

Resilience and ethics of care against racial capitalism in David Chariandy's *Brother*

VICENT CUCARELLA-RAMON

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31577/WLS.2023.15.2.7>

The concept of resilience has gained currency in recent years vis-à-vis the tumultuous realities of the so-called *risk societies* (Beck 2005) because it entails the capacity to face and respond to troubles. Departing from the idea that “the very notion of resilience, as the capacity to bounce back from stress and pain, rests intrinsically upon the narrative sequencing of events, responses and adaptive processes” (Basseler 2019b, 26), several scholars in the field of humanities and in literary studies (Sarah Bracke, Susie O’Brien, Michael Basseler, and Ana María Fraile-Marcos, among others) have approached resilience as a relevant analytical lens which may open up a path toward a new “ethics of responsibility” (Evans and Reid 2014, 6). Positioning resilience “as a central emerging concept and concern of the twenty-first century” that can be “constructed through narratives” (Basseler 2019b, 18) stimulates efforts to envision a “cultural narratology of resilience” (21) that may well bring to light the connection between narrative and “the sort of knowledge that may prompt radical resilient ways of being in the world” (Fraile-Marcos 2020, 10). Hence, the focus on resilience in the humanities promotes a shift away from the trauma paradigm¹ toward a post-trauma paradigm². Furthermore, by relying, to a certain extent, on a communal effort to endure and thrive in the present world of ubiquitous risk and ongoing crisis, resilience can be studied hand in hand with the ethics of care, since both resilience and care rely on relationality, allowing people to cater to one another and to develop an “empathic concern for others to resist” and to “question ourselves about our obligations to others” (Slote 2007, 33). I posit that both resilience and care, with their focus on resistance, adaptation, and relationality, hold the potential to herald an ethical function that eschews the ideological trap of neoliberal practices that are premised on individualism and exceptionalism.

Drawing on Robyn Maynard’s seminal *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present* (2017), I offer an analysis of David Chariandy’s elegiac second novel, *Brother* (2017) intending to show how the author’s style and the way he shapes the story falls within the aesthetics of resilience whilst it brings to light the intersection between different forms of resilience and the ethics of care in the face of “Anti-Blackness discourse”.³ The novel is set in Scarborough, at the outskirts of Toronto in the early 1990s and tells the story of Michael and Francis, two young Black

Canadian brothers who live with Ruth, their hard-working Trinidadian mother. She desperately wants a better life for her sons and works herself to the bone to scrape a living. Throughout the story, Michael and Francis struggle against the prejudices and low expectations that confront them as young Black men. Francis loves music, especially hip hop with its beats and styles, and he dreams about becoming a professional musician. Michael, on his part, dreams about Aisha, the smartest girl in their high school, who is determined to find a life somewhere else. But suddenly, their dreams are shattered and everything changes, because of a tragic shooting. The police violence that results in the allegedly lawful killing of Black youths brings about a familial tragedy that exposes the fatal effects of racial prejudice. Canadian scholar Robyn Maynard has conceptualized “the use of race and racial hierarchies to justify unequal power relationships and make them appear natural” (2017, 57) as a rehabilitated version of racial capitalism. In *Brother*, such forms of Anti-Blackness attach “Blackness to criminality and danger” and thus rationalize “state violence against Black communities” crystallizing the pervasive idea that “Black people are presumed to be guilty in advance” (Maynard 2017, 10). In this way, the state violence premised on racial capitalism showcases the way in which “Canada’s Black population has been excluded from those seen as ‘national subjects’ and denied many of the accompanying protections and rights” (11).

As a means to counteract these forms of violence against Black Canadians, the novel puts forth resilient methods of resistance that revolve around Michael’s ethics of care towards his mother, especially after Francis’s violent death. Thus, in what follows I read David Chariandy’s *Brother* using the novel’s articulations of resilience (drawing on Basseler 2019a, 2019b; Evans and Reid 2014; Fraile-Marcos 2020; Bracke 2016a, 2016b) and ethics of care (following Held 2006; Sevenhuijsen 1998; Slote 2007) against Canadian racial capitalism (Maynard 2017; Tator and Henry 2006), and aim to prove how the interplay between resilience and care acts as a healing mechanism of “self-repair” (O’Brien 2017, 58) in the violent context of the story. I also suggest that such interplay fosters a mode of survival characterized by “a concern not only for individual welfare but for good relationships” (Slote 2007, 12), which prompts collaborative acts of resilience representing an ethical stance to fight the ongoing practices of racial capitalism in Canada. The article is divided into two parts: the first one discusses the way in which the story represents the violence of racial capitalism and the establishment of anti-Black policies in Canada. The second section showcases an ethics of care that is grounded in collaborative acts of resilience that constitute healthy ways to survive the pervasive violence of the nation-state against Blacks and racialized peoples. In so doing, *Brother* comes across as a relevant resilience narrative while contributing to “their embedment in larger cultural and national narratives” (Basseler 2019b, 29).

