

Theorizing the Local: Diversity, Race and Belonging in the City of Toronto

Shana M. Almeida

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Social Work
York University
Toronto, Ontario

July 2016

© Shana M. Almeida, 2016

Abstract

This thesis engages with critical race and postcolonial theories to explore how race is reproduced and organized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. The central question of my research is: which historical conditions and practices, tied to what kind of truth-claims, are re-articulated and justified by diversity discourse? The focus of this study is an examination of how power is negotiated and transformed through multiple conceptual and embodied schisms into the re-production and justification of particular “truths” which, in turn, provide conditions for the possibility of diversity discourse in the present. My research involves two phases: interviews with 15 racialized City of Toronto staff to explore their multiple positionings in the active subjectivization and instrumentation of diversity discourse, and a detailed genealogical review of past and present diversity-related documents from the City of Toronto to expose the “illegitimate” accounts of diversity discourse. In this second phase, I begin to reflect diversity in the City as a series of “events”, bending to the will of political and racial forces and their effects. I draw and expand upon critical discourse analysis to analyze how the uses and understandings of diversity by racialized staff get taken up and reproduced through formal City documents. This helps me to outline the complex conditions of power and resistance, and how they are negotiated by racialized City of Toronto staff in and through the institution.

In my analyses, I demonstrate how diversity discourse limits the belonging of racial Others in the City of Toronto, whereby they become articulate(d) subjects only to the extent that diversity is reiterated, reproduced, and cited by them, and through them. I also explore how diversity discourse invites negotiations of belonging via being bound with deeply affective longings to be not-strange, not-raced, with the understanding that the various subjectivities that are caught up in processes of yearning are reproduced through diversity discourse *as racialized*

subjects. Finally, in my conclusion I attend to the ideas of complicity, contradiction and refusal in diversity work, as mechanisms of disruption. I also reveal my own complex and *produced* positionings in this “diversity” work, as one who seemingly stands “outside” the research, in order to expose my own complicities in the very violence which I seek to make visible and disrupt.

Dedication

For Olive: You are my greatest love, and my greatest teacher.

Acknowledgments

The work of this thesis is inspired by multiple expressions of determination, strength, resilience, trauma, and survival that are integral to encountering, living and challenging racism in everyday life. This work would not have come to fruition without the support and encouragement of my friends, colleagues and comrades, many of whom share their stories of survival and witness my own. I would like to thank Prof. Barbara Heron for her incredible feedback, wisdom and insights that strengthened every thought, every feeling that I struggled to put into words. Her guidance and friendship has been unwavering and truly empowering, most especially on those days when I felt I could do nothing more. She has been one of my biggest cheerleaders, and I am incredibly humbled and honored by her support. Prof. Sherene Razack has from the day I met her driven me to explore the edges of my critical thinking, and has been instrumental in the growth and leaps of faith I have taken in my writing on race. Quite simply, she is a powerhouse and an inspiration. Prof. Narda Razack was the first person to teach me about race and whiteness. About thirteen years ago, in a class Narda taught, my experiences of racism made sense to me for the first time. Since then, I have spent a lot of time with Narda, sharing my tears, frustration and anger. She always held space for me. She still does. Prof. Yasmin Gunaratnam, Prof. Ranu Basu, and Prof. Wilburn Hayden, your critical interrogations and depth of insight both during my defense and afterwards have strengthened my work significantly. I thank you for your patience and am grateful for your physical, mental and emotional engagements in the final stages of my work.

Ameil Joseph and Julia Janes began the doctoral journey with me, and remain a constant source of support, laughter, strength, and honesty. Their critical insights were invaluable in the research and writing process, and they both taught me that trust in an academic setting is not only

possible, but necessary. I look forward to our many years of friendship and mutual support as we continue on in our respective journeys.

My parents struggled with violent experiences of racism when they came to Canada, and thereafter. I want to thank them for their courage in the face of sheer adversity and trauma. They are true survivors. Brendan, thank you for all that you did for Olive while I was writing the most challenging parts of this thesis. She is truly lucky to have you as her father. To my dearest friends, who called me at all hours of the day and night to see if I was surviving, eating, if my face had seen the sun, and if I needed anything; thank you for believing in me. Thank you for continuously reminding me to be in the moment, to take each task on, day by day, and to ask for support when I needed it.

Thank you to *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies* who, in their special Fall 2016 issue, will publish some of the preliminary ideas and findings of my archival research in the article "Exposing the Threads: A Critical Interrogation of the Policies, Practices and (Non)Performativity of Diversity in the City of Toronto". Short segments of chapter 8 have been published in refereed book chapter: Almeida, S. (2012). Race in democratic spaces: The politics of racial embodiment in the City of Toronto. In H. Bauder (Ed.), *Immigration and settlement: Challenges, experiences, and opportunities* (pp. 37-54).

I am especially grateful to those who shared their experiences of doing diversity in the City of Toronto, who trusted me to be a witness to their multiple ways of navigating and reflecting on being racialized staff in the City. Our conversations will stay with me for a long time to come, and will continue to inspire my work on diversity in the City.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
Chapter 1.....	1
The Diversification of Diversity	1
Theorizing the Local – the Research Project.....	5
Organization of the Thesis.....	12
Chapter 2.....	17
The Diverse City: An Overview	17
Introduction.....	17
Diversity.....	18
The Diverse City.....	44
The Racial Body and the Problem of Representation.....	47
Conclusion - On the Gaps.....	52
Chapter 3.....	57
A Genealogy of Diversity, Race and Power	57
Introduction.....	57
Genealogy.....	59
Critical Discourse Analysis.....	70
Ethical Concerns.....	71
Concluding Remarks - On Genealogy, Diversity and Race.....	73
Chapter 4.....	77
Diversity and Belonging: A Theoretical Approach	77
Introduction.....	77
Key Concepts: Discourse, Power, Space.....	78
Belonging.....	88
(Non-)Belonging Through Encounter.....	92
Hailing and Belonging.....	99
Be-longing.....	99
Conclusion: On Discourse, Race, and Belonging as Co-Constructed in Space....	104
Chapter 5.....	108
The Performativity of Diversity	108
Introduction.....	108
On Performativity, Racialization, and Diversity Discourse.....	113
Chapter 6.....	123
Being the Exception(al)	123
Introduction.....	123

Moving 'Beyond Race'.....	124
On Being the Exception(al) - Final Thoughts.....	170
Chapter 7.....	172
Being Like No Other	172
Introduction.....	172
On Being Like No Other - Final Thoughts.....	193
Chapter 8.....	195
Through Consultation	195
Introduction.....	195
Race-Pleasure and the Commodification of Others.....	197
Consultation, Democracy, and Diversity Discourse.....	200
Through Consultation - Final Thoughts.....	221
Conclusion - On Belonging and Desire.....	223
Chapter 9.....	226
On Diversity Discourse and the Problem of Agency	226
Introduction.....	226
Theorizing the Local - Critical Insights.....	228
On the Problem of Agency.....	238
Final Thoughts - On Complicity and <i>This Diversity Work</i>	245
References.....	246
Appendices.....	260
Appendix A: Invitation to Participate in a Study.....	261
Appendix B: Consent Form.....	262
Appendix C: Interview Guide.....	264

Chapter 1

The Diversification of Diversity



In July of 2015, a billboard was erected in the state of Arkansas with the message “‘diversity’ is a code word for white genocide”.¹ When I first saw this picture, I was immediately struck by how “diversity” could imply and pose such a threat in Arkansas, yet be championed as a defining feature and asset of Toronto. If diversity could signify white genocide in one place, and inclusion and welcoming of difference in another,² how many other ways could diversity be taken up? How might diversity constitute and/or threaten space, and bodies within that space? How might bodies and space shift diversity’s terms of incorporation and articulation?

These questions fueled my interest in exploring the ways in which diversity moves, travels, shifts and encapsulates. Diversity circulates and moulds, attaching to different spaces and to “different” bodies. Diversity can mobilize values of tolerance, equality and democratic

¹ There have been numerous other billboards with messages about diversity or anti-racism being about white genocide or “anti-white”. Many (but not all) are connected to the “White Genocide Project” – see <http://whitegenocideproject.com/diversity-is-white-genocide-billboard-goes-up-in-arkansas/>

² See for example 2015-2018 City of Toronto Strategic Plan (and City of Toronto motto ‘Diversity Our Strength’): https://www1.toronto.ca/City%20Of%20Toronto/Equity,%20Diversity%20and%20Human%20Rights/Divisional%20Profile/Policies%20-%20Reports/A1503399_Strat_Plan_web.pdf

inclusion of ethno-racial and/or immigrant groups at the same time that it masks the continued exclusion of racialized bodies in socio-political spaces. For some, diversity is a celebration of multi-cultures; for others, diversity reinforces racial lines, whiteness and racism. Diversity can be simultaneously celebrated and anxiety-producing. It can authorize acceptance and rejection. In short, diversity *does* many things. Much like Sara Ahmed (2012) was in her book *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, I became increasingly interested in the task of following diversity around, to see what it does (or does not do, as Ahmed would suggest in her chapter on commitments to diversity as non-performative). However, I began the research for this thesis with the idea that diversity could “do” different things, and could be thought of and “done” differently, depending on *where* and *with/by whom*.

The story of this research project begins after years of reflecting on my own work as a former political staff person in the City of Toronto. I often think about what diversity “did” for me, as one of the only racialized women in a senior political staff position at the City. I used the term “diversity” to gain the support of City Councillors, political and bureaucratic staff, while disguising my intentions of inserting an anti-racist agenda into the City’s policies and practices. I became confident that politicians and staff would support my initiatives *because* I argued for anti-racist action in diversity terms. I often argued on the need for representation and the lived experiences of Toronto’s “diverse communities” in order to shape anti-racist policies and practices at the City, believing without hesitation that my audience would know exactly what (or more precisely, who) I meant by “diverse communities”. Looking back, I cannot recall one incident in which I was asked to clarify what or who I meant. My anti-racist initiatives were also

often taken up as a reflection of the City of Toronto's "promising practices" and success in "achieving diversity" (Averill, 2009, p. 39).³

Although I believed that diversity "did" something for me in particular as an anti-racist activist in the City, what became increasingly clear is that diversity ended up *being* about the same thing: race, and the reproduction of race. I had not thought until a few years ago about how and why diversity becomes synonymous with race in the City of Toronto. As Lentin and Titley (2011) write, "[diversity] always has a constitutive centre, unquestioned and assumed" (p. 10). Perhaps this is the most important point to consider, in terms of what diversity does - that the "smokescreen" of diversity (Darder & Torres, 2004, p.1) enables a simultaneous synonymy and obscuring of race which remains largely unexamined and/or unchallenged in everyday writing and speech acts. I wrote this thesis with the explicit aim of making the invisible, visible. Specifically, in this thesis I introduce a series of theoretical and empirical provocations which seek to expose that which undergirds and obscures the co-articulation(s) and reproduction(s) of diversity and race in the City of Toronto.

The work of this thesis is grounded in a theoretical framework which was inspired primarily by evocative books of Sara Ahmed and Nirmal Puwar. In *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Sara Ahmed (2012) explains how diversity work can entail insisting on belonging in institutional spaces where Others are not expected and/or assumed to be. The very act of insisting on your belonging can, as Ahmed suggests, confirm "the improper nature of your residence" (p. 177). In *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*,

³ A project I initiated as political staff in 2007 advocated that the City of Toronto's Board of Health citizen members be at least 50% "visible minorities", so that the Board could begin to investigate the racialization of health, poverty and income. The motion I wrote to the Board of Health asking that the composition of the Board change passed unanimously, and later became an example of the City's leadership in achieving diversity – See Maytree Foundation's "Diversity Matters" report, p. 28-41 http://maytree.com/PDF_Files/DiversityMatters.pdf

Nirmal Puwar (2004) similarly examines what happens when racialized and women's bodies occupy spaces in which they are seen not to belong. For Puwar, the multiple assumptions and reflexes that are engendered in the encounter with "bodies out of place" reflect and reaffirm the naturalization of whiteness and masculinity in privileged spaces, even as "diversity" purports to celebrate, value and include difference. Although Ahmed and Puwar make poignant statements about the historical, social, political and racial constructions of space, belonging and bodies, Puwar (2004) also suggests that there are elements which permit certain 'Othered' bodies to conditionally belong, as "familiar rather than unfamiliar strangers" (p. 123).

