and effective, I ask the facilitators if I can take home a giant stack of the reference material they provide for us. I want copies for my students; I want copies for my team back in Powell River.

I go home and read a booklet entitled: #itstartswithme: Creating a climate for change (First Nations Health Authority, n.d.):

“Cultural safety is an outcome based on respectful engagement that recognizes and strives to address power imbalances …”

“Cultural humility is a process of self-reflection to understand personal and systemic biases and to develop and maintain respectful processes and relationships
based on mutual trust. Cultural humility involves humbly acknowledging oneself as a learner when it comes to understanding another’s experience.”

“Systemic racism is enacted through societal systems, structures, and institutions … It is commonly manifested in social exclusion and isolation that limits or prevents political and economic participation, or access to and participation in other social systems such as education and health.”

Hm.

*

The post-secondary education system is one I am quite comfortable in. I have been conditioned to thrive in that particular organizational structure, and it has rewarded me for my performance. But it is one that has been violent to those I love. As is the case of the child welfare system, the medical system, the justice system, and our system of government. And these institutional structures remain intact.

But there are cracks.

*

John Louie is opening a public event. He stands at the front of the theatre, and graciously welcomes us all to Tla’amin territory. Then he lets us know he is going to pray. As always, before he begins he invites us in the audience to pray in our own ways, or not at all. He tells us that he was once forced to pray in a certain way, and he will not put anyone else in that position. We should all be able to express our spirituality as we wish.

And then, with this respect, he offers up his prayer.

*
These friends of mine who I have referenced are all very different from each other. But as I re-read my small stories about them one after another, I notice something: They show up.

They don’t force their ways onto others, but they consistently and clearly engage with the world in ways that are in alignment with their principles and values. And by showing up in these ways – in their ways – they generously create the space for others to do the same.

They are gently guiding me with the gift of their examples.

My tendency - because of my white skin, the histories it connects me to, and my fears of replicating colonial patterns - is sometimes to try to disappear. But by offering his prayer as he did, John teaches me not to erase myself from the equation but to take responsibility in my own way.

And he beautifully offers an example of how to show up in a way that doesn’t erase others either.

*

And now, here I am.

I haven’t even started this paper: haven’t done much referencing⁵, haven’t framed the argument, haven’t outlined the recommendations for CYC. But I am done.

---

⁵ The hyperlinked photos, videos, resources, and websites are intended demonstrate the value of forms of knowledge that extend beyond those typically privileged in academic structures. Providing access to these is my attempt to honour the fact that these (and other) sources of wisdom inform my learning process in significant ways, though they are often obscured in standard referencing practices.
Emote, to:

Fiona Mayhill, for reminding me that sometimes a story is what’s called for.
Wolfgang Vachon, for showing me that different forms of writing do different
things, and giving me the courage to experiment.
My on campus CYC 364 class, for teaching me that theory may guide us but it
should not hide us. We need to be attuned and responsive to those we encounter.
Dr. Jennifer White, for her example of leadership within the academic system as
it is currently organized.
My friend and neighbour, Jenna Adema, who has inspired me with her passion
for decolonial pedagogies.
Ed, Sherman, John, Koosen, and my beloved Kymo, for giving me permission to
share these stories, and for enriching my life in ways you can’t imagine.
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Glorifying Suicide? Radical Encounters with Difficult Texts, Radical Approaches to Youth Care

Cameron Greensmith and Jocelyn Sakal Froese

Dedication
This piece is dedicated to all of the youth who have strayed away, and to those youth who have expressed concern about the ways structures of violence have made life extremely difficult to live in.

“It [13 Reasons Why] has graphic content related to suicide, glamorization of suicidal behaviour and negative portrayals of helping professionals, which may prevent youth from seeking help. We have recommended that our teachers not use this as a teaching aid”
Hamilton Wentworth District School Board – May 29, 2017

13 Reasons Why has taken the world by storm; Jay Asher’s 2007 novel has been adapted into a Netflix television show, which is currently in its second season (Asher, 2017; Yorkey, 2017). 13 Reasons Why has brought difficult conversations regarding everyday gendered violence, rape, and its repercussions in girls’ lives, as well as the somewhat forbidden topic of suicide out of our dusty closets and into our schools, homes, and mobile devices. The reader (and viewer) follows Hannah Baker, a white “conventionally unconventional” girl who shares a series of thirteen “tapes” with some of her peers: “I’m about to tell you the story of my life. More
specifically, how my life ended. And, if you’re listening to this tape, you’re one of the reasons why” (Yorkey, 2017, Tape 1, Side A). The “tapes” publicly call out the community of youth at Hannah’s school who inflict seeming everyday gendered violence on her and illustrate the reasons for which she decides to take her own life. The reasons are complicated, and highlight the complexities girls are required to deal with everyday, such as (hetero)sexism and misogyny. Additionally, the “tapes” provide a powerful venue through which the reader (or viewer) can opt to interrogate how their own mundane practices with others may indeed cause harm, and may even contribute to unlivable conditions that effectively bring suicide onto the horizon for some youth.

As readers of the novel, and consumers of the television show, we appreciate the ways 13 Reasons Why tries to address the difficult and oftentimes erased experiences young people (girls) face; high school is not an easy thing to survive, despite mantras of It Gets Better (Greensmith & Davies, 2017). Our writing makes sense of the ways young adult texts that youth engage can offer a radical critique of institutions and the adults who run them. However, within this short piece, we offer an opportunity for youth workers specifically to think with youth through the texts that they consume. As noted in the epigraph above from the HWDSB, we want to push against the dismissal of suicide texts as a place to begin fostering and maintaining relationships with youth. This dismissal is locked into ever-increasing demands placed upon youth of which adults routinely ignore and connected to neoliberalism’s meritocratic promise.