RACIAL CAPITALISM AND ANTI-BLACKNESS

If in his debut novel *Soucouyant* (2007) Chariandy reconfigured Caribbean myths around an unnamed son returning home to Scarborough to take care of his mother, who suffers from Alzheimer’s disease, in his second novel the author revisits the scene

of his own adolescence. Michael's role as the novel's narrator underlines the "significance of storytelling in the process of building psychological resilience" (Basseler 2019b, 20) as well as the importance of storytelling as a healing tool.

The novel opens with Michael's recollection of the time Francis took him to climb a hydroelectricity pole that provides a great view of their city. Francis warns Michael about the danger of touching two live wires that could potentially become a conduit for the electricity coursing around them. This initial risk the two brothers are facing stands as a metaphor of the Beckian risk society and the many dangers they are exposed to throughout the story. The opening metaphor extends its meaning to represent the way in which trying to climb up the wrong way may entail getting burned in the racially-divided Scarborough: "touch your hand to the wrong metal part while you're brushing up against another, and you'd burn" (Chariandy 2017, 2). The hydroelectricity pole also stands as a symbol of guidance in itself. Symbolically, Francis is guiding his brother through the slippery surface, thus providing the readers with a sense of the mentorship needed to survive the many challenges that Scarborough poses. This initial chapter that acts as a prologue of sorts is wrapped up with Francis emphasizing the importance of Michael following him closely and always remembering. In other words, this first episode encapsulates the whole ethos of the novel: the potential of resilience in the tumultuous reality of an impoverished neighborhood, the importance of establishing an ethics of care by bonding with those you love the most and the necessity to always remember the stories that help society to understand the injustices of the present.

Early in the first chapter the reader is introduced to Aisha, a childhood friend of Michael's who had been living overseas but has now returned to Scarborough because her father is in intensive care with cancer-related problems. The reunion is used to talk about Michael and Francis's mother. In Michael's view, "Mother worked as a cleaner in office buildings and malls and hospitals. She was also one of *those* black mothers, unwilling to either seek or accept help" (10). As Ruth works long hours as a cleaner, her sons are often at home without her supervision. Ruth is fiercely protective and equally worried that the boys will ruin their lives by falling in with bad crowds and negative influences. A single mother after the boys' father disappeared when they were very little, Ruth stands for many Caribbean Canadian migrant women who earned a living working as domestics and managed "to keep their families intact when men had to be absent for employment or other reasons", thus occupying "a central role and not merely a supporting position" (Carty 1994, 205) in their communities. As Linda Carty argues, "[s]ince their arrival in Canada, it is the women of the African Canadian communities who have kept the communities going" though they "have never had their rightful place in history" (1994, 205). Through the character of Ruth, Chariandy pays homage to the Caribbean women who migrated to Canada in the second half of the 20th century and whose lives were conditioned by the Canadian state ideology and its endeavors to control the economy. According to Robyn Maynard, "housing and land were two major forms of economic advancement withheld to Black Canadians in many cities and towns", resulting in forms of economic "segregation that barred Black families from housing," which

eventually “played an important role in preventing Black economic mobility” (2017, 37). Preventing social mobility favors the informal economy and organized crime that underlie the stereotypes connecting the Black poor “to drugs, hypersexuality, danger and criminality” (40). It is against this background that Ruth grows worried and gets furious when she learns that Francis is spending time at Desirea’s, the barbershop that functions as the neighborhood’s hub for Black youths. Ruth perceives the barbershop as a suspicious spot linked to drug dealing and shouts out: “You are my son! [...] ‘You will never be a criminal’” (Chariandy 2017, 25). Michael witnesses this furious scolding in awe of his mother pointing out the impact of her words and how she uttered them: “Maybe it was the way Mother pronounced the word, briefly stepping out of the Queen’s English and into the music of her Trinidadian accent. *Cri-mi-nal*” (25).