During my research, I became increasingly intrigued by the intricacies of belonging/not belonging in space, specifically the terms under which belonging is "granted" to racial Others. I also wanted to investigate how and under what conditions belonging is negotiated by racial Others in the diverse City, and if/how these negotiations re-confirm and naturalize whiteness in a City that *requires the inclusion and celebration(s) of (racial) difference in order to make itself up*. For me, the City of Toronto could not claim to be "one of the most diverse cities in the world [who] has gained an international reputation for the successful management of its diversity" (City of Toronto, 2003a, p. 2) without the support and inclusion of *some* racial/"diverse" bodies in the City. I asked: what are the terms under which racial Others come to be included and "managed" in the diverse City? How might the negotiations of belonging for racial Others in the City authorize the City's various diversity claims? I also wanted to think through how and *why* racial Others continue to negotiate their belonging in the City, if what these negotiations accomplish is a reconfirmation and reproduction of race, whiteness and power in space, as Ahmed and Puwar suggest. What else might these negotiations of belonging offer, accomplish and/or *do* for racial Others in the City? How might diversity discourse enable and/or foreclose

these negotiations? In Chapter Four of thesis, I address these questions. In doing so, I theorize how belonging for racial Others in the City cannot be thought independently of diversity discourse, and thus from the reproduction and organization of race.

In this thesis, I also pay close attention to the specificities of diversity in space, particularly as diversity is used both to describe and *effect* the City of Toronto's claims of leadership in addressing and managing issues of diversity and racism. One of the aims in this thesis is to show how experiences and discussions of racism get taken up and framed in a City which repeatedly claims to have expertise and leadership on eliminating racial discrimination. I also ask what implications the spatial configurations of diversity might have on how (and the terms under which) racial bodies come to be included and excluded in the City. Diversity can shape how we think about and talk about (or not think about/talk about) racism in various spaces. How diversity is articulated spatially might also have the effect of *containing* these discussions via processes of inclusion (and exclusion) in the City. In my research I also came to realize that to think about and talk about racism in the diverse City is a difficult, risky and painstakingly emotional process. Although I would argue that this is not necessarily specific to the City of Toronto, I want to suggest that diversity discourse in the City *does* something specific to and with these experiences, and to/with the bodies that describe them. This thesis offers some critical insights into how doing diversity in the City requires the careful management and containment of space, and bodies within that space.

Theorizing the Local – the Research Project

This research project is concerned with how race is produced and organized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. As Keil explains: “to Americans, the Canadian metropolis is everything American cities are not....the sharp racial and ethnic segregation typical of American

cities does not exist, rather, a colourful mosaic of ethnically diversified communities creates an urban landscape that is full of surprises” (1994, as cited in Croucher, p. 8). The City of Toronto’s motto “Diversity Our Strength” implies a celebration of ethnic harmony and multicultural inclusion in a city that is now over fifty percent people of colour (Altilia, 2003; Saloojee and Siemiatycki, 2002). In her book *Municipalities and Multiculturalism - The Politics of Immigration in Toronto and Vancouver*, Kristin Good (2009) argues that the official adoption of the City of Toronto’s motto is one example of how integral the accommodation, integration and engagement with immigrant and ethno-cultural groups is to the City’s mandate and image. In Good’s view, initiatives such as these show how the City of Toronto goes “well beyond their ‘limits’” to respond to and successfully manage its diversity (p. 87). As she also suggests, it is evident that diversity, multiculturalism and inclusion are extremely important to the City of Toronto, as “community leaders representing immigrants and ethno-cultural minorities would not support an increased municipal role in immigrant settlement and multiculturalism policy if the city were not responsive to their concerns” (p. 65). Isin and Siemiatycki (1997) also write that mobilization of immigrants and ethno-cultural groups in the political life of the city demonstrate their willingness to assert their citizenship rights in Toronto, a city with a “tradition of accommodating diversity” (p. 105).

However, research also indicates that despite the City of Toronto’s motto, the City has consistently excluded racialized communities from its political decision-making processes (Altilia, 2003). In her study of the City of Toronto, Altilia (2003) argues that diversity is useful to the maintenance of power because it presents socially constructed difference in a linear form. Diversity precludes analyses of inequity within those differences and of the social relationships

that create them. As such, the exclusion of racialized communities in Toronto's municipal government is not prioritized, or even addressed (Altilia, 2003).

In the City of Toronto, the term “diversity” vacillates between presence *and* absence, inclusion *and* exclusion, mobilization *and* repression of people of colour. Furthermore, any tensions between the “inclusion” of racial bodies and the “management” of racial bodies dissolve to a point where they appear in a natural, even symbiotic relationship. How and under what conditions do these tensions become resolved? This dissertation takes these paradoxical moments as its point of departure. Specifically, this dissertation seeks to investigate diversity as a discourse, and as a mechanism of power. The focus of this work moves beyond an attempt to capture the “essence” or “origins” of diversity, to an examination of how power negotiates and transforms multiple conceptual, racial and embodied schisms into the re-production and justification of particular historical “truths” and knowledge which provide *conditions for the possibility and (re-)emergence of diversity in the present*. As Stoler (1995) argues, power organizes “truths” (or truth-claims) in a way that justifies and re-produces historical, social, and racial distinctions and exclusions in the world. This dissertation poses the question of which historical conditions and practices, tied to what kind of truth-claims, are re-articulated and justified by diversity discourse, in order to begin to grasp the political force behind truth, knowledge, and diversity itself.

As Hook (2007) suggests, the work of exposing the “truth” of a discourse is to unravel what appears as self-evident and linear; to show its discontinuities, exclusions and alternative accounts so that its very essence and logic as a “given” explodes (p. 144). The research of this dissertation encompasses two main objectives: (1) to explore the productive and political workings of truth and power by unearthing the “local, discontinuous, disqualified, illegitimate

knowledges” (Foucault, 1980, p. 83) of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto; and (2) to explore the ways in which diversity discourse, its historical “truths” and (local) effects construct and are re-constructed by the subjectivities of ethno-racial City of Toronto staff who are charged with systematizing – at least minimally – the knowledge, truth-claims and practices of diversity. The latter objective is concerned with Derek Hook’s (2007) assertion that racialized affects disrupt what would otherwise be theorized as a seamless exchange between institutional and individual forms of power. As he suggests, the norms and ideals of discursive practices produce racialized affects which condition psyches and subjectivities in various contexts, and which also produce different sets of tactics and techniques “in order to fulfill various tasks and objectives of power” (p. 255). In this vein, I also explore the multiple positionings of racialized City of Toronto staff in the active subjectivization and instrumentation of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto.

I began this research project by following around what diversity does with, through, and for racialized staff in the City of Toronto. In the first phase of this study, I conducted fifteen semi-structured interviews with City staff who self-identified as part of an ethno-racial group, a “visible minority” and/or person of colour. The interviews took place at various locations in Toronto – in staff offices, nearby boardrooms, in coffee shops and libraries. Recruitment of the fifteen interviewees took approximately eight months. As I describe in Chapter Three, there was deep hesitation from many of the interviewees to participate in a study which asked them to talk about what they feel the term “diversity” does, in the City, and for the City’s policies and practices.

Although the interviews were slated to be approximately one and a half hours, many (if not most) of the interviews went to two hours, if not more. The conversations I had with the

interviewees for this research project continue to resonate with me, for many reasons. Although my explicit aim was to uncover how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto (re-)produces and is (re-)produced by the subjectivities offered in its name, as a former insider I experienced the City of Toronto and diversity discourse in ways that many of those who participated in the study describe. I struggled with compartmentalizing moments of pain, anger, and in some cases, feelings of comradery. One of the ethical concerns that I continue to struggle with is the work of turning the narratives of struggle of racialized Others in the City into “diversity discourse data”, which I discuss in more detail in Chapter Three, and in the final chapter. However, as an “outsider”, as an academic with the task of examining the various ways in which racialized City staff fulfill the objectives of diversity discourse and power, I was committed to my concern with what the various positionings that racialized Others take up in the City “does” for diversity discourse, in the interests of power. In this first phase, I also became interested in how racialized City staff describe how they “do” diversity shapes their sense of *who they are* in the City. The question of what racial Others do for diversity discourse is thus also a question of what diversity discourse does for and to racial Others in the City. In my final chapter, I reveal how this positioning, as a researcher who “reveals” what diversity does, engages with multiple contradictions and complicities which I seek to expose.

The second phase of my project involved following diversity around in City of Toronto texts. This proved to be a huge undertaking – combing through hundreds of City of Toronto documents to trace how, when and under what terms diversity moved, shifted and encapsulated in order to reproduce and organize race in the City. In this second phase, I had several illuminating moments. The first was the realization that exploring what diversity *does* is not simply about tracing and noting where diversity shows up in City texts. As I describe in Chapter

Six, diversity circulates in a web of discourses, to reproduce and re-articulate race and racial norms. The second phase of my project thus grew into one that traced the historical continuity and repetition of *racial norms*, which diversity discourse regenerates in the present. For example, as Puwar (2004) explains, representation of racial Others is often taken to mean that diversity is ‘achieved’ in institutional settings. While it becomes possible in my dissertation to trace the idea of representation to diversity rhetoric, in speech acts and in texts, I also show how representation circulates with and through other discourses/terms, such as “equal opportunity”, “equity”, “inclusion”, multiculturalism” and “antiracism”. In this thesis I thus describe the idea of representation as a reproduction and reorganization of race and racial thinking which becomes re-articulated and regenerated through a web of discourses, including diversity discourse in the City of Toronto.

During the second phase, I also developed a firmer, more grounded sense of direction for my research, particularly as I started to think about diversity in the City of Toronto as a performative. Judith Butler (2011) brilliantly describes performativity as “the reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains (p. xiii); that “it is always a reiteration of a norm or set of norms, and to the extent that it acquires an act-like status in the present, it conceals or dissimulates the conventions of which it is a repetition” (p. xxi). As I describe in Chapter Five, in my preliminary reading of City texts against the interview transcripts, what began to resonate was how the historical and racial terms which diversity discourse reproduced and organized seemed to re-circulate relatively unobscured and unnoticed. What also struck me during this reading of City texts against interview transcripts was Butler’s idea that any intelligibility, viability, qualification, and identification(s) *are effects of* regulatory norms and the power of discourses to govern, materialize and/or disavow bodies and

subjectivities. Importantly, this theorization of performativity enabled a close examination of how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto enables, forecloses, assumes and limits forms of speaking, writing and *being* via the regeneration of historical and racial norms.

Nirmal Puwar (2004) argues that we have become so caught up in the language of diversity and in its widely proclaimed and celebrated social, economic, and political successes, that what diversity actually *is* remains unexplored. As Ahmed (2007) and Shaw (2007) also suggest, the elusive nature and lack of clear definition of diversity is exactly what allows the term to signify the inclusion *and* exclusion, transcendence *and* containment of racialized bodies. However, as McWilliam (2003) asserts, moving from an inquiry into the contents of familiar terms to their conditions of possibility allows an engagement with and a problematization of what counts as “common sense and knowing” (p. 66).