Neoliberalism, it seems, requires young people and adults alike to understand themselves as individuals. And, this understanding of subjectivity negates the interlocking effects of being in and connected to communities. As Vikki Reynolds (2012) notes, neoliberalism slips into our understandings of suicide; as a word it is insufficient as it does injustice to the ways “we” are all complicit in the structural violence that makes life increasingly unlivable. As such, texts that trouble flat positivist interpretations of suicide should be taken seriously and engaged within the context of youth work/care, since they opt to interrogate neoliberalism and
implicate communities in suicide. To echo Scott Kouri and Jennifer White (2012) who posit that suicide and intervention can be engaged with in playful and creative ways, we pose that youth workers address suicide lovingly – as a radical divestment from top-down adultism and neoliberal understandings of youth as innocent and therefore in need of protection. To invest in love, is to divest in the normate and normative interpretations of suicide that rest within the epoch of biology and psychology (Kouri & White, 2012; Marsh & White, 2016). *13 Reasons Why*, as a text, offers a critical intervention to conventional conversations of youth suicide and shifts the conversation away from normative and neoliberal frameworks for understanding violence youth encounter. And, we, as youth workers, must take this intervention seriously as we attempt to work with youth – despite all popularized suicide dialogue that suggests the contrary.

In an attempt to work against individualist logics used to constrain our imaginings of youth suicide, we post that love be taken seriously within youth work. Love, defined by bell hooks (2000) always works in opposition to hate. As hooks notes: “Society’s collective fear of love must be faced if we are to lay claim to a love ethic that can inspire us and give us the courage to make necessary changes” (p. 91). This courage, we argue, comes to manifest in many different ways – however, we will be focusing on developing this courage or “taking a leap of faith” into critical conversations of youth suicide. Such an evocation of love does not rest within the lexicon of the heteronormative – it is not about monogamy, procreation, or marriage; rather, hooks suggests that love can be imagined as having multiple dimensions: “care, commitment, trust, responsibility, respect, and knowledge” (p. 94). Think for a moment, what would it mean to truly love youth? What would youth care look like if love was centered in our everyday practices? And, to echo Kouri and White (2012) as they ask lovingly: “What spaces might we open up by placing the tools of critical analysis in the hands of young people and what might young people do with that space?” (p. 190). We contend that a loving approach to youth care would engage, rather than dismiss, the debates, topics, and
texts with which youth are already engaged, rather than enacting a protectionist stance, or cowing behind the language of moral panic.

Within the context of adult-youth relations, amplified in the epigraph from the HWDSB, it is clear that helping professionals, at least in that context, do not love youth in the way hooks imagines. To love youth would mean to trust in them in their engagements with difficult topics, and in their experiences of multiple forms of pain. The criticism directed at 13 Reasons Why works to call out the show for “glorifying suicide” is hateful; it works to sustain existing hierarchies and power structures that we know are not serving youth well, and further stigmatizes the topic of suicide (including suicide prevention), illegitimating a topic in which youth are increasingly invested (Kouri & White, 2012; Marsh & White, 2016). We are concerned that this adultist and neoliberal critique of 13 Reasons Why may be harmful to youth. Encouraging youth workers to disengage with suicide texts’ pedagogical possibilities does a disservice to youth and the on-going violence they encounter. Banning and vilifying suicide texts that address youth head on may actually prevent meaningful engagement with youth where they are at, for example, by foreclosing the possibility of conversations with youth looking to better understand the process or discourse of help seeking. Interestingly, it is not all texts that depict suicide that are deemed to be inappropriate. We note that William Shakespeare’s (1913) Romeo and Juliet, which remains a staple in many high school English classrooms, ends with two youth taking their own lives and frames those deaths broadly as the result of an “ancient grudge” (Prologue, 3) that has caused “civil blood [to] make civil hands unclean” (Prologue, 4) throughout the whole of the community – a phrase that suggests the burden of loss is widely shared, just like in 13 Reasons Why. To us, there appears to be a contradiction within what some youth workers (want to?) engage.

Following hooks’ theorization of love, Hans Skott-Myhre and Kathy Skott-Myhre (2007) note that the praxis of love can allow for youth workers to “build community without using tactics of exclusion or domination/discipline” (p. 55). That is, a praxis of love would indeed challenge contemporary neoliberal
articulations of suicide by doing away with notions that adults know what youth need and instead actively address difficult conversations as a community – even suicide – that youth want to engage (Kouri & White, 2012; Marsh & White, 2016). A praxis of love would not suggest the problems youth encounter are developmental; rather, love as praxis, within the context of youth work, would allow for possibility, nuance, and multiplicity. It would allow for youth workers to engage with their own practice, the institutions in which they work, and so on, countering or mitigating some of the problems youth face. Indeed, to engage with love would mean that youth workers respond to the ways they may be complicit in youth suicidiation, rape culture, homophobia, and fat phobia. A praxis of love would allow for a radical unlearning of conventional and mainstream suicide prevention; for example, at the end of each episode there is a public service announcement prompting viewers of 13 Reasons Why to visit https://13reasonswhy.info if they are feeling triggered by the content of the show – with a list of resources (e.g., American Foundation for Suicide Prevention Talk Saves Lives VIDEO), and links and phone numbers (e.g., National Suicide Prevention Lifeline) prompting people to text or call if one is in crisis (Thirteen Reasons Why, n.d.). If we can engage in a praxis of love, then we can imagine that love be radical, and in doing so, allow us, as youth workers, to challenge normalized suicide intervention frameworks, work toward creating new conditions for living that address the reasons why youth consider suicide, catch youth before they are in crisis, and mobilize the knowledge that being in and experiencing crisis is okay.