The impoverished and derelict neighborhood where the family lives alongside their marginalization and the difficulties that accompany “the dangers of the climb” (2) not only expose the difficulties that poor Black people face in the current society of risk but also situate the setting of the story within the ideological premises of racial capitalism, whose roots can be traced back to slavery.⁴ Despite its many positive outcomes, Rinaldo Walcott sees Canada’s official multiculturalism as having fostered the invisibility of “the existence of blackness in this country” (2003, 14), while Maynard claims that it served to overshadow Canada’s role in “supporting the causes of Black (and brown) displacement” (2017, 57). In so doing, multiculturalism “has masked the ongoing policy of Black subjection that has undergirded official and unofficial state policies, regardless of language centered on formal equality and rights to cultural retention” (57).

In *Brother*, physical and economic segregation reinforce the status quo of racial capitalism through the way in which both (Black) brothers “are rendered simultaneously invisible”, as Gugu D. Hlongwane notes, and therefore “devalued and socially marginalized”, which makes them “a target of state surveillance and police harassment by dominant Canadian culture” (2021, 172). In these circumstances, Francis’s and Michael’s own neighborhood becomes the target of the racist policies of racial capitalism:

The world around us was named Scarborough. It had once been called “Scarberia”, a wasteland on the outskirts of a sprawling city. But now, as we were growing up in the early ‘80s, in the heated language of a changing nation, we heard it called other names: Scarlem, Scardistan. We lived in Scar-*bro*, a suburb that had mushroomed up and yellowed, browned, and blackened into life. (Chariandy 2017, 13)

The overlapping of racial capitalism and anti-Blackness through stereotyping can be best appreciated in the novel in the moment that recounts the reflection Michael and Francis see when looking into a newspaper box. This powerful metaphor is a symbol for Canada’s inordinate mistrust of young Black men. When detailing the atmosphere of fear and segregation that permeates Scarborough, Michael gives details of how he and his brother grow up seeing the “stories on TV and in the papers of gangs, killings in bad neighbourhoods, predators roaming close” (16). As if looking themselves in this mirror that reflects the reality of racial profiling and ste-

reotyping, Michael goes on to explain that “[o]ne morning, I peered with Francis into a newspaper box to read a headline about the latest terror *and caught in the glass the reflection of our faces*” (16; emphasis added). This episode not only supports Ruth’s fear of her children being targeted as criminals but also evinces the profound impact that the sensationalized media and the discourse attached to power represent in passing on the infectious values of the anti-Blackness imagery to Black young men.

The pervasive power of anti-Blackness can also be perceived when the two boys suffer continuous nightmares, very much influenced by their seeing other Black and brown boys suddenly pitched to the pavement by the police and arrested, hearing rumors of boys getting jumped and beaten, and seeing news stories about supposed predators and gang killings that make them feel vulnerable and unsafe (16–18). Michael’s nightmare corroborates the greatest fear of young Black boys and their unrelenting parallelism with criminality and social danger: “The criminals, Michael. The criminals will be caught by the police and punished. They do not stand a chance. Please try to understand” (155).

What the boys are terrified of is the unequal way Canada treats Black subjects because of its factual composition of different categories of citizenship which, in effect, “delineate who ‘belongs’ to the realm of humane treatment and state protections, and who is excluded – deemed [...] disposable” (Maynard 2017, 159). That is why when little Michael naively holds that “We’re lucky here. We’re very safe”, Francis overtly shuts off the argument asserting: “We’re not. We never were” (Chariandy 2017, 155). It is thus not strange that out of this feeling of insecurity and suspicion the boys are constantly stopped by the police for no manifest reason (29). Michael’s apparently ingenuous association between racial profile and his Black skin proves that also in Canada the “tropes of anti-Blackness that were created centuries ago are reproduced within the racialized surveillance and punishment of Blacks, migrant and refugee communities” (Maynard 2017, 161).

In this suffocating context of fear and anti-Blackness, Francis does not abide by the policies of racial profiling and anti-Black prejudice and will see it to the bitter end. The night of a concert that Francis’s friends had prepared at Desirea’s, the police show up on an alleged neighbor’s complaint that they could smell pot smoke: “they appeared in force at the front door, six of them at once in bulky vests, and when they asked to be let in, we understood that it wasn’t really a request” (Chariandy 2017, 116). The disproportionate action that follows becomes a battle between the agents and the Black boys, resulting in Dru, the pub’s owner, being pushed and forcibly interrogated. Francis cannot restrain himself and lashes out: “Don’t touch him!” he shouted” (117).