In this dissertation, I move beyond the question of what diversity is, to what diversity does, in order to examine how historical antecedents of race, racial thinking, and the production and categorization of racial Others are (re-)produced and organized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto in the present. By investigating what diversity does, I seek to expose how, why and under what conditions race and race thinking becomes simultaneously obscured and reinvigorated in the City through the discourse of diversity. I also respond to Sara Ahmed’s (2012) call for a genealogy of the term “diversity” in order to better understand its institutional appeal, as well as her desire for us “to have conversations with each other from our specific locations” (p. 16) to understand how diversity manifests in the local. This thesis thus begins a complex interrogation into the conceptual and material logics which evoke the (re-)emergence of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto as a *specific and local context*.

The work of this dissertation is supported by a critical race approach, as well as literature, research and theory from a wide array of fields including critical race studies, postcolonial theory, poststructuralist feminism, cultural studies, political science, geography, and anthropology in order to better understand how race is a productive force in discursive and material formations at the local, national, and global levels. Examining the dimensions of these works is critical to understanding how race is organized and produced across time and space, and to gaining a deeper level of analysis on the centrality of race in the configuration of the City of Toronto, through multiple discourses, expressions and encounters. In this thesis I rely on, bring together and build upon a range of inspiring works, including those of Sara Ahmed, Nirmal Puwar, Himani Bannerji, Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, Ann Laura Stoler and Jane M. Jacobs, to produce a local theorization of diversity which articulates how and under what conditions diversity discourse coalesces in and with space to reproduce race in the City of Toronto. It is my hope that the local theorization of diversity which I have produced compels deeper interrogations into the salience and regeneration(s) of diversity discourse and race in other spaces, as well as how bodies are organized and reproduced in and across spaces in racial terms through the discourse of diversity.

Organization of the Thesis

This introduction has offered some key insights into what is to come in the following chapters. In the next chapter (Chapter Two) I review some of the literature on diversity discourse which enables a further exploration of literature on the role of the city, the state, and the body in its articulation(s). Importantly, in this chapter I contrast ‘liberal-democratic’ perspectives with critical race scholarship in order to expose the significance and underlying effects of race on popular notions of diversity, multiculturalism, the city and the state. I also identify the gaps in

the literature in order to situate the relevance of this thesis in and across local, national and international spaces.

Chapter Three elaborates on how I used genealogy as a research method in order to produce an account of diversity with historical antecedents of race. Tamboukou (1999) explains how discursive practices of the past are reconstituted in the present, and that the focus on genealogy as a method asks “what is happening now” and how this “now” is a re-emergence of historical relations of power in the present (p. 203). In this chapter, I draw heavily on Foucault’s multiple works in order to situate the approach to my research. However, drawing on heterogeneous approaches also gave rise to a thesis which includes and *goes beyond* Foucault’s methods, in order to produce a genealogy of race and racism. In this chapter I also describe the first and second phases of my research in more detail, including the methods I used for analyzing my interview and textual data. I then discuss some of the ethical concerns that arose during the research process; some of which remain unresolved.

In Chapter Four, I review and expand on popular understandings of belonging in order to provide a lens through which to frame and inform the findings of this thesis. In this chapter, I develop a three-pronged approach to belonging which questions how and under what conditions belonging for racial Others is actualized (if in fact it can be) via diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. This chapter also introduces important provocations into the role of emotion and affect, both as they construct and reinforce the negotiations of belonging of racial Others, and as they are interpellated through diversity discourse in the City. I argue in this chapter that the negotiations of belonging of racial Others, through the discourse of diversity, invite specific subjectivities, emotions and desires which are structured by and grounded in the reproduction(s) of race.

Chapter Five explores the idea of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto as a performative. As I described earlier in this chapter, this critical insight evolved part way through my readings of interview data against City of Toronto texts, and enabled a deeper exploration and context for the findings of this research project. In this chapter, I draw on Judith Butler's (2011) notion of performativity alongside Sara Ahmed's (2002) theorization of racialization so that it becomes possible to understand how diversity discourse enables intelligibility and articulation(s) of racial Others in the City via the reproduction and organization of race. I also bring in Chen's (1999) theorization of "hegemonic bargaining" to situate how the performativity and racializing practices of diversity discourse are "met" and/or negotiated by racialized City staff – in short, to offer a context for what staff *do* to and with diversity. By expanding on these theorizations of performativity and racialization, I offer a way of conducting a detailed reading of interview data and City texts which traces how diversity discourse and belonging in the City is continually reconstituted through the inclusion *and* abjection of racial Others, in racializing terms. The contents of this chapter provide some illuminating insights into how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto simultaneously (re-)produces, organizes and *occludes* race.

Chapter Six, the first of the three findings chapters, reflects on how the belonging of racial Others is in various ways premised on "being the exception(al)" in the City. This chapter discusses how the positioning of being the exception(al) in the City is *produced*, conditioned and subjectivated by the recirculation of race, which further determine the inclusions and exclusions that make up diversity discourse in the City. In this chapter, I describe how diversity enables and is enabled by multiple "exceptional" subject positions, which in various and sometimes contradictory ways seek to move diversity and the City 'beyond race'. What is concealed in these various moves towards being the exception(al) is how race is simultaneously refused and

reinscribed in order to reinforce separations between the (exceptional) “us” (insider-Others, “diverse”, those who ‘belong’) and “them” (stranger strangers, other Others, abjected) in the City. These refusals and reinscriptions are also *spatially* configured, so that the City is reproduced as an exceptional space. I argue in the chapter that the conditional belonging of racial Others in the City, and the maintenance of the City as an exceptional space, is thus dependent on the abjection of racial other Others.

Chapter Seven builds upon the analyses of chapter six, to highlight how ‘being like no Other’ in the City is premised on the repetition of racial stereotypes and/or having “specialized knowledge” of racial other Others. In this chapter I discuss some of the problems that follow when knowledge of the Other gets taken up as a *condition* of belonging for racial Others in the City, especially as it re-authorizes colonial thinking, interventions and practices, as well as the naturalization of the white, middle class male in the space of the City as the true bearer of knowledge and “truth”.

In Chapter Eight, I expose how the City’s claims to “lead” in the areas of consultation with and democratic participation of racial Others disguises the terms under which Others are included and erased through the commodification of Otherness, and through race-pleasure. I also discuss the role of racialized City staff in the promotion of consultation, specifically the role of and complexities involved with “included” racial Others inviting other racial Others to participate in the City, but within the narrow scripts of diversity discourse. I suggest in this chapter that the encounter with the racial Other via consultation is a *necessary* condition of belonging for racialized City staff, and to the City’s re-articulations of leadership on diversity and democracy. I also trace how, again, diversity enables the refusals and reinscriptions of racialization and race by narrowing intelligibility and articulations in negotiations of belonging,

through speech acts and through texts. In this chapter, I show how belonging via consultation and democratic participation in the City is invited through and reproduces race.

In the final chapter, I reflect on diversity discourse, race and power in the City of Toronto, and question whether or not agency is possible in the City. I offer a way of thinking through agency that requires critical attention to our selves, not as individual, rational and autonomous agents, but as subjects in and of power who are ‘made up’ with collusions, contradictions, and tensions. In this conclusion, my thesis illuminates the difficult work of examining our selves as extensions of power, and as non-unitary beings who are still capable of ‘changing the world’ in ways perhaps much different than we once thought. I also interrogate what agency in the City might look like, given how the City legitimizes and authorizes diversity discourse to achieve certain aims. The notion of agency thus requires entirely new ways of thinking through strategy and resistance, as well as *being* in relations of power.

Chapter 2

The Diverse City: An Overview

Introduction

In this chapter, I bring together literature on diversity, the city, the state, and the racial body in order to outline how diversity might need to be thought of as a discourse with local implications, particularly in the context of negotiations of belonging for racialized communities in urban spaces. In the first section of this paper I conduct a survey and critical review of existing literature on the significance of diversity in multiple contexts. I then bring together particular fields of literature, studies and authors in conversation with one another, in a way that expands on and problematizes notions of diversity in the West.

For example, current readings on the relationships between diversity, multiculturalism, ethno-racial groups and the City of Toronto generally outline gaps in political systems which negatively impact racialized and immigrant minorities – as systems which are seemingly unprepared for the confrontation with “minority groups demanding recognition of their identity, and accommodation of their cultural differences” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 10). As such, the major focus has been on how to make policies and practices more inclusive, more democratic, and more responsive to the needs of racialized and immigrant groups, in some cases in order to manage diversity and to compete on the international stage more effectively. The literature in this area calls for (more) democratic inclusion of ethno-cultural group needs in order to move beyond racial inequalities that are produced through systems.

In this chapter, I problematize this approach by contrasting it with literature from critical race theorists who attempt to explicitly draw out the racial character of systems; the ontological and epistemological assumptions that make the existence of a racial hierarchy “real”, and which

also excludes racialized bodies from several spaces, across time (Anderson, 1991b; Mills, 1998; Puwar, 2004). Thus what is presented in the literature as systems that produce racial inequalities will be critically re-engaged and situated within a broader field of work which seeks out *how race (re)produces systems*. The latter perspective concerns itself with what David Theo Goldberg (1993) calls “mapping racist culture” (p. 3). Examining the dimensions of this literature is critical to understanding how race is organized and produced across time and space, and to gaining a deeper level of analysis on the centrality of race in the configuration of the city, through multiple discourses, expressions and encounters. In this chapter I also outline gaps in the literature and demonstrate the relevance of this thesis at local, national and international levels.

Diversity

Scholars have written about diversity in the context of globalization, transnational flows and immigration of ethno-cultural groups to countries in the West, as an economic and corporate priority and advantage for organizations, and as a way to trivialize, organize, normalize, reproduce and *occlude* relations of race, gender and class. In her book *Death of a Discipline* (2003), Gayatri Spivak offers that in their quest to become centres of global knowledge production, Western institutions endorse multiculturalism, diversity, culturalism and pluralism: techniques of cultural knowledge-production which predicate recognition of difference on the ability to systematize otherness within codes of intelligibility that are not themselves subject to interrogation. She also argues that this knowledge production of the Other serves as an ideological function; it reinforces the inevitability and the stability of the centre. As Jordan and Weedon (2015) also write, “to celebrate cultural diversity without attention to the construction of this diversity is to leave long-established racist assumptions, integral to both the history and present of Western societies, unchallenged” (p. 162). Kirova (2008) similarly defines diversity as

a mechanism used by the dominant (white) group to essentialize difference, where the agenda in the production of this difference, and the different *from what* is not interrogated. Diversity discourse thus becomes as a form of “ideological trafficking between nationality and ethnicity”; those who create and benefit from diversity discourse remain hidden (McLaren, 1997, p.8). Mohanty (2003) also suggests that diversity as a discourse, “bypasses power as well as history to suggest a harmonious empty pluralism” (p. 193), while simultaneously (re-)categorizing people of colour as those who need to be controlled and managed. Goldberg (1993) traces the transition from liberalism and colonial strategies in the modern era to the unifying of difference and diversity management strategies in the postcolonial, and suggests that despite appearances, these are two strategies of reproducing and regulating the Other.