Ironically, we find that a refusal to engage with 13 Reasons Why is also a negation of one model of what a praxis of love, albeit a flawed one, might look like in the character of Mrs. Bradley, Hannah’s Communications teacher. Mrs. Bradley runs her classroom in an open and inviting way, one that is intended to draw out deep and meaningful discussion of important topics without censoring anyone. She facilitates open debates, tempers extreme viewpoints carefully and without silencing those that hold them and orchestrates opportunities for communication across barriers such as discomfort or shyness by providing “complement bags,”
which facilitate anonymous communication between youth. Though the conversations that happen in her classroom are not always politically correct, the show strongly implies that they are useful tools for dialogue, and generally positively received by the youth; Hannah’s description of Mrs. Bradley’s class figures it as the one place where Hannah is able to find human contact, and where she does not feel as soul-crushingly lonely as she does in the rest of her life. Later, we see Mrs. Bradley handle an anonymous letter (written by Hannah) that alludes to suicide. Mrs. Bradley’s way of dealing with the letter is as open and warm as her classroom seems to be to Hannah – she allows the class to respond and reflect, and then closes off the discussion with an important note, though one that Hannah does not fully hear because she is already too intensely involved in the negative interpersonal relationships that will eventually make her life unlivable: “This is serious. This is someone who is in a great deal of pain. ... I think it was very brave of this person to tell us how they are feeling, and I want them to know that they are not alone. There are lots of excellent resources” (Yorkey, 2017, Tape 4, Side A).

While 13 Reasons Why responds to some of the criticism of the show and provides resources to its viewers in an effort to support youth in crisis, it, unfortunately, cannot replace the power of what love can bring to youth work. We see Mrs. Bradley offering us a model for a praxis of love; the onus is now on youth care workers to engage and employ that model by loving youth and their (differing) engagements with these and other suicide texts. 13 Reasons Why provides an opportunity for youth workers to take seriously the realities of youth experience – they deal with parental neglect, experience sexual violence, are slut and fat shamed, bullied, experience the trials and tribulations of being queer and/or trans, and so on. The violence youth encounter must be addressed, not on an individual level (which adopts positivist suicide prevention models located within a neoliberal lexicon), but instead at the level of the collective or the community in a manner that recognizes the brokenness of the current approaches adults are equipped with.
To engage in love as praxis would require youth workers to understand the impact of prohibiting suicide dialogue. This dialogue is especially important, since not all youth are responding or relating to *13 Reasons Why* in the same way; youth responses to the show may be shaped by their history of trauma, religious background, race, class, size, disability, and so on. In the YouTube episode *Teens React to 13 Reasons Why*, Leyla, a 17-year old racialized fat girl, says: “I’ve seen the show. I’m not a big fan” (Fine Brothers Entertainment, 2017). When watching some of the scenes where Hannah experiences gendered violence and is slut shamed, Leyla recoils, looks away, and is visibly upset. As youth workers, it is our responsibility to inquire as to why Leyla might say something as apparently neutral as she is “not a big fan” and simultaneously have a strong embodied negative response. Other youth note that the show is important, but it negatively depicts youth who are struggling with mental health issues – an argument we contend neglects an engagement with everyday forms of sexism girls encounter that would make them mad and locates the critiques the text makes as sufficient only if it connects suicide to pathology.

Other youth, at Oxford high school in Michigan, created the project *13 Reasons Why Not*, which used the medium of “tapes” (like Hannah did) through which youth share stories of why they chose not to commit suicide (Morgan & Siddiq, 2017). In an attempt to pay homage to the Oxford youth, in the last episode of season two, Hannah created her own 13 Reasons Why Not list highlighting the complexities that arise amongst youth as they contemplate suicide. Importantly, the project out of Oxford pays respect to youth as youth who are struggling with daily violence, who may have attempted suicide, or had a close family member commit suicide. Indeed, as one youth notes: “Hi, I’m Morgan Abbott, younger sister of Megan Abbott. I know a lot of you didn’t know my sister, but you know of my sister. My sister ended her life on May 31, 2013, while she was a freshman [first-year student] here at Oxford High school” (Morgan & Siddiq, 2017, n.p.). Instead of banning the conversation, youth at Oxford sought to address suicide from a standpoint of love – the love they evoke implicates the school community, youth workers themselves,
and the struggles youth face in an effort to start a dialogue with regards to why youth contemplate suicide.

In a world plagued by the realities of neoliberalism, we invite youth workers to consider how both their action and inaction have reverberating consequences. In light of the critical insight of difficult suicide texts, we want to invite dialogue around suicide in all its iterations. We hope that the call to ignore texts youth engage prompts important conversations between generations – where adults and youth can learn from and love one another (Kouri & White, 2012; Marsh & White, 2016; Skott-Myhre & Skott-Myhre, 2007). To evoke love once more, we hope that the love for youth be built into our relationships with them; a love that works to address much needed structural inequalities youth continue to face, and a love that, if taken seriously, can transform the work we do, our relationships, and the communities we are part of. We, then, suggest that texts like 13 Reasons Why be considered valuable within the context of youth work for their criticisms of contemporary youth cultures and the everyday violence youth experience, but also worthwhile as primary opportunities to challenge contemporary power structures and neoliberal regimes we are all implicated in reproducing and resisting simultaneously.
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The Power of the P.B. and J. Sandwich

Kelsey Friedrich

I have always had a powerful relationship with food and mealtime. Despite having to raise thirteen children in a small mining town in northern Ontario, my grandmother always fed her family well. Up until the day of her passing, all her children and her children’s children would gather in the kitchen to pick off of each other’s plates and share in good – and often very loud – conversation and laughter. Her house was the place to go to if you needed an ear and a warm cup of tea. Despite having too many grandchildren to count, she never forgot what our favorite foods were and the latest news regarding our personal lives. I lived a whole country away from her, and every year I came to visit during my childhood she would have fresh baked ginger cookies and a warm cup of tea waiting. She’d drop the whole plate in front of me, break out the playing cards so we could start a game of Rummy, and, to my amazement, chit chat about details of my life that even I had forgotten.