Although in this case the police find nothing and leave, the following altercation, when Francis and Michael go to Desirea’s to attend DJ Jelly’s audition, results in a more tragic outcome. Jelly and Francis are best friends and spend their days spinning records at Desirea’s. When a hip-hop concert comes to town, Jelly sees his opportunity to prove himself and auditions to be the opening act. The day of the audition there is a doomed atmosphere right from the moment in which Francis and his crew arrive. The police follow suit in tactical gear exhibiting coercive moves as “other

forms of systemic racism” that, down the line, prove that in the context of racial capitalist practices it is simply “race that impacts police treatment” (Myanrad 2019, 107). Carol Tator and Frances Henry explain that the “long and heated debate over racial profiling reflects the deep chasm between the White political, cultural, and social systems – which have long been dominant and rarely change – and the individuals and groups who suffer from the dis-enabling and marginalizing effects of those systems” (2006, 7). Put bluntly, the novel shows that “racial profiling is a manifestation of ‘democratic racism’ in which bias and discrimination ‘cloak their presence’ in liberal principles” (8). This racial profiling triggers Francis’s killing at the hands of the Canadian police, a tragedy that will haunt Michael and his mother thereafter.

The second part of my analysis aims to bring to light the novel’s emphasis on acts of care and collaborative resilience as relevant mechanisms for surviving the stifling practices of racial capitalism.

ETHICS OF CARE AND COLLABORATIVE ACTS OF RESILIENCE AS SURVIVAL

The day of the audition represents a turning point in the novel. Under the premises of racial profiling the police order those attending the try-out to line up against the wall and show ID. When Francis protests this unjust treatment, the police unholster their guns and warn Francis not to move. However, when one of the cops grabs his friend Jelly’s arm he confronts the police: “No,” Francis said. “You tell me. What did he do?” (Chariandy 2017, 158). In an attempt to contest the way he is perceived, Francis shouts “you think I’m dangerous” (159) and he is shot to death: “it was over. I don’t even remember hearing the shot. My brother just fell” (159). Francis’s murder not only confirms that “the policing of Black bodies” is all the more grounded in “the policing of an anti-Black social order” (Maynard 2017, 40) but also that the violence underpinned in such vicious practices responds to an accepted “relationship between Blackness and criminality [that is] enormously effective as a means to justifying and maintaining Black subjection” (41).

After Francis’s death, Aisha’s return to Ruth and Michael’s lives at a moment when they are hardly coping with grief serves to revisit the tragic event that tears their lives apart. Ruth’s “complicated grief” (Chariandy 2017, 66) turns to a mourning silence. Michael, on his part, seems to adhere to Lily Cho’s contention that the “injunction to ‘move on’ demands a forgetting” (2011, 116). Consequently, Michael shows no interest in meeting people who could bring back memories of his late brother. When Aisha tries to convince him to host a gathering at the apartment to pay tribute to her father and Francis, Michael declines: “I don’t think so, Aisha, my Mother doesn’t need a group of strangers in her home” (Chariandy 2017, 65). This incapacity to revisit the painful past is reinstated when Michael disapproves of Jelly’s visit to his mother and invites him to leave their apartment: “This isn’t a good idea, Aisha [...] I’ve warned you. I don’t want Mother disturbed or confused. She’s fragile” (89). However, refusing to remember only prevents him “from moving forward by making sense of the past” (66). Thus, the novel implies that the only way to cope with a catastrophe is by clinging to those you care for to walk the path of remembering.

In this fashion, the story puts together the ethics of care and resilience as the path for survival and healing. *Brother* thus follows the pattern of resilience narratives, where “the overcoming of trauma and a positive outlook take center stage” (Basseler 2019b, 28).