Current readings also acknowledge the intrinsic value and broader trend of what Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2002) call “‘selling diversity’ – whereby the skills, talents, and ethnic backgrounds of men and women are commodified, marketed, and billed as trade-enhancing” in Canada (p. 12). Jordan and Weedon (2015) describe how, in the age of diversity and cultural pluralism, racial Others have become “highly profitable commodities” (p. 155). For Shaw (2007), diversity is a consumable product of whiteness, rather than a range of types of people as it seems to suggest. Only those who have the class, cash and right ethnicity can enjoy the rewards and benefits of “ethnic” diversity (p. 95). Catungal and Leslie (2009) also suggest that diversity, specifically with respect to ethno-racial difference in Toronto, is included only to promote economic capacity and to market the city for trade and investment. Clayton (2008) argues that the middle class concept of multiculturalism has made diversity “attractive on certain economic and cultural terms” (p. 258). For Smith (2010), diversity draws directly on corporate logic, market based strategies, and the achievement of goals and standards alongside the

management and containment of internal differences. As Smith suggests, the new governing mentality under late capitalism requires that “these differences be ironed out and ‘integrated’” (p. 47). Diversity is therefore taken up by organizations, including academia, because of its detachment from social justice, equity and civil rights struggles (Smith, 2010, p. 47).

Himani Bannerji (2000) also explores some of the political uses and gains of diversity discourse in order to better understand its popularity. As Bannerji argues, through its banality diversity is able to obscure an un-marked whiteness, a politically and racially motivated agenda which re-constructs racial difference, and the mechanisms of power which solidify its truths. Diversity discourse, akin to multiculturalism, presents itself as value-free and neutral, signifying pluralism and difference across a horizontal space. It is through this de-politicized reading of difference that (cultural) difference can be re-deployed as a political tool to secure racial, gendered, and sexual ordering and hierarchies (Bannerji 2000, p. 548). Bannerji also explains the power and re-circulating effects of diversity discourse in various institutions, that it is often used by people even when they may see some of the negative consequences of using it. What makes diversity so dangerous is that in discourses of difference, the historical, ontological, political and economic violence of racism becomes subsumed within a celebration of cultures, disconnected from power (Bannerji, 2000). The assumption generated by diversity discourse is that racism simply cannot exist in a democratic society, so when racism is exposed, it is regarded as an isolated incident related to a number of unforeseeable mitigating factors, or the outcome of a longtime tradition that is no longer an identifiable part of Canada’s democratic nature (Henry & Tator, 1994). The pervasiveness of this kind of discourse thus deflects an examination of power evasive ideologies and restrictive views of equality, tokenism and paternalism. As such, diversity

discourse becomes “a fusion of cultural classification, or an empirical/descriptive gesture” infused and overdetermined with and through politics (Bannerji, 2000, p. 547).

Sara Ahmed (2012) describes how, through the discourse of diversity, “power can be redone at the moment it is imagined as undone” (p. 13). For Ahmed, the “promise of happiness” (p. 165) that diversity re-generates enables certain ways of “doing” diversity and of *being* diverse in institutions that leaves unexamined a racist status quo. The mainstreaming of the language of diversity in and across spaces and the way it is marketed and circulated internationally as a promise of inclusion of bodies that ‘look different’ both reinforces and is reinforced by institutional statements of commitment which Ahmed calls “non-performative” (p. 117). Through their reproduction and circulation, these institutional statements of commitment to ‘achieve’ diversity goals and/or initiatives work to reaffirm the ‘goodness’ of the institution, while concealing “the failure of that document to do anything” (Ahmed, 2012, p. 97). In her analyses of interviews with diversity workers in higher education institutions in Australia and the United Kingdom, Ahmed is also able to show how diversity is taken up in higher education as “form of repair” to the injuries of racism (p. 164). This, for Ahmed, leads to the assumption that those who speak about racism are the *problem* – they must simply ‘get over’ the past in order for racism to disappear. Diversity thus becomes a defense of, mobilization for, and reaffirmation of institutional whiteness through the denial of ongoing issues of racism.

Swan and Fox (2010) also write about the professionalization and managerialism of diversity work, specifically how the “business case” (p. 571) for diversity in the public sector both shapes and impacts the activism of diversity workers, particularly of racialized minorities and white women. The authors question if/when the political resistance strategies of diversity workers slide into co-optation, under increasing obligations towards managerial technologies

such as auditing, performance indicators, monitoring and codifying of “diversity competencies” (p. 569). Diversity workers are further constrained in their work because they are perceived to have special and essential knowledge about their own embodied experiences, and *only* these experiences, which often narrows their mobility and wider applicability in organizations. The authors suggest that “becoming an insider” (Swan & Fox, 2010, p. 585) through diversity work in the public sector thus occurs in multiple, complex and challenging ways, which at any given moment can involve both resistance *and* co-optation.

However, Ahmed (2007) argues that there are pros and cons to the language of diversity, precisely because of its lack of fixed meaning and its ability to move. While she does not discount that the term has generally been used to conceal privilege and to inhibit social and anti-racist action, Ahmed argues that it can actually *work*, depending on what institutional commitments that are already in place. Ahmed suggests that we should not be concerned with what diversity can or cannot do, but instead with who our audience is, in order to figure out “how to make it work” (2007, p. 240). As Ahmed also argues, diversity can be re-attached strategically to social justice work and other struggles against social inequities precisely because of its social currency in multiple spaces.

It is at this juncture, where critical scholarship on diversity, difference and (unexamined) whiteness meets Ahmed’s (2007) assertion that diversity “*can work*”, that it becomes necessary to explore the specificities of space. In the following section of this chapter, I review literature which discusses race and belonging in urban space/cities, in order to offer a context from which to interrogate where, when, for whom and under what conditions diversity discourse might “work” (and not work). I then explore literature which contextualizes the relationship between cities and the State, in order to consider how Canada’s multiculturalism policies and discourses

might condition and/or reflect diversity discourse in the City of Toronto, and how they deploy, complicate and organize (ethno-)racial “difference” in similar and site specific ways. In the last section of the chapter, I review literature on the politics of representation of racial Others in and across socio-political spaces, in order to pursue a discussion of how and under what conditions racial Others might be included, excluded, co-opted and *mobilized* via national and local discourses and practices. Within this dissertation, this last section offers preliminary ways of thinking through, contextualizing and contesting agency and modes of resistance within and through discourse.

The Racial City. Scholars who focus on citizenship and democracy in Canada have argued that cities are sites where citizenship is actively challenged and re-configured (McDonald, 2007; Sassen, 1998). For example, Isin and Siemiatycki (1997) argue that cities are sites where new conceptualizations, expressions and struggles of citizenship emerge, as immigrant and ethno-cultural communities continue to reside, grow and assert their presence in urban spaces. As they state, “diversity challenges citizenship” (p. 92). The authors also suggests that mobilization of immigrants and ethno-cultural groups in the political life of the city demonstrate their willingness to assert their citizenship rights in Toronto, a city with a “tradition of accommodating diversity” (p. 105). Good (2009) echoes Isin and Siemiatycki’s assertion that municipalities are important hubs where multicultural democratic citizenship is often tested and/or expanded to increase participation and access to local governance for immigrant and ethno-cultural groups. However, Good also argues that the meaning and value of multicultural democratic citizenship is contested, municipality by municipality. According to Good (2009) the leadership, advocacy, and political mobilization of Toronto’s immigrant settlement sector and

diverse local leaders is what made the City of Toronto a successful, multicultural municipality, by having a stronger role in immigration and multiculturalism policy.

As McDonald (2007) suggests, cities both enable and transform active citizenship through the political activism of marginalized groups who seek to gain access to social services, city services and the right to public spaces of the city. An example of this is provided by Isin and Siemiatycki (2002), who argue that symbolic and spatial forms of urban (and demonstrably racialized and Orientalist) citizenship were directly challenged by Muslims in Toronto who sought to erect a Mosque in North York. Participation in the economic, social, cultural, and political spheres of the city has typically excluded racialized groups, but the active and collective claims to urban space put forward by Muslims in this case directly challenged the discourses of citizenship that mark conditions of space, place and belonging, that present Islam and democracy/citizenship in binary forms, and that re-make Muslims as domestic threats (Isin & Siemiatycki, 2002, p. 193). As Isin and Siemiatycki suggest, the collective presence of Muslims in the political sphere and the claims to urban space that they put forward directly challenged the universal, liberal citizenship that is typically and spatially constituted through the exclusion of the “strange outsider” (p. 193). As they argue, conflicts over racialized space and citizenship, and thus who belongs, are becoming increasingly visible in urban politics.

However, as Clayton (2008) suggests, negotiations of social, political and economic belonging in urban space have conditioned both the production and valorization of difference. Cross and Keith (1993) argue that the city is conceptualized in theory, policy and/or practice not based on any empirical reality, but through a series of discourses that reflect patterns of urban production, consumption and competitiveness, which in turn have the power to shape and reflect the lives of people living in urban spaces (p. 7). As Cross and Keith (1993) suggest, it is “

ethnicity [that] is celebrated in the collage of the exotic cultural pick and mix...the centrality of race to the configuration of the postmodern city, turns out on closer inspection not to be missing at all, only unspoken” (my emphasis, p. 8). The experiences of immigrant social, political and economic marginalization are rarely reflected in portrayals, celebrations and promotions of culture; nor are the racial divisions of labour and exploitation that constitute the new urban economy (p. 8). The representation of the city is thus contained within an economic and racial narrative that simultaneously excludes and reconstitutes race and the racial Other. It is therefore imperative to examine the dreams, fantasies and desires which underlie major shifts in the (re-)making of cities, and critically re-evaluate what might appear to be naturally-occurring images, identities and interactions in urban space through processes of globalization, capitalism and their attendant economic and political transformations (Keith, 2002).

Goonewardena and Kipfer (2006) argue that cities have historically and theoretically had a co-productive relationship with imperialism. *With and through* imperialism, the city transformed from being the centre of political, economic and colonial power and hegemony extending absolute rule and authority over a colonized periphery, to the site of rapid urbanization, drawing colonized bodies from the outside to within its borders to facilitate economic expansion and an increased concentration of capital (Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2006). Imperialism, in its continual quest for total economic, political and military dominance, has been re-packaged and re-invented in new, and some would say insidious ways *with and through* shifting symbolic and experiential geographies of the city.

Shaw (2007) discusses the use of racialized discourses to control, manage and reinforce difference and the racialization of space in the city. She argues that the discourses of decline that re-produce the image of the “black ghetto” reinforce the existence of the big, international

city...as “a global cosmopolitan metropolis complete with its own ‘problem area’” (p. 138). The ghetto is constructed symbolically and discursively as a racialized space: the social, political, economic and physical marginalization of racialized bodies in the ghetto authorizes white entitlement to urban space through the logic that “*they* simply cannot cope in the city” (my emphasis, p. 180). Races are thus seen to have their naturally places, biologically and spatially. The imagery of the ghetto symbolizes and reinforces the colonial narrative of inferiority, disease, poverty and savagery, which is re-circulated by the media and residents in the neighbourhood to bring about urban change, regeneration and new ways of living and consuming (p. 175). For Shaw, the space(s) of whiteness (signified by the urban space of Sydney Australia) is constituted in direct relation to marginal space of Indigeneity (signified by the Aboriginal settlement “The Block”). Furthermore, the exclusion of Indigenous peoples from the social, political and economic space of the city draws on colonial history and the mythology of ‘Terra Nullius’ (or ‘empty land’), which works to naturalize and protect the spatial and racial entitlements gained through colonization. As Shaw suggests, “everyday practices of denial or indifference to social inequalities and the pathologies they create have been socialized through discourse and the production of space” (p. 169).

In what Massey (2005) calls the “throwntogetherness of cities” (as cited in Clayton, p. 256), it is important to examine how race is experienced, practiced, interpreted and encountered in multiple ways, in and through the space of the city. Despite the appearance of being based in any cultural, demographic or empirical “reality”, images and imaginaries of the city are socially, spatially and racially constructed. As Razack (2002) explains, we must therefore uncover the social processes that map race onto space and furthermore, begin to “unmap [these] spaces...to uncover how bodies are produced in spaces and how space produces bodies” (p. 17). It is

important to ask how whites “(re-)create their own identities and superiority against the bodies of racialized others” (Razack, 2002, p. 49) and also to interrogate how the space of the city provides the ground for both the re-articulation and refusal of superior/inferior relations.