When I think of the ideal CYC worker, I think of my grandmother. I was deeply insecure as a child, and painfully shy to the point that my parents had to endure countless conferences regarding my grade school teachers’ concerns about my social development. I never once felt insecure around my grandmother though. I believe this was because she took a genuine interest in being a part of my life, and because she fed me.

Food is more than just nourishment. Steckley (2013) notes that food has the “symbolic power” to “emotionally nurture or alienate” (p. 50). In what follows I will examine this symbolic power in relation to three key points. First, food and mealtimes can be used to facilitate conversation and engage in relationship building. Secondly, food and the routines or practices associated with it have the ability to
empower children and their individuality or autonomy. Finally, there can be much healing that comes from nourishment for children who have experienced neglect or abuse, and damage can be done when food is used as a form of punishment. These three concepts can be used to understand how food can both be used as a tool and as a symbolic representation of emotions, an idea that child and youth care workers should keep in mind as it “fits well into the everyday activities to promote healing and development” within the field (Steckley, 2013, p. 50).

How Food Can Enhance Relationships

Child and youth care is a unique discipline as its overall purpose is not to diagnose or intervene. Instead, it is “relationally based” (Phelan, 2014, p. 84). Youth work seeks to develop what Skott-Myhre (2014) calls “the common,” or “a new subject that is not an individual” (p. 37). By this, he does not mean a togetherness, but rather a oneness, which is a difficult concept to grasp when institutions teach and encourage the opposite. Youth work has unfortunately, too often, been ultimately about domination on the part of the youth worker, and in response, rebellion on the part of the child (Skott-Myhre, 2014). In contrast, I would argue that child and worker should become rebels together and share in each other’s journey. This is what I envision when I think of relational practice. Being in relationship with young people involves immersing oneself within their world and being a part of their everyday life. Phelan (2014) notes that “Mature practitioners cannot imagine doing CYC work anywhere else than in real life-space situations” (p. 85). Eating can and should be considered one of these “life-spaces.” It is not the space itself that is important, but rather the result of the worker being with the youth and the results that manifest from having and developing that experience together.

This development of a relationship is essential. Punch, Dorrer, Emond, and McIntosh (2009) state that “Mealtimes could offer a real sense of belonging and closeness” (p. 9). The child and youth care worker must occasionally get their hands dirty – both metaphorically and literally – to create that trusting bond, a
bond that many of the children CYC workers encounter are lacking. Krueger (2013) describes the importance of having “An understanding of the significance of food in human development and how trust and attachment are often rooted in feeding” (p. 19). Children are so much more aware of and in tune with our rhythms and movements than we typically give them credit for. At meal time, every action can be seen as an important one. Often times body language is significantly more important than what is said verbally. Krueger (2013) encourages child and youth care workers to pay close attention to details such as where or how the youth are seated during mealtime, the rituals or customs the youth engage in during mealtimes, and even one’s own body language and whether or not it conveys to the young people that the worker cares and is present with them in that moment. These seemingly minute details “can communicate recognition, acceptance, or the claiming of a person or place through its link to personal needs” (Punch et al., 2009, p.18). I see the setting for mealtimes as neutral ground that bridges the gap between practitioner and client.

A caring environment fosters honest conversation and vulnerability. I would go so far as to argue that this setting is one in which a counselor can gain a more accurate snapshot of who their client is. When I was a child, I remember lunch time being the part of the day where I could finally relax and crawl out from under the overly-critical gazes of my teachers. The lack of structure lets the young person temporarily let their guard down and genuinely interact with others. Just as the meal is nourishing their bodies, the interactions and freedom to express themselves nourish their spirits. Garfat (2004) notes that “For many people food is associated with caring, and youth should feel cared for at all times.” Caring for youth through feeding them “creates excellent additional opportunities to form attachments and relationships during the meals” (Krueger, 2013, p. 20).

**How Food creates Opportunities to Explore**

Another interesting opportunity that food creates in the field of child and youth care is offering children the opportunity to develop skills and gain a sense of
independence. Offering a young person the chance to learn more about food, cooking, and nutrition can be an activity that practitioner and client can participate in together in order to strengthen their bond. Furthermore, it gives the child a sense of autonomy and a chance to participate in the care they receive. This evens out the playing field so that the child does not feel they lack a voice or the ability to make decisions for themselves. For example, Punch et al. (2009) note that “the children in our study were not averse to the idea of being taught how to look after themselves in terms of managing money, cooking, and cleaning but they felt they should not be made to” (p. 12).