The importance of remembering proves crucial to bring wounded people together in their way toward survival because, as Francis prophetically demands at the story’s opening, “‘if you can’t memory right,’ he said, ‘you lose’” (Chariandy 2017, 2). Since memory can be an act of resilience in itself (Fraile-Marcos and Noguero 2020) the act of remembering constitutes the first step toward coming together and healing. By stressing the importance of coming together, the story presents a type of resilience that refuses to conform to the individuality attached to the neoliberal ideology that is intent on exploiting subaltern resilience (Bracke 2016b, 851–852). Certainly, Francis’s death exposes the importance to nurture a specific way of being resilient by means of cultivating a collective ethics of care that emphasizes human dependency and the need for substantial care from others. When Michael understands that when abandoned by policies that should protect lives, the only way out is accepting that “caring involves a ‘displacement’ of ordinary self-interest into selfish concern for another person” (Slote 2007, 12), he engages in “a caring relational practice” (Held 2006, 39) with Ruth, thanks to Aisha. This practice, which “involves attentiveness, and responding to needs” (30), will eventually start their process of healing and re-establish their relationship.

Brother illustrates that the care ethics is “characterized by a concern not only for the individual welfare but for good relationships” (Slote 2007, 12). Although Michael affirms that his “relationship with Aisha appeared to be based upon the most fragile and quiet of connections” (Chariandy 2017, 51), she joins in the communal ethics of care by taking an active part in helping him to get to grips with his and his mother’s reality. This is enacted the very same day that they bury Francis, when Michael goes for a walk only to return to find neighbors crowded outside their home, offering their condolences with looks of distress. Inside, Ruth has emptied all the cupboards and moved the furniture whilst she is hammering at the floor, complaining of the havoc she herself has created. From this point on, Michael develops a “sense of responsibility for a vulnerable being in need of one’s care” (Held 2006, 92) and his life becomes utterly devoted to looking after his mother: “From that moment, Mother became someone I could care for” (Chariandy 2017, 168). At this point Michael understands care as “an attitude and as a form of action” (Sevenhuijsen 1998, 4). In other words, it becomes a specific and communal way to adopt a compromised resilience that is played out through collaborative acts. This is even more openly manifested when dealing with the relationship between mothers and their children. In this case, Slote defends that “caring needs to be completed in some kind of acknowledgement or acceptance of caring on the part of the one(s) cared for” (2007, 11). Just as Ruth cared for, provided for and defended their sons when they were little, now it is Michael’s turn to take over and stand up to care for his mother, proving that the ultimate ethics of care involve the bidirectionality of “the mother’s caring and the relationship between mother and child” (11).

Aisha also plays a pivotal role from the start in Michael's ethical awakening because, even though he initially refuses to talk to her following the shooting, she lovingly pushes her way into the house with food thus committing to an ethics of care that favors "mutual concern, and empathetic responsiveness" (Held 2006, 15). A relevant instance of the kind of revisiting of the past that triggers resilience and healing takes place when Aisha insists on walking with Michael to the library. This creates the opportunity for him to tell her what really happened with Francis. Michael concludes that according to the Canadian authorities the killing was deemed "lawful" (Chariandy 2017, 171). To rebuke the "judicial void" (Menon 2004, 4) around this state confirmation of racial capitalist violence, Michael places the reader in the very moment in which he visits the library again and once there, he meets a former friend of Francis's with whom he relished the song "Ne me quitte pas". The song's lyrics – "I will create an area / Where love will be king / Where love will be the law" – act as the premise to reveal the homosexuality of his brother: "He loved a young man named Jelly" (Chariandy 2017, 174). Thus, Francis's death at the hands of the police is revealed both as a murder and as an act of love on Francis's part to defend his lover. This revelation, resulting from revisiting the past, is a turning point toward acknowledging the importance of "caring relations" (Held 2006, 54). After it, Michael decides that he has to achieve healing and closure by reuniting with Jelly and Aisha. The library acts literally and symbolically as a repository of memories and (his)stories and is offered as a resilience-building place where the shared memories around Francis pave the way toward the final act of communal care. This resilience-building place builds upon the barbershop as the spot where these young Black men found solace. As Hlongwane puts forth: "[t]he clearings of barbershops, historically regarded as sanctuaries in Black discourses in the West, help restore the humanity of Black men. These small businesses accomplish that restoration by enabling Black men to exercise and cultivate their creativity; such is the function of Desirea's, the barbershop in *Brother*" (2021, 173). These locales serve as sites for the creation of collaborative acts of resilience against oppression. The library, therefore, allows Francis's memories to be redrawn and redirected so that Michael's picture of his brother and, eventually, of his family changes and makes him change his mind with regards to getting reunited with his painful past in order to accommodate his present.