As Goonewardena and Kipfer (2005) suggest, “urbanism is the very technology of separation...capitalism now can and must refashion(s) the totality of space into *its own particular décor...*” (p. 29). Goonewardena and Kipfer (2006) also argue that urban space is a productive and reproductive force of capitalism and of the social relations required to sustain it. They argue that the exploitation of racialized labour which engenders capitalist accumulation and expansion is accomplished through the management of bodies in urban space; what Kristin Ross (1996) calls the “interior colonialism” (p. 7). Ross argues that the interior colonialism of France’s urban spaces isolates, contains and manages immigrant workers in the city, regulating their work and home lives through the conditions (and possibilities) of capitalist domination. Immigrant workers are brought into the city for production and consumption needs, but by and through economic exploitation, marginalization and the denial of participation in place-making, they occupy divided spaces of the city, and live in prescribed ways which preserve and reinforce wider social and economic inequalities. What is important here is that the *physical* displacement of immigrant workers to the suburbs outside the city was accompanied by anti-immigrant discourses, policies and practices of the local and central states, which reinforced the *social, political and economic marginalization* of immigrant workers, as well as the imaginary boundaries of Paris and other French cities (Ross, 1996). These anti-immigrant attitudes and practices also recycled the racism of the colonial Empire pre-urbanization, constituting what Etienne Balibar calls the spatial “neoracism” of the state (as cited in Goonewardena & Kipfer, p. 33).

Analyses of the complexities of discourse, city space and the conditions for exclusion, inclusion and production of Othered bodies can also be applied to Franz Fanon's chapter, *Algeria Unveiled*, in his book, *A Dying Colonialism* (1965). Fanon argues that the racial exclusions and exploitations characteristic of colonialism were dependent on the psychic, spatial organization of colonized bodies in colonial cities, in particular the necessary ordering and administration of control outwards, from the city to the countryside (Fanon, 1965, as discussed in Kipfer, 2007). As such, the national liberation movements spurred by colonized populations often involved the transgressing of spatial boundaries, in particular the re-claiming of colonial city space. Fanon (1965) describes the role of Algerian women in the re-claiming of city space, as part of the Algerian liberation movements against colonial France. Algerian women concealed weapons in their veils as they moved from the native countryside to the European city, using the colonizer's desire to unveil Algerian women and to penetrate and emancipate Arab culture against him, in order to confront and subvert the colonial presence in the city (Fanon, 1965). As Bhabha (1994) suggests, "The veil that once secured the boundary of the home - the limits of woman - now masks the woman in her revolutionary activity, linking the Arab city and the French quarter, transgressing the familial and colonial boundary" (p. 91). For Kipfer (2007), Fanon connects this revolutionary transformation of the woman's body and her objectified self to *the transformation of urban space and its representations*. As Clayton (2008) offers, it is in and through the space of the city that racial difference is produced, maintained, and re-negotiated. Following Fanon, however, Kipfer (2007) also notes, "the revolutionary dialectic of body and world necessarily implies *transforming* urban space in all its dimensions, for it is urban space which articulates everyday life and social formations as a whole" (p. 714, my emphasis).

Although many have engaged with a feminist critique of Fanon's writings, in particular the question of woman's positionality, agency, and the supposed "end of Algerian patriarchy", Mohanram (1999) maps how the veiled Algerian woman comes to represent timeless, static culture and tradition; an object/other that needed to be brought into modernity through unveiling by the colonizer. At the same time, through discourses of nationalism and nationalist resistance, both land and the Algerian woman's veiled body are represented as man's property to be fought over (p. 73). Through these doubly-confining patriarchal representations, the woman's body, her agency and her subjectivity is lost (Mohanram, 1999, p. 74). She can only ever be represented through the veil. For example, Fanon (1965) argues that in her unveiling, the Algerian "revolutionary" woman has to relearn and renegotiate space and her own body, originally (and always) shaped through the presence of the veil. She thus finds it difficult to judge distances in the street and even finds it difficult to sense the shape of her own body. Her movements are almost entirely limited to the Arab city, and so, each time she enters the European city unveiled, she must "achieve a victory over herself, over her childish fears" (Fanon, 1965, p. 52). Feminist readings of Fanon's work suggest that how bodies come to know themselves through space is tangled in a web of complex social and spatial relations which construct multiple (i.e. gendered, classed, raced, sexualized) bodies as Other. While the "revolutionary woman" in Fanon's work penetrates the borders of the European city, and perhaps even, as Kipfer suggests, transforms representations of urban space through her negotiated presence, she is able to do this only through being (re-)bound, spatially, by gender and race. This occurs despite the insinuation in Fanon's text that "the overthrow of colonialism results in the overthrow of patriarchy as well" (Mohanram, 1999, p. 78). Spatially and discursively, the Algerian woman's movements are controlled through the (re-)construction of gender. That the Algerian woman, through the act of

veiling/unveiling, is included in or even transforms the space of the city, the nation, and/or the revolution needs to be re-evaluated within this context.

Goldberg (2002) traces urbanization to the end of the nineteenth century, where post-war rapid industrialization, labour demands and desires lured migrants from the global south to the northern metropolises. He argues that the new urban economy was premised on the increased prosperity and demands of whites, and on the labour, exploitation, close proximity and access to non-whites. However, this close(r) proximity to difference intensified the fantasies and fears of whites in European and North American capitalist cities (p. 208). White supremacy thus needed to be re-fashioned in urban space, in order to fulfill the desire for continued control, management, surveillance, exploitation and colonizing of non-white bodies. As Goldberg (2002) suggests, urban white fantasies and fears, and the desire for white supremacy manifested into a historicized and colour-blind “raceless” racism, which viewed racial differences not as inherently biological but as a matter of culture and (under)development (p. 212). Racial governance, racist exclusion, and white supremacy thus came to be incorporated and justified through the city, dividing whites with innate capacity for progress and economic growth from the racialized urban poor, imbued with discourses of lack. In many cases, the simultaneous erasure and management of race characteristic of a “raceless” racism required the administrative apparatuses of the local state, but this was seen to be “too complex for local, uneven, ad hoc interventions” (Posel, 2000, as cited in Goldberg, p. 208), and thus required national intervention. This is what Goldberg (2002) calls the beginning of state multiculturalism (p. 217).

The City and the State. There are multiple and in some cases conflicting interpretations of the relationship between the municipality and the central state on issues of race. Scholars argue that in the newly amalgamated Toronto, diversity policies and practices and the image of ethnic

harmony draws directly from liberal state multiculturalism and its celebrations of ethnic differences that have dominated Canadian public discourse for years (Catungal & Leslie, 2009; Croucher 1997; Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005). Yan (2003) argues that one of the most powerful incentives of diversity discourse is that it tends to conflate multiculturalism and anti-racism. Cross and Keith (1993) write that it both politically and theoretically necessary to interrogate whether the limits of “race equality” efforts in cities, as far as they may have been pushed, reflect the extent of the commitments made by municipalities themselves, or “the degree to which the mirage of an autonomous urban political machine masked the necessary subservience of the local to the central state” (p. 20). Scholarly research in this area demonstrates the complex interplay of factors that make interpreting and taking up the task of determining this ‘subservience’ a challenge.

For example, Good (2009) examines the various ways in which large, diverse Canadian cities draw on Canada’s multicultural policy to create localized “municipal multiculturalism policies” (p. 56). According to Good, municipal corporations adopt local, place-specific policies informed by Canada’s multiculturalism goals of immigrant and ethno-cultural integration, eliminating barriers to equitable participation, and facilitating a sense of belonging in political, social and economic spheres to foster “interethnic equity and social harmony” (p. xv). Good’s study aims to measure the degrees of “municipal responsiveness” to multiculturalism or, as she suggests, to what degree each City (Toronto, Vancouver, Richmond, Surrey, Markham, Coquitlan, Mississauga, and Brampton) has adapted their local governance structures and services to manage diversity, “consistent with Canada’s policy of official multiculturalism” (p. 48). “Responsiveness” is measured by how comprehensive municipalities are in adapting their structures, and how proactive they are in their policies, to respond to immigrant and ethno-

cultural diversity. Good argues that the City of Toronto is an extremely responsive municipality, and in fact is an “exceptional case” (p. 288) because of the City’s long-standing and successful “institutionalized commitment to multiculturalism policy goals” (Good, 2009, p. 57).

Several questions arise about the theoretical approach and implications of this work. For one, the success of multiculturalism policy in Canada and the conceptualization of “diversity management” that Good accepts in her work is highly contested; this is noted very rarely throughout the book. However, for the sake of the challenge issued by Cross and Keith (1993), if there is a direct relationship between state multiculturalism and municipal multiculturalism policies, as Good seems to suggest, what accounts for the differences in the responsiveness of various cities? Why is the City of Toronto, for example, more responsive than the City of Mississauga? Is the implication here that municipalities have some level of autonomy over how strictly they follow the goals of state multiculturalism?

Croucher (1997) and Goonewardena and Kipfer (2005) suggest that bourgeois urbanism uses multiculturalism in Canada to reinforce capitalist urbanization and the desires of the elite and middle class because of the failures of multiculturalism, particularly its avoidance of the racial hierarchies that sustain nationalist, multicultural policies and narratives. Multicultural rhetoric thus allows Toronto to re-imagine itself as ethnically harmonious while preventing racism from being seen as a social problem (Croucher, 1997, p. 341). While these scholars are highly critical of Canada’s multiculturalism policies, the impression here again is that multiculturalism policy and urban policy are being refashioned in similar and mutually dependent ways, and that municipal policies regarding race in particular are conditioned by policies of the state.

However, McDonald (2007) contradicts this assumption by pointing out that those municipal policies which prohibit questions about immigration status directly challenge the racism and

discrimination of the Canadian state. Sassen (1998) also argues that that city has evolved into a site where new claims are being made because of the denationalization of urban space. The relationship between municipalities and the state is also complicated by Clayton (2008), who argues that fear of immigrants, “strange outsiders” and terrorism that have typically been conceived of as issues of national concern are taken up differently in different city spaces (p. 256). Leicester, England for example has gained an international reputation for inter-ethnic harmony and lack of ethnic conflict, in spite of the fact that the city is home to a large population of non-whites and immigrants (p. 256). The City of Leicester has been highlighted by the state in comparison with other cities, where images of “race riots” threaten the future of multiculturalism in the UK (p. 256). As Clayton notes, both the British government and the media have looked to Leicester to understand how and why positive ethnic relations exist in this city, as well as how its successes as a modern, diverse, global city can be translated to other spaces.

While the focus of Clayton’s work is not necessarily on the relationships between the municipality and the state, it is important to note that Leicester is regarded both as a distinct and defining space of multiculturalism in England. The central state is simultaneously *responsible for and reliable on* Leicester to promote the success of its multiculturalism project. As Clayton observes, “there has been no overt and widespread ‘white’ backlash to a project of multiculturalism in Leicester” (p. 257). The City of Leicester is seen to be successful because it has appropriated the multiculturalism project of the UK and at the same time, the UK multiculturalism project is seen to be successful because it has worked in Leicester. However, Leicester also appears to be successful in its own right because it has avoided the white backlash that has plagued the larger multiculturalism project in the UK. The implication here is that the

City of Leicester has some autonomy from the state in how it deals with issues of race and racial meanings in the space of the city.