It can be easy for adults to feel that they are superior to their young clients and thus think that it is their responsibility to create a sort of rulebook with the hope of guiding the young person in what the CYC worker believes to be the appropriate direction. However, learning is most effective, not when an individual is made to do the work or when the work is done for them, but when they are given the agency to make their own decisions. Contrary to this basic CYC principle is the common practice in many agencies of using behavioral interventions rather than helping the youth “navigate the early years of adulthood and independence” (Gharabaghi, 2014, p. 9). The difference between those two is significant in that behavioral change “really means being compliant and conforming to the expectations of society as they perceive them”, while helping a young person navigate young adulthood puts the power to choose within the youth’s hands (Gharabaghi, 2014, p. 9). Rather than trying to produce cookie-cutter versions of what we think successful adults look like, I would argue that we should seek to empower children and encourage them to explore and try new things that interest them. Food is one way that can happen.

A way of doing that could be cooking together. Garfat (2004) states that “Food, as we will all probably acknowledge, somehow nourishes the spirit. It involves the ‘feeding of the self’”. The task of the youth worker is just that – helping young people find themselves. It is not the youth worker’s vision of them or the agency’s vision of them that is important, but rather that individual child’s vision for his or
her self. For example, in a group home young people could be given the opportunity to pick a new or interesting recipe each week. They could decide who does what task, from the cooking to setting the table. By doing this, these activities no longer become chores, but opportunities to interact and make decisions as a unit while simultaneously learning important skills. CYC work needs to stray away from being demanding of children towards encouraging them to “find a sense of self” (Gharabaghi, 2014, p. 12).

**How Food can be a Healer**

Phelan (2014) expresses the importance of humility, as an antidote to unequal power relations that can “destroy(s) any genuine relational possibilities in the helping process” (p. 93). I would argue that humility is also an important component of preparing and eating food together. Garfat (2004) expresses his outrage at the common practice within institutions to attempt to dominate its populations when he states “I am always amazed at how often food becomes the stimulus for power struggles between youth and staff”. Personally, I see using food as a form of punishment as unethical and archaic. Child and youth care workers will come face-to-face with young people who have been through severe traumas related to abuse and neglect. What is more neglectful than denying a child the most basic of needs? Krueger (2013) notes that “these youth might have had to scrounge up what they could for lunch or dinner” (p. 19). Effective CYC workers “would not take food away or use it as a punishment or reward, but rather see it as a vital part of building trust and connections with youth who might have experienced little of either” (Krueger, 2013, p. 19). Rather than food becoming a way to punish or reward children, it should be looked to for its “restorative (or destructive) potential in our related practices” (Steckley, 2013, p. 50).

This restorative potential comes in many forms, the most obvious being that consistent nourishment is something that youth who have been living on the streets or in neglectful homes may have never experienced before. It may seem obvious to those of us with privilege that you should be given food when you
become hungry. This is not necessarily so with youth who have had to go to bed hungry on countless occasions. Being given food demonstrates to the youth that the worker cares. Furthermore, the group experience during mealtime develops the community, creating a sort of family that lives and eats together, and cares for one another. Mealtimes are “about repairing poor experiences and relearning ways to socialize and make relationships” (Punch et al., 2009, p. 9).

I will end with one of my fondest memories from working at an addiction recovery center. Typically, I am assigned to work with the younger male clients, ranging from age eighteen to twenty-three. Though they are not “youth” per se, this memory in particular goes to show the power of food in generating connections and fostering healing.

At the end of the day, staff carries up a large box of peanut butter and jelly sandwiches to give to the clients. This particular evening had a gloomy tone over it, as some of the staff members present that night were significantly more uptight than the clients would like. I was told when I was first hired that the clients are only allowed to have one sandwich each night. Being fully aware of what happens during the detoxification process, I know that there comes a point towards the cusp of the torment where the individual gets a monstrous appetite and craves sugary foods. The sandwiches we give out are tiny, certainly not enough to fill anyone’s stomach. Because of both my upbringing and my studies, I refuse to deny a person their right to nourish their body. A young man I had not yet met came up to the office and asked for a second sandwich, rather sheepishly, perhaps expecting me to reprimand him as other staff had the tendency to do. I smiled and tossed him a sandwich. His face lit up, and he dashed into the common area where the other clients were sitting. I heard hushed voices, and no more than five minutes later, I had another client with whom I had developed a relationship standing at the office door. He grinned and said “Rumor has it the pink-haired chick is giving out extra P.B. and J.’s.” I laughed, and the rest of the night we made a game of “dealing” sandwiches to the other clients so that my coworker wouldn’t see.
As I have said throughout this paper, sharing food is a way to let people know they are cared for. I always want the populations I work with to know that I see them, I hear them, and that they are important. The mood completely shifted that evening. One of the clients asked to play the guitar, and the rest of the night was spent with both staff and clients singing along and engaging with one another in the most genuine of ways. After room curfew, my coworker noted that it had been an unusually cheery night that evening. I tried not to smile too much as I thought of the secret sandwich operation that had just transpired and could only nod in agreement between stifled giggles.
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The Resistant Artist: Street Art as Radical Youth Work

Matty Hillman
Taking Learning to the Streets

Last year I led a class of elementary school students and their accompanying teachers on a brief tour of local street art. For around 35 minutes we walked a section of back alley in the downtown core of the artsy and historically counterculture city of Nelson, BC. The class was from Wildflower School, an alternative program featuring multi-age classrooms and theme-based, personalized learning (Wildflower School website, 2018). A close friend was doing her teaching practicum with a senior class (grades 5, 6, 7) and had arranged to take the students on a tour of street art. The friend contacted me to ask if I would meet the class during the tour and speak about local street art and some of my experiences painting murals in town.