The novel ends with a significant reunion. In the last lines of the story, Aisha and Jelly join Michael and Ruth as the latter is being discharged from the hospital, to finally see "a new day" (Chariandy 2017, 176). They go together to be "all at home now, the four of us" (176). As the novel proceeds to its closure, the reader is reassured that memory "manifests itself as the element that saves us from alienation" (Fraile-Marcos and Noguerol 2020, 152). The characters' shared memories are the basis for collaborative resilience, communal care, and bonding, proving not only Audre Lorde's statement that care can be a valid "act of political warfare" (1988, 131) but also that "connection and affectivity should be recognized as important sources of moral reasoning" (Sevenhuijsen 1998, 12). While they eat and accommodate themselves to one another for the first time since Francis's death, Jelly puts on a record. To everyone's astonishment, Ruth "[g]estures upward" (Chariandy 2017, 177) to have them all listen

to “Ne me quitte pas”. The song reclaims Francis’s memory while affirming the collaborative acts of care and resilience that have helped them build resilience in the face of racial capitalist “oppressive social structures” (Held 2006, 37).

CONCLUSION

David Chariandy’s multilayered novel *Brother* strongly evinces anti-Blackness in Canada and offers the ethics of care as the basis of resilience against the ideological and political premises of racial capitalism. As Blackness is projected as tantamount to criminality in the eyes of the authorities, the novel’s Black characters develop to foster a compromised resilience through an ethics of care that privileges “processes of connection” (Sevenhuijsen 1998, 13) as a sensible way for endurance and survival. Rejecting the individuality that is assigned to the resilient subaltern, the novel opts for collaborative acts of resilience based on a commitment to care for one another. In this vein, the ethics of care becomes a way to be resilient against discriminatory Canadian policies toward poor Black people. As Canada’s violent history and ongoing abuse toward Blacks and other racialized communities is brought to the forefront, the novel challenges the myth of Canada as a beacon of equity through its multicultural policies. Ruth, Michael, Jelly and Aisha’s reunion at the end of the novel not only “re-script[s] their belonging” (2011, 329) to use Chariandy’s own words, but also serves to emphasize the importance of the ethics of care as a particular way to be resilient “not only [for] mere survival, but also [for] flourishing in the midst of difficulties” (Fraile-Marcos 2020, 1).

NOTES

- ¹ Literary trauma studies was established in the early 2000s as a critical field which examines how literature deals with the personal and cultural aspects of trauma and its outcomes and engages with such historical and current phenomena as the Holocaust and other genocides, 9/11, climate catastrophe or the ever-present unsettled legacy of colonialism.
- ² The post-trauma paradigm, as studied by Michael Basseler (2019b), Kurtz (2018) or Balaev (2014), aims at focusing on the capacity to resist and endure rather than focusing on the suffering that accompanies the trauma paradigm.
- ³ The novel was longlisted for the 2017 Scotiabank Giller Prize and has received the 2017 Rogers Writers’ Trust Fiction Prize, the 2018 Toronto Book Award, and the 2018 Ethel Wilson Fiction Prize.
- ⁴ This nuanced form of racism relies heavily on the use of race and racial hierarchies and segregation to justify uneven power relations and make them look natural and necessary. Hence, the concept of racial capitalism makes it possible to “understand the ongoing economic subjugation [...] as well as the enormous wealth divisions that persist between the white and racialized or Black peoples” (Maynard 2017, 58).