The autonomy of municipal government is further articulated by Gilroy (1987), who examines how the City of London's anti-racist policies are perceived in Britain. He points out that generally, the anti-racism policies of the City of London have received widespread opposition; they have been called a "product of Black and anti-racist zeal that is both destructive of democracy and subversive of order" (p. 229). Of interest here is that the City's anti-racist policies are seen as being absolutely unnecessary because "British people are not, nor have they ever been racist" (*Sun*, 24, 10.85, as cited in Gilroy, 1987). As such, the City of London has been described by British press, elites and state institutions as being seized by Blacks and their socialist allies, who use their political power to police the behavior of a tolerant British population. As Gilroy (1987) also argues, "this popular opposition to municipal anti-racism also constructs a version of the nationalist past which directly challenges the emphasis on slavery (p. 229). Municipal anti-racist efforts are thus re-framed, through popular and official discourses, as being threatening to the freedom, patriotism, and democratic nature of Britain, and by extension to its tolerant and welcoming citizenry. These municipal efforts are isolated as being contra the will of the British state and the general British population. Gilroy also points out that "this connection between contemporary British racism and the city is an important reminder that 'race' is a relational concept which does not have fixed referents" (p. 229).

The complex relationship between the City and the state is also articulated by Croucher (1997) in her study of ethnic relations in Toronto. Croucher examines Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's response to the 1991 Toronto riots, which occurred in reaction to racial profiling and the unfair and violent treatment of Black youth at the hands of Toronto police. Prime Minister

Mulroney issued the following statement after the riots: “I think Canadians ought to refrain from the suggestion that all of a sudden Canada is engulfed with very, very grave and overriding problems of racism” (Goodman, 1992, as cited in Croucher, 1997). Mulroney’s conflation of Toronto with Canada in this regard could symbolize the official ‘script’ of the nation overpowering the racial realities of the city, which highlights further the role of state multiculturalism in the management of race in cities. However, his statement could also be taken in this instance to mean a complete *dissociation* with racism in the city of Toronto, rendering Toronto completely separate from the multicultural state, as a result of its ongoing battles with racism.

The context of the 1991 Toronto riots evokes the larger question how experiences of racism are made to fit within official and racialized discourses of the local and nation-state. In a similar way to Leicester, Toronto has been heralded as “the Canadian city that works” (Croucher, 1997, p. 320) despite evidence to the contrary. The City of Toronto maintains its image of having successfully integrated immigrant and ethno-racial groups, despite the continued existence of racialized and immigrant groups at the margins of its social, political and economic spaces. However, defining the role of the central state in the production and management of racialized difference by the local state has proven to be quite a challenge. Furthermore, for scholars who suggest that the City of Toronto’s diversity draws directly from Canada’s multiculturalism policies, they tend to gradually conflate the two terms, and present them as essentially accomplishing the same thing. This begs the question: why the motto “Diversity Our Strength” in the City of Toronto, and not simply “Multicultural(ism) Our Strength”? A review of current literature on multiculturalism and the nation-state in Canada is thus required to explore how the state manages racial difference in and through the space of the nation. This allows for a

preliminary exploration into the possible connections and contradictions between Canada's multiculturalism and the diversity that is specific to the City of Toronto.

Multiculturalism. Canadian philosopher Will Kymlicka (1995) approaches the politics of multiculturalism from a liberal-democratic perspective. In his book *Multicultural Citizenship*, Kymlicka seeks to draw out what Canada, as a liberal nation committed to freedom of choice and equality of all individual citizens, need to take into account in the face of increased demands from national (Quebecers and Indigenous peoples) and ethnic (immigrant) minority groups to accommodate their identities and differences. Key to multiculturalism, he argues, is the accommodation of national and ethnic differences, “in order to move towards a more tolerant and liberal-democratic nation” (p. 19). Despite the assumption by many that accommodation of differences hinders a strong sense of national identity and unity, Kymlicka suggests that accommodation of minorities actually fosters a greater sense of belonging to a national culture that is willing to be revised and transformed in order to promote greater freedom, choice and opportunity for all its individual citizens. Thus the accommodation of national and ethnic minorities advances the liberal-democratic goals of the nation and the state, which “goes hand in hand with an increased sense of nationhood” (p. 88). Kymlicka argues that while national minorities present their own challenges that cannot be fully reconciled by multiculturalism, the integration of *ethnic* minorities is important to its success. As he suggests, newcomers' demands are evidence that they want to become integrated and committed citizens in Canada. Through the liberal goals of multiculturalism, these newcomers can be successfully integrated, which allows them to develop strong ties to their host country and for the country to also to be seen as “tolerant and welcoming of *diversity*” (p. 178; my emphasis).

Kymlicka (1995) also tackles the issue of to what degree freedom and choice should be made available to minority groups within the nation. For example, there are minority groups which might deny freedoms to members of their own group (i.e. women and lower castes), and as such they do not reflect the liberal values of the nation they inhabit. Kymlicka asks: to what extent should the liberal nation-state accommodate demands for protections in these cases? As he argues, toleration has its limits. External protections (to protect minority groups from discrimination in the larger society) should only be extended in cases where disadvantages can be rectified within groups, and where freedom within and equality between groups can be guaranteed. It should also only be extended to minority groups who protect the right and choice of individuals to leave their group if they so choose. Kymlicka (1995) argues that until these liberal goals are secured by minorities, it is impossible for a liberal-democratic nation-state to accommodate all of their demands (p. 152).

Several scholars have drawn on Kymlicka's work to contribute to ongoing debates on multiculturalism. For example, Shachar (2000) argues that multiculturalism might actually "threaten the rights of women in the name of cultural toleration" (p. 72), which in turn directly challenges the liberal-democratic nature of the nation and the state in Canada. She further argues that granting full citizenship and accommodation to identity groups without examining the inter and intra-group conflicts actually implicates the state in further silencing those voices who wish to criticize their own group policies but cannot because they remain oppressed by its members. Shachar (2000) thus recommends that Canada take into account the multiple power dynamics in and between identity groups, and facilitate a new approach in which the voices of less powerful members of a group can be heard (p. 78). In contrast, Nagle (2009) argues that multiculturalism can actually foster "democratic, peaceful and liberal forms of ethnic mobilization" (p. 172) to

promote the involvement of ethnic communities in political arenas. Nagle also argues that the vast interpretations of multiculturalism assumed by multiple states and multiple levels of government directly contradict the assumption that there is a “dominant discourse” of multiculturalism which serves neo-colonial desires of the state (p. 174).

Much work on multiculturalism and the nation-state has focused on how the state should respond to the increasing pressures of ethno-racial diversity, and whether or not state-sponsored multiculturalism can actually accommodate equal recognition of cultural identities in liberal democratic societies (see Benhabib, 2008; Good, 2009; Parekh, 2006; Taylor, 1994). According to Kymlicka (1995), liberalism grants the freedom to each individual to choose what is good in life, but more importantly, in the context of the liberal-democratic society, the freedom to reconsider and revise their conception of the good in light of new information and experiences. The democratic nation- state is instrumental in providing the space for accessing new information and experiences, thereby shaping new conceptions of the good (p. 82).

However, Lentin (2005) also argues that multiculturalism was not the outcome of the struggles of minority communities for greater recognition, as some might suggest, but an institutional policy designed to subvert any analysis on the connections between race and capitalism through centralizing cultural identity. Ahmed (2000) and Mackey (2000) also argue that multiculturalism puts cultural diversity to work and on display to attract and acquire global capital. As Ahmed (2000) further suggests, the exploitation of racialized bodies that have engendered the success of capitalist accumulation and profit are both concealed and re-created by multiculturalism policy.

Mills (1998) asks what would happen if we put race at the centre of modern political philosophy and contemporary liberal theory, rather than as an add-on item. Critical race

scholarship suggests that the ideologies of democracy and liberalism deny, constitute and are constitutive of race and racial exclusions (see for example Dhaliwal, 1996; Goldberg, 1993; Henry & Tator, 1994). When liberal orders offer inclusion and democracy for all in theory, in practice the systems that purport to embrace all equally are the very systems that devalue racialized bodies in the first place (Goldberg, 1993; Razack, 1998). Bannerji (1997) further argues that Indigenous and immigrant “Others” who are the carefully considered bodies in liberal-democratic theories of multiculturalism embody the terrain on which the liberal spirit of the nation-state is re-affirmed. As Bannerji (1997) suggests, liberalism cannot succeed without transcendence, and in liberal theories of multiculturalism, the move to multiculturalism and the embracing of “unity in *diversity*” empowers the nation-state to re-constitute its own liberal-democratic and tolerant character, as well as to (re-)name the core liberal subjects of the nation (white, English and French), marking Others as “multiculture” (p. 31, my emphasis). The racial immigrant is thus written into the discourse of the liberal nation as a *condition* of transcendence, rather than as the outcome of it. Conversely, the “Indian problem” gets taken up in the nation-building project as being inherently disruptive to multiculturalism and inherently divisive to the goals of national unity. This deliberate categorization manifests a psychic and material space in which White settler colonialism can co-exist with liberal democracy in Canada (Bannerji, 1997, p. 32).

Sunera Thobani (2007) similarly argues that multiculturalism in Canada has enabled the white, Western national subject to uphold white supremacy. As the nation is represented on the global stage as racially and culturally tolerant, the “exalted” subject (he who is elevated and powerful) is re-inscribed relationally through the Self/Other narrative, as *the only and originary* identity of the nation and the state. Thobani argues that exaltation is not abstract; it is concretized

in moral terms, naturally bounded to a particular community endowed with specific characteristics, including being fundamentally concerned with the “good” of humanity. This concept of community, she argues, is central to the Canadian national mythology (p. 7).

In a related criticism, Anderson (1991a) advances the idea of nations as ‘imagined political communities’. Despite the existence of inequalities and exploitation, the nation that is imagined constructs a sense of belonging and comradeship which is generated by the state. As Thobani (2007) also suggests, multiculturalism as an official state policy re-solidifies conditions of belonging to the nation in direct relation to those constituted as outsiders in the nation; the Indian, the immigrant, and the refugee, who are inherently void of exalted qualities (p. 5). Exaltation is thus a technique of power magnified and multiplied by the state.

Multiculturalism also conceals the social relations that create both the national subject and his Other by grounding the national subject’s natural and original Canadian identity in policy form. As such, ‘multicultural Canada’ cannot be taken as a given. Bannerji (1997) refers to multiculturalism as “obviously a construction, a set of representations, embodying certain types of political and cultural communities and their operations” (p. 24). The de-politicization of state anti-racism that accompanies the move to “culture” in multiculturalism simultaneously re-enables the racialization of raced-gendered “Others” and the further exclusion of Indigenous peoples. Bannerji (1997) also points out that the national formation of “multiculturalism within a bilingual framework” re-established and continues to re-establish Anglo-Canadian culture as the core culture of the nation, while “Others” embody the “multiculture” surrounding it (p. 35).

The racial ordering of difference through “multiculturalism within a bilingual framework” is also taken up by Haque (2005), who argues that racist exclusion, citizenship and belonging was reproduced by the Canadian nation through the official and political recognition

of language (p. 30). In response to the challenges to conformity issued by Aboriginal and racial minorities in the 1960s, the Canadian state issued a “multiculturalism within a bilingual framework” policy. In the policy, groups that were defined as “multiculture” were written in opposition to Canada’s main linguistic groups, English and French, which Haque argues re-established white hegemony and the project of white settler nation-building (p. 2). For example, The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, responsible for striking up multiculturalism policy, reported in its “blue pages” that the founding communities in Canada were “Anglophones of British origin and Francophones of French origin”, and other ethnic groups, in contrast, were deemed “Anglophones and Francophones of other origins” (p. 164). Haque points out that the terms “race” and “ethnicity” were decidedly left out of the documents because, according to the Commission, they wanted to avoid any ethnic definition(s) of the nation. The Commission argued that inclusion of these terms in the report would create rigid barriers which would divide people, create closed-membership groups and “deny the principle that all men are equal before the law” (Book 1, 1967, p. xxiii, as cited in Haque, 2005).