Although we explored only one block worth of walls, the volume and diversity of the mediums and messages that we discovered were impressive. There were large and obvious pieces such as the two-story psychedelic phoenix floating in space, colourful mallards taking flight from a rainbow reflecting lake and picturesque snowy mountain scapes. There was also ample cryptic messages and tags which appeared in black or silver marker, scrawled on earth toned back doors and army green dumpsters. Some images were politicalized like the feminism-branded Ms. Pac Man hungrily chasing a blue ghost aptly labeled patriarchy.

The class noted other less obvious works like small stencils of personified animals and old activism posters, peeling off the cinderblock wall to which they were wheat-pasted. I pointed out the ‘buffed sections’; grayed out squares of paint applied haphazardly by the city to cover up graffiti. The juxtaposition of the gray buffed sections against the equally gray buildings they adorn gives an urban jungle camouflage feel, very fitting to the ambience of a back alley. The irony of an anti-graffiti policy that applies additional paint to create an unsightly visual plane was not lost on the youth.

---

1 Wheatpasting is the act of adhering paper-based arts and crafts with an adhesive made of wheat flour or starch and water. In the street art and activist worlds, this process is commonly used to affix posters and propaganda to walls in public spaces.
As a group we discussed the artistic merit of some of the pieces, but we also talked about what it meant to deliver a message in this way. I invited the students to think about who might be making these statements through their art and why. Was it perhaps young people or other groups whose voices were normally not the most heard? Nelson has a relatively large street population for its size and the alley we were touring boarders a subsided housing building. In this area, it is not unusual to see messages about the hardships of living in poverty.

We discussed the content of the messages, how those expressions in a public space might feel for the writer and what purpose they may serve. I asked the students to think about why certain types of messages are permitted in society (e.g., advertising) and others were swiftly neutralized with uniform and institutional gray. The students were quite captivated by the subject matter and conversation. One student remarked how it’s important that all people have a voice and this is how some people achieve that voice. Several noted their previous obliviousness to street art being created in their town and how they now planned to take the back alleys when walking and explore other areas where they would be likely to come across the words, pictures and buffs of street art.
This article suggests that there is a yet to be realized space in youth work for the use of art-based acts of resistance. I argue for the promotion of graffiti and street art practices as part of a radical approach to youth work, one where the voices of young people are expressed through visual and text-based means and presented in the public sphere. These acts can be considered a form of resistance to the silencing and erasure of youth voices, opinions and values. To elucidate this idea, I have provided a brief conceptualization of graffiti as an act of resistance,

---

2 While many purists would argue that distinct differences exist in the aesthetic form and culture of each, for the sake of this article, I use the terms graffiti and street art interchangeably.
highlighted the reality that this art form has been appropriated by capitalism and conclude with a guide to the use of street art in radical youth work.

**Graffiti and Street Art Subculture: Authority, Resistance and Appropriation**

Researchers have documented graffiti subculture as a form of resistance to political authority in a variety of world settings; youth resistance to authority in the former Soviet Union (Bushnell, 1990), Catholic resistance to British rule in Northern Ireland (Rolston, 1991), Toronto street artists attack of colonialism (Kummel, 1991) and young Palestinian militants resistance to Israeli authority (Hedges, 1994). Ferrell (1995) summarises this as a “dance of authority and resistance” (p. 80) between graffiti writers and structures of urban control vying for spatial dominance in increasingly segregated and regulated cities. Not unlike the sometimes subtle paintings and drawings it hopes to minimize and prevent, this battle and the weapons used can easily go unseen. Increased privatization of public space, proliferation of surveillance technologies, graffiti reporting hotlines and ‘buffing’ policies can all be seen as offensive measures by city and business interests to minimize unsanctioned public art. Meanwhile, graffiti writers and street artists respond by continually gaining access to and painting areas deemed off limits. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this dance is the increased value and meaning assigned to this activity as a result of authorities’ attempts to suppress it. The rush of adrenaline and excitement that graffiti writers often speak about is in part due to the illegality and possible police presence of the activity (Ferrell, 1995).

This “succession of wars on graffiti” (Dickenson, 2008) by politicians and media can be understood as a direct reflection of the power society exercises over young people at large (e.g., curfews, permission requirements, control of space and time through mandatory schooling legislation, etc.). The undervaluing of youth voices, especially when coupled with the criminalization of public expression through graffiti, allows for a free rein of power for the political structures that control the messages (i.e., graffiti is vandalism, young people require structured environments) and mediums (i.e., media and voices of authority).
But graffiti and its tamed down and more universally appealing cousin, street art, are not exclusively presented with criminalized discourse. The market-based economy of late capitalism has moved beyond the economic realm and now appropriates and commodifies a wide variety of cultural practices (Alexander, Hagg, Hayrynen and Sevanen, 2018) As such, street art and graffiti, crafts that were ‘born in the streets’, have now reached global proportions of popularity and can be simultaneously characterized as a criminalized act and a sought after marketing strategy. This acceptance of graffiti aesthetics by the mainstream, coupled with the huge media profile of artists such as Banksy, has led to the appropriation of graffiti and street art on a major corporate level. Advertising campaigns and corporate logos now appear in graffiti iconography, and street art can be found in both small galleries and major metropolitan ones (McAuliffe & Iveson, 2011). Retail designers often collaborate with street artists by featuring their work on everything from purses to sneakers, and in doing so increase the urban image and ‘street cred’ of their brand (Crinniion, 2017). High profile artists now sign sponsorship contracts with spray paint companies and are invited to attend international street art festivals. Not surprisingly, many graffiti and street artists see this levying of graffiti’s cultural capital in the name corporate interests as a ‘watering down’ of the craft. As seminal graffiti artist Sever (2017) states “[street art] has been absorbed so deeply into the mainstream for so long now that it’s just been left defanged, declawed. Its cool, youthful, rebellious spirit now sells condos or Hot Pockets” (p.76).

