

## ineradicable voices: narrations toward rerooting



We gratefully acknowledge the licensing of the above photograph ('untitled' from "Up in the Sky", Tracey Moffatt, 1997) via a Creative Commons non-commercial/non-derivative license (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>) by the Tate in London, England. All rights to this image and its use are reserved by the Tate, London. Link to image: <https://www.tate-images.com/preview.asp?image=P78109>

**A collaborative oral history research-creation project**

**Based on the life stories of individuals who experienced transracial  
and/or intercountry adoption**

**Zeina Ismail-Allouche, Individualized PHD (INDI), Concordia University.**

### **Daniel Drennan ElAwar' statement on intercountry and/or transracial adoption**

We remain the repulsed, splinters, expelled from the body; the corpus surrounds us, englobes us, drives us out; it then returns to a state of “as if” we had never existed. When we dare attempt return, we do not notice that the immune response starts yet again, only at this point we are incapable of understanding its reasonings and explanations. Thus is primed our rude awakening.

For this state of affairs, we are told we should be grateful; that we are better off; that our adoptions were God’s will. Such remarks come easily to those whose lives remain a continuum, with or without us; for those with ancestry, and genealogy, and history with or without us; whose lives have continuity backward and forward, with or without us. In stark contrast are our lives halted. Interrupted. Ruptured.

And so, we exist as the discontinuous and the uprooted. And so, we are denied agency, political embodiment, civil validity, as well as base humanity. And so, adoptees are historically faced with the existential contradiction of adoption into classes and nation-states otherwise bent on their very destruction and their wholesale eradication.

This annihilation is not staunched by the adoptive act. It continues apace, contrary to mythologies of salvation and chosen status. The dominant culture’s adoptive actions have thus always correlated with extirpation, with social death, with inscribed eugenics, and with intentional genocide: a predestined, lifelong, and societally imposed “final exit”.

Such a vaguely bestowed “existence”, premised in notions of our merest survival, is a great and totalizing violence. In this light, the only valid response is a revolutionary one, premised upon an awakened “radical popular consciousness”. Paulo Freire defines the radical as one who “is not afraid to confront, to listen, to see the world unveiled”. Angela Davis states that radical means deep understanding; literally “grasping things at the[ir] root”.

Davis further states: “I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change; I am changing the things I cannot accept.” Here, in the face of the logical conclusion of our attempted eradication, the idea of “radicalization”—a revived rootedness—can be seen as the obvious and only antidote. For in fact the bare minimum of our existing day-to-day proves us to be “ineradicable”: unable to be uprooted.

And thus, the charge that we leave you, to think radically about adoption. Because the most radical statement one can make in reaction to the destructive slow-motion violence inherent in adoption practices is as follows: “Adoption is not acceptable; I no longer accept adoption.” Everything that is the basis for communal hope unfolds from this bold remark; from this stark truth; from this, a small yet decisive step forward toward justice.