However, Haque demonstrates that language, as a means for identifying group rights under the policy, came to stand in for and duplicate racial divisions. By positioning groups in the nation as founding linguistic communities and “other ethnic groups”, and “by retaining the division of the two groups in this way, the hierarchy of race and ethnicity had not been eliminated, but rather had been shifted onto a linguistic hierarchy (p. 164). (Multi)Culture was thus used to mobilize the language rights and privileges of Canada’s two officially recognized language groups. Other ethnic groups were encouraged to integrate by acquiring the appropriate language skills, while their claims and Aboriginal groups’ claims for collective forms of recognition were limited or erased because they could not establish a common language, heritage

or culture. Under multiculturalism policy, language thus defined belonging and ownership in the multicultural nation.

Haque (2005) also issues a critique against Kymlicka's theory of multiculturalism, arguing that his acceptance of the natural existence of a "societal culture" in Canada (the white settler bi-nation) detracts from any analysis of the racial order they evoke or entrench through the nation-state (p. 308). As Dean (2002) argues, it is society, not the state, that helps determine "why there has to be government, to what extent it can be done without, and in which cases it is needless or harmful for it to intervene" (Foucault, 1997, as cited in Dean, p. 41). As such, the liberal governing through freedom, liberty and democracy that is associated with Canada's nation-state requires the (imagined) presence of individuals who are not fully capable of ascertaining these liberal goals on their own, which reinforces the need and desire in civil society for the rationalities and techniques of a liberal government. Those who must be coerced into accepting liberal goals and are asked to guarantee such freedoms within their own groups (what Kymlicka calls "illiberal groups" in the nation) may be a necessary feature of all liberalisms (Dean, 2002, p. 47). As Dean (2002) further suggests, the justifications for employing the techniques of government that originate in civil society are reinforced by "liberal governmental discourses of moral obligation and paternalism which have a long history in colonial governmentality" (p. 47). Thus, the originary "societal culture" in Kymlicka's theory of multiculturalism is implicated not only in the exclusion of racialized and Indigenous bodies, but also how these exclusions are produced and managed by the state.

As Chatterjee (1993) espouses, the relationship between liberal nationalism and illiberal regimes that Kymlicka expands on can be situated within discourses of development. Illiberal nations, through these discourses, are simply incapable of modernizing themselves in the same

way (and at the same speed) of liberal nations, and thus suffer from “a great historical lag which they must make up” (Razack, 2002, p. 6). According to Chatterjee (1993), development discourses situate illiberal regimes in opposition to liberal democracies, trapping “Othered” bodies in a transition narrative which shackles them to “pre” suffixes and marks of incompleteness. In this way, the economic structures of illiberal societies are never fully industrialized and their social institutions are never fully modernized (p. 5). Liberalism, with and through nationalism, excludes from national membership all cases in which the goals of liberty and progress appear to out of reach, or better yet, set in reverse.

Kymlicka’s argument against extending legal protections to “illiberal” groups until they meet the requirements of their liberal-democratic “host society” also further entrenches the multicultural rhetoric that implies “we have done our best, we have done everything we could for you, and now it is your turn” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 78). As van Dijk (1993) suggests, this also re-affirms the existence of such disclaimers as “we have nothing against immigrants, but we can’t just let anybody in” (p. 78). Anderson (1991b) similarly states that by unpacking the unified, “one-character nation” concept that sustains liberal, multicultural rhetoric in Canada, what is revealed is a clear picture of a mainstream (Anglo-European) society in which “others” are expected to contribute (p. 27). Ahmed (2000) deconstructs the “we” in multicultural discourse, identifying an authorized subject who tells the story from a particular vantage point of generously “allowing others in” to mix or be appropriated into a pre-existing culture. This “we” builds a common strategy of living with difference, deciding who should be tolerated, how the stranger should behave, and what languages they should speak. The stranger or newcomer to the national space needs to perform in certain ways, but it is still “we” who must live with it (or more specifically, live with “them”) (Ahmed, 2000, p. 95). Hage (2000) similarly offers that

multicultural rhetoric also assumes a territory or space to be claimed as “ours”, a master of this space who is already well-acquainted with it, and a racial Other who lands in this space (p. 28). As such, Canada appears in official texts such as the Multiculturalism Act as pure space that undergoes significant (and in many cases negative) transformations with the ‘acceptance’ and tolerance of ‘Othered’ bodies (Anderson, 2000).

Although scholarly work suggests that there is a complex and multifaceted relationship between cities, the City (local state) and the nation-state, it is also worth re-visiting Jacobs’ (1996) assertion that we should attend to the local, and take the local seriously, specifically when it comes to understanding how and why diversity discourse (re-)produces racial difference in the City of Toronto. In this vein, if one were to suggest, as some scholars do, that the City of Toronto’s diversity discourse draws directly from and/or reflects Canada’s official discourse of multiculturalism, how does one begin to account for variations in diversity’s articulation(s) across multiple spaces? If the intention here is to take the local seriously, is it possible that the city of Toronto can simultaneously authorize the existence of diversity discourse and cause such racial anxieties as to force its particular (re-)production in and by the City of Toronto? Do the liberal and democratic ideals which re-constitute the racial Other as a condition of multiculturalism discourses and practices of the nation also re-constitute the racial Other in the diverse City? Finally, following Bannerji (1997), Gilroy (1987) and McDonald (2007), how might negotiations of belonging and/or claims of racism made by racial Others in the City be taken up in a way that (re-)constitutes the ‘diverse’ City of Toronto?

The Diverse City

As Keith (2002) asserts, the celebrations of cultural diversity that state organizations have come to embrace and that are touted as progress in North America must be situated within the

context of historical geographies of colonialism and imperialism, and hegemonic whiteness. Kipfer (2007) also suggests that “careful links must be made between the ‘colonial management of the planet’ and the ‘colonial management of the neighbourhood’” (p. 722). As such, celebrations of cultural diversity in cities might not necessarily mean an “end to racism” or substantial improvements in the lives of racialized minorities (Keith, 2002, p. 35), but rather a re-vamped expression of the political, economic, and cultural agendas that underwrite systems of production and consumption in urban spaces. As race is thoroughly implicated in ideologies of production and consumption, as well as colonial expansion and exploitation, we must at least be willing to consider that “our way of seeing cities and thinking about cities is deeply racialized” (Cross & Keith, 1993, p. 9).

As Keith (2002) further suggests, “we need to get under the skin of the city to consider how the valorization of racial subjects links to the institutional architecture of politics, economy, and culture (p. 35). For Keith, this means that in addition to seeking out the racialized images and imaginaries that inform multiple and shifting descriptions of the city, we must interrogate how race is simultaneously evoked and erased through state apparatuses in order to reinforce these descriptions. Cross and Keith (1993) also note that City governments have become instrumental in the marketing of their ethnically diverse cities on a global scale, while excluding the racist and racializing processes that produce and sustain their image (p. 26). The existence of racialized (second-class or non-) citizenship, or more accurately, the disavowal of it, thus becomes intimately connected with City politics and policies, reinforced by racial and economic terms, attitudes, and assumptions of worth.

Croucher (1997) begins to articulate the disavowal of racialized citizenship in her study of the City of Toronto. She argues that Toronto is an urban space where the dominant imagery of

ethnic and racial harmony prescribes what problems and issues come to be (and not be) defined and acted upon by the local state. She explains that these images and identities that embody “ethnic harmony” in Toronto are socially constructed phenomena, emerging from “the tug and pull of vested interests or, as Cobb and Elder (1972, p. 161) observe, the ‘struggle of social forces, [which] at any point in time, will reflect the existing balance of those forces, or the mobilization of bias within a community’” (p. 320). Croucher offers that these elitist interests slide quite easily into representations of a given urban setting because they are *invested* with distributive power and social, political and economic resources. As Croucher (1997) also points out, because the City of Toronto relies heavily on its image as a ‘diverse’ city of multiple languages, cultures, and positive ethnic relations to compete effectively in the global marketplace, any struggles based on race and class are effectively written out of the historical and political space of the city.

In her study of diversity in City of Toronto, Altilia (2003) analyzes how the concept of diversity functions as a dominant discourse, useful to the maintenance of power because it presents social and cultural forms of difference in a linear form. The concept of diversity precludes analyses of inequity within those differences and the social relationships that create them (Altilia, 2003). Politicians in the City of Toronto diminish the racial barriers to full participation by embracing diversity, and by establishing committees and task forces which have no legislative power to address the “overt” experiences of racism. Although these committees and task forces might be set up to address issues of diversity and racism, their findings and recommendations are often ignored (Henry & Tator, 1994).

Lentin (2011) writes that “diversity implies a confined and recognizable space. It is curry and couscous but not hungry and destitute asylum seekers; it is bangles and ankle chains but not

hijabs” (p. 120). Jacobs (1996) furthers Lentin’s understanding of diversity in space to offer that “contemporary spaces of consumption seek out Otherness” to bring the Self closer to a multicultural present (p. 160). The tendency for governments, organizations, and the media to emphasize diversity over anti-racism suggests the desire to organize the space of the social, political and economic in a way that re-generates historical forms of privilege and status that come with dominant subject-positions, and the discrimination that comes with Others.

These conceptualizations of diversity and race in space are critical to understanding how the racialized discourses of the City (meaning the local state) might produce and reinforce race and racial inclusion and exclusion with and through the space of the City. In the next section of this chapter, I conduct a review of literature which discusses how ethno-racial/racialized groups are “included” in multiple spaces, as well as the terms of their inclusion. I draw on this literature in order to contextualize how the racialized body might be included in a way that simultaneously maintains the construction and containment of “difference” through the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto. The literature on race, space, discourse and cities also speaks to how the *presence* of select racial Others authorizes and is authorized by certain discourses which reinforce hegemonic whiteness and entitlements in space. Within this dissertation, this literature contributes significantly to an understanding of how and under what conditions diversity discourse allows the presence, partial inclusion and/or subjectivization of racialized Others in the City of Toronto, as well as what (or whose) purpose(s) the presence and subjectivization of racial Others in the City serves.

The Racial Body and the Problem of Representation

Scholars have consistently sought to examine the political participation and voting patterns of ethno-cultural, ethno-racial, and immigrant communities in Canada as a way to point out

systemic inequalities and racial barriers, to make recommendations on how to address issues of diversity and racism, and to make democratic systems and spaces more inclusive. For example, Bird (2005) writes that visible minorities are significantly underrepresented in local politics in Canada. Using ethno-racial profiles of elected politicians as an indicator of who has access to political power, Black and Lakhani (1997) also suggest that the under-representation of racialized bodies is a symptom of a system that does not respond to the policy interests of racialized groups. For example, racialized minorities in Canada experience racism in such forms as unemployment, poverty, discrimination, and barriers to quality healthcare, education and housing. These issues can be addressed through policy changes that are shaped and affected by politicians; yet they remain largely unaddressed because the racism experienced by racialized communities makes them less likely to acquire the resources necessary to achieve political representation, participation, and/or political influence to shape policy that might change their circumstances (Bird, 2005).