REFERENCES

- Balaev, Michelle. 2014. "Literary Trauma Theory Reconsidered." In *Contemporary Approaches in Literary Trauma Theory*, ed. by Michelle Balaev, 1–14. London: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137365941_1.
- Basseler, Michael. 2019a. "Fictions of Resilience: Narrating (Environmental) Catastrophe and Crisis in Cormac McCarthy's *The Road* (2006) and Jesmyn Ward's *Salvage the Bones* (2011)." In *The American Novel in the 21st Century: Cultural Contexts – Literary Developments – Critical Analyses*, ed. by Michael Basseler and Ansgard Nünning, in coll. With Nico Völker, 169–183. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Basseler, Michael. 2019b. "Stories of Dangerous Life in the Post-Trauma Age: Toward a Cultural Narratology of Resilience." In *Narrative in Culture*, ed. by Astrid Erll and Roy Sommer, 15–36. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110654370-002>.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2005. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bracke, Sara. 2016a. "Bouncing Back: Vulnerability and Resistance in Times of Resilience." In *Vulnerability in Resistance*, ed. by Judith Butler, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay, 52–75. Durham and London: Duke University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822373490-004>.
- Bracke, Sara. 2016b. "Is the Subaltern Resilient? Notes on Agency and Neoliberal Subjects." *Cultural Studies* 30, 5: 839–855. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2016.1168115>.
- Carty, Linda. 1994. "African Canadian Women and the State: 'Labour only, please'." In *We're rooted and They Can't Pull Us Up: Essays in African Canadian Women's History*, ed. by Peggy Bristow, 193–229. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442683273-009>.
- Chariandy, David. 2007. *Soucouyant*. Vancouver BC: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Chariandy, David. 2011. "Black Canadas and the Question of Diasporic Citizenship." In *Narratives of Citizenship: Indigenous and Diasporic Peoples Unsettle the Nation-State*, ed. by Aloys N. M. Fleischmann, Nancy van Styvendale, and Cody McCarroll, 323–346. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Chariandy, David. 2017. *Brother*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Cho, Lily. 2011. "Affecting Citizenship: The Materiality of Melancholia." In *Narratives of Citizenship: Indigenous and Diasporic Peoples Unsettle the Nation-State*, ed. by Aloys N. M. Fleischmann, Nancy van Styvendale, and Cody McCarroll, 107–127. Alberta: University of Alberta Press.
- Diego-Sánchez, Jorge. 2020. "Resilience and Healing in Contemporary Narratives of Sexual Violence against Women in Indian Writing in English." In *Glocal Narratives of Resilience*, ed. by Ana María Fraile-Marcos, 89–102. New York: Routledge.
- Evans, Brad, and Julian Reid, eds. 2014. *Resilient Life: The Art of Living Dangerously*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Fraile-Marcos, Ana María. 2020. "Introduction: Glocal Narratives of Resilience and Healing." In *Glocal Narratives of Resilience*, ed. by Ana María Fraile-Marcos, 1–20. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fraile-Marcos, Ana María, and Francisca Noguero. 2020. "Critical Dystopias in Spanish: Memory as an Act of Resilience." In *Glocal Narratives of Resilience*, ed. by Ana María Fraile-Marcos, 148–162. London and New York: Routledge.
- Held, Virginia. 2006. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195180992.001.0001>.
- Hlongwane, Gugu D. 2021. "'A Different Economy': Postcolonial Clearings in David Chariandy's *Brother*." *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature* 52, 3–4: 171–199.
- Kurtz, J. Roger, ed. 2018. *Trauma and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316817155>.
- Lorde, Audre. 1988. *A Burst of Light: Essays*. New York: Courier Dover Publications.
- Maynard, Robyn. 2017. *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present*. Toronto: Fernwood Publishing.
- Menon, Nivedita. 2004. *Recovering Subversion: Feminist Politics beyond the Law*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

- O'Brien, Susie. 2017. "Resilience Stories: Narratives of Adaptation, Refusal, and Compromise." *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 4, 2: 43–65.
- Sevenhuijsen, Selma. 1998. *Citizenship and Ethics of Care: Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality and Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Slote, Michael. 2007. *The Ethics of Care and Empathy*. New York: Routledge.
- Tator, Carol, and Frances Henry. 2006. *Racial Profiling in Canada: Challenging the Myth of "Few Bad Apples"*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Walcott, Rinaldo. 2003. *Black Like Who? Writing Black Canada*. Toronto: Insomniac Press.

Resilience and ethics of care against racial capitalism in David Chariandy's *Brother*

Resilience. Ethics of Care. Racial Capitalism. Anti-Blackness. Violence. David Chariandy.

This article reads David Chariandy's elegiac novel *Brother* (2017) through the lens of resilience thinking in tandem with the ethics of care. Staged in a suffocating context of police violence and surveillance and the ideological premises of Canadian racial capitalism, the plot revolves around Francis and Michael, two Black Canadian brothers from Scarborough. The story unfolds Francis's tragic death while trying to protect his friends from the police. To counteract the Anti-Blackness that is proffered by the nation-state, the novel opts for collaborative acts of resilience based on a compromise to care for one another. The ethics of care become a way to accommodate a compromised resilience that reveals the shortcomings of Canadian multiculturalism policies.

Vicent Cucarella-Ramon, PhD
Department of English and German
Faculty of Philology
Universitat de València
Avenida Blasco Ibañez 32
46010 València
Spain
vicent.cucarella@uv.es
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1547-2273>