Despite this appropriation and sanitization of street art and graffiti, creative public art continues to produce narratives that subvert the status quo. Sever (2017) calls it “one of the best (and last) stages that exists where art can protest and challenge, annoy and inspire” (p. 98). As an inherently collective activity that allows youth to shape both individual identities and form communities of support (Ferrell, 1995), graffiti is an ideal mechanism to promote critical thought and resistance to state and corporate control of public space and aesthetics. Furthermore, graffiti and street art can showcase how alternative forms of communication can and do convey important messages, especially for marginalized groups. The complex and
often cryptic iconography of graffiti has been conceptualized as a local literary practice in racialized neighbourhoods (MacGillivray & Curwen, 2007). For these reasons as well as its continued popularity with youth, street art and graffiti continue to provide an opportunity for young people to express themselves to the world – to command a public audience through the creative dissemination of their voices.

To encourage and support young people to find and express their voices through creative acts in public space, I have composed a guide to street art as radical youth work.

**A Guide to Street Art as Radical Youth Work**

The following guide is based on Conrin Browne’s (2013) steps for creative, radical community building. Youth workers interested in engaging with young people through supporting (and participating in) the creation of street art can use this guide as a starting point for any creative venture in the public sphere. However, this is not an exhaustive list of steps and considerations. Youth and youth workers should continuously educate themselves and gain experience though each art piece.

**Become street art aware**

- Begin by checking out existing street art and graffiti in your community. What mediums and messages are present? It is just tags or are there more illustrative pieces? What looks good, what does not? What can you learn from what is already there and where might you be able to contribute?
- Seek out street and graffiti artists in your town and online. Follow your favorites on social media. Take out arts books and periodicals form the library. Attend gallery openings. Many artists have political commentary within their pieces. Try to discern what the message(s) may be or better yet, ask the artists.
Get to know your community

- Follow local (and national and world) politics and events. Attend town hall meetings and other events where community members organize. What are the pressing issues for young people in your town? What matters to you? Where might art hold a place for expressing your opinion on these issues?
- Try to get a sense of your community’s relationship with public art. Is it condoned or criminalized? Are there legal walls to paint or opportunities for mural projects? Does your town’s administration have a mural proposal process?

Develop a philosophy for your street art

- As an individual or as a crew, you will need to have a very clear understanding of why you are doing this. What is your message and how will you communicate it? How will you make decisions about where to execute pieces? Are all walls and surfaces fair game or will you stick to public space? You also need to think about what will happen if/when you get caught. What will be your stance/defense?

Procure, borrow or purchase art supplies

- Begin to think about what mediums you will work in. Consider the advantages and disadvantages to each: spray paint can be quick and exciting but messy, conspicuous and hard to control; stencils are good for providing detailed pieces but are tedious to create; paint pens and stickers are simple and quick but visually underwhelming.
- Work with what you have. Paint recycling centres and landfills often have free partial gallons of leftovers and building supply centres sell miss-tints for discounted prices.
Create, create, create

- Practice first. Find legal walls or practice on your own property (fences, walls, sheds). Tack cardboard to a side of your house and practice how fast you can get your piece up.
- Seek out walls with good location (i.e., low risk and high visibility). Determine ideal times to paint. Consider things like get away routes and how much light is present at various times of the day. Then, get up; get up lots.

Guerrilla market your art (anonymously)

- Take photos of your pieces (the next day). Post them to social media. Focus on the message of the piece as an impetus for conversation on the issue.
- Submit photos and an accompanying commentary to local print media.

Reflect continuously on your art

- What kind of reaction are you noticing to your pieces? Are they getting buffed immediately? Are they soliciting (and receiving) responses from the public?
- What has worked well and what has not? How effective has this medium been for a vehicle for community engagement?

Creative expression in the public sphere has much to offer young people and their communities. As this article demonstrates, graffiti and street art can provide a medium and opportunity for personal expression by those whose voices are less heard in our society. Through supporting young people to recognize and care about socio-political issues, engaging them in the creative process and ultimately providing a platform to illustrate their views, street art should be considered a practicable approach to radical youth work.
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Moments Without Us

Kiaras Gharabaghi

One of the core ideas of child and youth care practice, at least as it has been discussed at child and youth care gatherings over the last decade and perhaps longer, is that moments matter. Perhaps more than that, the practice itself is really focused on moments – ‘daily life events’, ‘making moments meaningful’, ‘being present’, ‘care’. In all of these articulations of the practice, our focus has been on shaping the moment. Indeed, we teach students of child and youth care interactional skills, intervention skills, communication skills, listening skills, and more generally skills to shape the way we are with young people in the moment. This core idea, I strongly believe, provides a frame for our practice that is useful, meaningful and powerful. Still, lately I have been thinking deeply about three things related to this core idea:

1. What is ‘a moment’?
2. Do moments happen in our absence?
3. If they do, what is child and youth care practice during moments without us?

In its most common usage, the term ‘moment’ refers to a measure of time. Not a lot of time, but more than a split second. We move from moment to moment as we transition from one ‘moment of time’ to the next. “I'll be back in a moment” takes us from a time when we are together through the passage of a short period of time until we are together again. We were apart for a period of time that we measure in units of moments. We expect to be apart longer if I say “I'll be back in a few moments”.
Another common usage of the term ‘moment’ refers to a particular constellation of circumstances that give rise to an identifiably unique experience. Our shared experience of enjoying a swim in the lake, while the sun is setting, a loon is singing, and we smell the aroma of coffee brewing on the camp fire is a ‘moment’. It may be much longer than the moment we referred to earlier, when I’ll be back in a moment; but it is a moment because the constellation of circumstances that surround our unique experience give rise to a feeling of shared emotional, natural, ecological connection with each other, with the land (or water), and with nature, and with the preoccupation of our senses.

A third, perhaps less common usage of the term ‘moment’ is to designate the sudden onset of a feeling or state of mind that is incongruent with the circumstance of our present tense. For example, I might think of something sad while we are ostensibly having a very nice time; you might ask me ‘What’s up’? And I might say ‘I am having a moment’, and then I recover and re-join our nice time together.

I am sure there are other usages of the term ‘moment’, but these are three that come to mind. And it occurs to me that these kinds of moments happen far more often while I am alone than when I am with someone. A ‘moment’ as a measure of time reflects the inevitable sequence of life. We cannot help but live moment to moment. And when you tell me that you’ll be back in a moment, the moment is explicitly one in which I will be alone. It ends when I am no longer alone. A ‘moment’ as a constellation of circumstance giving rise to a unique experience unfolds every time I do anything consciously. Whenever I pause long enough to consider my presence in space and time, I encounter a unique experience that defines that ‘moment’, that gives it content and creates a memory I will hold on to (perhaps merely for a moment or perhaps for a long time). And unless I am seriously ill, I am surely not the only person who sometimes starts laughing, or crying, or shuddering, or sweating while alone even when the present context seems to not call for these expressions or actions.
All of this might not seem particularly relevant to child and youth care practice. That’s because it isn’t. In preparing to write this column, I started reading random articles on CYC-Net to see what we are talking about when describing, explaining, or teaching our practice. While we certainly talk about moments, we talk about these only in the context of being with a young person and making particular moments, often moments framed around daily life events in the life-space, meaningful. *Our practice is about our presence.* The moments experienced by young people, however, are overwhelmingly experienced when we are not present. These moments without us are at least potentially meaningful, but our practice does not provide us with the tools to make them meaningful, since our practice is about our presence. The meaning of these moments is lost within our practice.

Although my column is not officially a part of this special issue on radical child and youth care practice edited by Hans, in the spirit of the theme I propose that a radical child and youth care practice departs from its orthodox roots in the following ways:

1. It contemplates a practice without us
2. It seeks meaning without production (or making)
3. It is set in moments that transcend the relational of ‘us and them’ and seeds (not seeks) the relational of Self and Being.

**KIARAS Gharabaghi** is the director of the School of Child and Youth Care at Ryerson University and a regular writer for CYC-Net. He is the author of the chapter ‘External Models of Supervision’ in the recently released book, *Supervision in Child and Youth Care Practice* (Charles, Freeman & Garfat, 2016). The book is available at [http://press.cyc-net.org/books/supervision.aspx](http://press.cyc-net.org/books/supervision.aspx)
Postcard from Leon Fulcher

Waitangi in New Zealand’s Bay of Islands

Kia Ora Everyone! We visited New Zealand’s Bay of Islands for a few days during the school holidays last month, and as morning rain gave way to afternoon sunshine, we managed to walk around the Treaty Grounds at Waitangi, New Zealand’s national birthplace. (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Waitangi)

After leaving the new Visitors’ Centre, both Colonial House and the Whare Tipuna o Waitangi are well worth time spent taking in the story of how New Zealand became British and not the French Novelle Zealande in 1840. In order to declare sovereignty over ‘foreign countries’ outside Europe, it was necessary to first establish settlements. While the French established a settlement at Akaroa in the South Island, the British offered Maori Chiefs citizenship under Queen Victoria. In so doing, they ‘settled’ the country through the device of a Treaty and for just over a decade, the Treaty was upheld before declared ‘a nullity’ by the colonial courts.
In this issue of CYC-Online giving special attention to structural arguments that underpin child and youth care practice – so long as we examine such arguments – it is worth noting how New Zealand Maori Elders took steps over several decades to challenge the New Zealand Court decision taken in the 1850s that The Treaty of Waitangi was ‘a nullity’.

From early in the 20th Century, young Maori were prepared through university legal training that led to a formal appeal of the nullity decision of the New Zealand Courts to the country’s highest Court of Appeal – the Privy Council in the British House of Lords. By unanimous vote in 1990, the British Privy Council declared the Treaty of Waitangi a living document.
Since 1990, the 150th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, the New Zealand Government – of whichever party or coalition parties – has been engaged in negotiating Treaty settlements with each and every Maori tribe. Europeans were no longer permitted to view Maori in monolithic racial terms, forced by the Privy Council to recognize the significance of tribal identities and different tribal experiences with New Zealand’s settler populations.

The French Pompallier Mission at Russell facilitated Treaty of Waitangi negotiations (see here) since establishing a mission was preparatory to establishing a settlement. The most important contribution made...
by these Marist Monks was that they printed New Zealand’s first books in the Maori language.

In the diplomatic maneuvering for control of New Zealand, the British ended up as net winners. Once the Treaty of Waitangi was declared a nullity, New Zealand’s indigenous population lost over 90 percent of their ancestral lands. That is now part of the settlements.

New Zealand’s Bay of Islands and Waitangi are a must for any visitors to New Zealand. It really is a special place. It’s worth noting how the Treaty approach was different from the shooting and killing approaches used to gain control of Canada, South Africa and Australia.
On leaving Waitangi, we couldn’t resist a visit to Kawakawa’s world famous public toilets!

Russell in the Bay of Island became the First Capital of New Zealand

The World Famous Austrian Architect Hundertwasser Designed Public Toilets
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