Similarly, Saloojee and Siemiatycki (2002) also point to the underrepresentation of visible minorities in Toronto's political area as an example of the racial polarization and multiple barriers that face newcomer communities. These barriers include "fewer available seats, the difficulty novices face challenging incumbents, and the socioeconomic barriers facing many newcomer communities in Toronto" (p. 261). Saloojee and Siemiatycki (2002) thus recommend the constitution of a body that would work with City Council on issues of group representation. For Kymlicka (1995), tackling the complex issue of minority group representation in liberal democracies begins with first asking ourselves "which groups should be represented?" (p. 144), "how many seats should a group have?" (p. 146), and "how are group representatives held accountable (to their group members)?" (p. 147). Furthermore, he suggests that group

representation is not illiberal, but is instead consistent with the goals of a liberal society. As he argues, however, people should also be “more able and more willing to put themselves in other people’s shoes, and truly understand (and therefore become able to represent) their needs and interests. This is the “challenge of empathy”” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 141).

However, Puwar (2004) offers that the discourse of diversity – which in policy terms has come to mean the inclusion of different bodies - actually works to mark racialized bodies who occupy multiple “privileged” spaces where they do not belong (p. 1). Goldberg (1993) similarly offers suggests that the privileged spaces that racialized bodies come to occupy are also never empty or neutral, but are imbued with history and meaning that cannot be erased through the “inclusion” of select bodies. For Goldberg, it is also equally important to situate the economic (and perhaps social) gains of Blacks within those same racialized discourses which have the power to define the “added value” and terms of inclusion and incorporation. Although he agrees that racial marginalization exists often in relation to capitalism, the economy and to class location, Goldberg is careful to note that it is not always the case that an entire racially constituted group be marginalized in economic terms. For example, he points out that a lack of employment and adequate housing are important aspects of the racial and spatial marginality of Blacks in South Africa’s urban spaces, however not all Blacks are displaced in the city in this way. As he argues “professional blacks may be accepted as neighbours or colleagues by whites....while the larger fraction of blacks remains displaced to the periphery” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 189).

Puwar (2004) additionally complicates the assumption that representation and participation of racialized minorities in organizations means that we have achieved the goals of diversity and inclusion in multicultural societies. She argues that seeking representation of racialized bodies in

areas such as government and the civil service masks the institutionalization of the somatic norm, the white male, who is seen to naturally occupy and have the freedom to take up space. Puwar also suggests that when women and racialized minorities take up privileged positions which have not been “reserved” for them, “this is an encounter that causes disruption, necessitates negotiation and invites complicity” (p. 1). Bannerji (1997) and Thobani (2007) also suggest that people of colour, regardless of their opposition to the hegemonic, discursive expressions “culture” that are used by state institutions, mainstream organizations and the media, often find themselves re-deploying these very terms because they have permeated many aspects of their professional lives. At the same time, any requests or desires to incorporate anti-racist policies and practices in institutions can actually be seen as a form of anger or hostility projected on whites by people of colour. This can result “in a deeper assimilation of people of colour under white supervision” (Thobani, 2007, p. 172).

In her book *Woman, Native, Other*, Trinh (1989) asserts that the invitation to the native Other” to contribute their voice in dominant systems and hierarchies re-ignites the “us” and “them” dichotomy that rationalizes socio-racial and spatial relations of power. In this practice, the native Other is both taken up as the “voice of truth”, and re-written by the white male in his own language, to reproduce and manage racial demarcations (p. 67). Natives are assumed to represent themselves, their ‘true essence’, unchanged by the outside world or their interactions with others (Appadurai, 1988). Appadurai (1988) argues that the racial and colonial dynamics of representation make natives “creatures of the anthropological imagination” (p. 39). Though the admittance of “them” among “us”, the anthropological discourse that imagines and knows the primitive native is thus recycled as “the mission of civilizing the savage mutates into the imperative of ‘making equal’” (Trinh, 1989, p. 59).

Thobani (2007) explains how the presence of Others, and perhaps even their successes, can be re-worked to signal the nation's openness to diversity, its tolerance, and its inclusive nature. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon (1952) writes, "from time to time he [the black man] fights for liberty and justice, but it's always for a white liberty and a white justice, in other words, for values secreted by his masters" (p. 195). Thus, as Fanon (1952) also writes, if one is to speak, it is to "exist absolutely for the other" (p.1). Mohanram (1999) further argues that the Black body "functions only within representation and demarcates the site of representation" (p. 200). She traces the meaning of the Black body in the West, revealing that raced and gendered bodies are characteristically seen as rooted to their place of origin, as marked, static and immobilized. Conversely, whiteness, in its ability to move freely in and across time and space, results in the unmarking of the body and the securing of the invisible norm (p. 4). However, her analysis offers that the simple binaries of us/them, black/white, First/Third World cannot fully articulate identity across space. This repeats the essentializing practices inherent in colonial discourses that we seek to complicate and unravel. She proposes that "blackness is a discursive practice exercised by the confluence of history, culture, economics, geography and language, which conditions the *enunciative* function" (p. xv). The marking of the in/visible are thus implicated with each other in ways that complicate and undo simple difference, as well as the neutrality of place.

Hall (1996) similarly offers that identity should be seen as a "production" rather than a reduction or essence – identity can never be "authentic" or authorized because it is a process that is always constituted within representation (p. 110). The numerous terms that come to name racialized bodies - including Black, immigrant, ethnic, and visible minority – can thus never fully represent the people who are described in these ways (Cross & Keith, 1993).

However, Brah (2000) suggests that, in seeking to mobilize collective identities and political change, marginalized groups may appeal to a common cultural experience, and thus reify an “essentialist difference” (p. 516). Although claims of origins can be mobilized by powerful groups and institutions to categorize and reinforce Otherness, “claims of origin, such as strategies of fixing identity in place, are also important for marginalized groups who want to distinguish their claims from the hegemonic” (Jacobs, 1996, p. 162). As such, those who engage in collective action might either refuse these terms as an indication of their resistance, perhaps risking further marginalization, or engage with and re-deploy these terms as a form of strategy, to reach wider audiences and create alliances.

Literature of representation and the inclusion/exclusion of racialized Others indicates the complex, challenging and contradictory ways in which racial Others come to occupy space where they are seen not to belong. While some advocate for a mobilization of collective identities in order to effect social and political change, others suggest that the essentialization and representation of racial Others in space is precisely how negotiations of belonging gets co-opted in order to reproduce the whiteness of institutions. Furthermore, the ideas of ‘inclusion’ and ‘resistance’ in institutions are complicated by racialized (and racializing) discourses which frame the terms under which certain racial Others *conditionally* belong in space, as well as the terms under which racial Others are *subjectivated*. In this dissertation, I seek to build upon this literature in order to interrogate how and why diversity discourse in the City of Toronto invites the presence of racial Others, as well as how the presence and negotiations of belonging of racial Others becomes both constitutive and representative of the ‘diverse’ City.

Conclusion – On the Gaps

According to Goldberg (1993), these social relations and negotiations of belonging are not expressed in a spatial vacuum...”social space is neither affect nor simply a given” (p. 147). A

critical understanding of how “subjects come to know themselves in and through space” (Razack, 2002, p. 17) thus requires an analysis of the tensions and contradictions between ascribed positions of subordination and assumed collective identities in *multiple* spaces, as well as an examination of the colonial and racist discourses which produce and contain these effects. This thesis is concerned with how race is produced and organized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. While existing work focuses primarily on diversity discourse in the context of movement and management of race *across* spaces, this thesis will further elucidate how diversity discourse is produced *in and through* space, thus to challenge space as a “natural given” (Jacobs, 1996, p. 22). I focus on diversity discourse and how it produces and manages race in the City of Toronto specifically with the intention of understanding how the City is implicated in the construction of racial meaning(s), as well as how diversity discourse both enables and is enabled by power, bodies and subjects.

Malando-Torres (2010) argues that understanding the construction of space in racial and ethnic studies has mostly been confined to the study of the nation. In this thesis I pose and attempt to answer some important questions about the role of the City of Toronto and diversity discourse in the conceptualization of race, space and belonging. My work seeks to understand how diversity discourse holds racialized bodies in space (and *place*) while simultaneously denying the existence of race and racism. And given that the City of Toronto fails to see racism as a significant social factor, I seek to understand how the City enables, justifies and denies the social, economical, political and spatial sorting and management of populations along racial lines with and *through* diversity discourse. This work has particular implications for how (and why) local governments employ racialized discourses in order to simultaneously contain and *celebrate* racial difference(s).

Goldberg (1993) further argues that expressions of racialized discourse are shaped, transformed and re-defined through the pairing of sociohistorical conditions with discursive formations of race, which allow for multiple conditions of enunciation (p. 1). Thus the nation, the state, citizenship, identity, difference, capitalism and other social constructs that have been identified in this chapter emerge with and through race, as *co-articulated* discursive and material expressions. As these concepts transform theoretically and materially, they do so within normalized racial logics and boundaries, in and across specific spaces. Goldberg (1993) explains that “race in turn has been able to set scientific and political agendas, to contain the content and applicability of Reason, to define who may be excluded and to confine the terms of social inclusion and cohesion (p. 4). He also argues that racialized power and categories continue to be spatialized across national and geographic regions, controlling the place of citizens and strangers in racial terms, even in the absence of “formalized racisms” (p. 182). Following Goldberg, in this thesis I seek to explore how diversity, belonging and the racial body/Other are co-articulated discursively and materially with and through historical conditions and expressions of race and the space of the City of Toronto.

The literature reviewed in this chapter suggests that racist violence continues to flourish through the multiculturalism and diversity management strategies of late capitalism. While the literature also critically engages with liberal-democratic theories of multiculturalism, and examines and emphasizes the construction of the strange Other that re-defines boundaries of belonging in the liberal-democratic nation, the work of this thesis asks some important questions about how productions of racialized difference through the discourse of multiculturalism may both reinforce and be reinforced by the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto. How might multiculturalism, as a way for the nation to re-imagine itself and how it lives with and through

difference (Ahmed, 2000), act in tandem with the City's diversity discourse and "diversity management" strategies to narrate race and place identity in and across spaces? Exploring the co-production of racialized difference and the Canadian (liberal) nation and state helps to frame an exploration and analysis of how the City of Toronto may both enact and react to racialized difference, in similar *and* in site-specific ways.

Goldberg (2002) argues that the racial configuration of states is not only reflected through the racist implications of their policies or the underrepresentation of racialized bodies in their institutions. As he writes, "states are racial more deeply because of the structural position they occupy in producing and reproducing, constituting and effecting racially shaped spaces and places, groups and events, lifeworlds and possibilities, accesses and restrictions, inclusions and exclusions, conceptions and modes of representation" (p. 104). It is evident by the literature reviewed that representation and racial Othering in space occurs in multiple, complex and productive ways, where the body is both a marker of oppression *and* a site of resistance. As Bhabha (1994) contends, in the colonial relationship, a new hybrid identity or subject position emerges from the interweaving of elements of the colonizer and colonized, challenging the validity and authenticity of any essentialist cultural identity. It is the indeterminate spaces in-between subject positions that are the locale of the disruption and displacement of colonial narratives, structures and practices. This hybrid or "third space" is an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation have no "primordial unity or fixity" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 37).

However, it is apparent that racial identities are still fixed in place by both the authority figure *and* the racial Other. This strategy of fixing and non-fixing is critical to my inquiry on how diversity discourse is taken up, negotiated and transformed by and through the presence and subject positions of racial Others in the City of Toronto. In reviewing literature on the

complexities and negotiations of the Black body and of representation, I seek to situate racialization and racialized difference within multiple negotiations of power, race and belonging in the City of Toronto. This thesis also seeks to examine the complexities and multiple negotiations of the racialized City staff and/or Others both *in and inside* power, and to trace how diversity discourse and the subject positions offered up in its name are engaged with as expressions of domination, power and resistance.

Through this dissertation, I open up levels of critical inquiry into the historical role of municipal government in the ‘management’ of race, space, and of ‘diverse’ populations. The work of this dissertation also responds to requests from researchers, organizations, interest groups and academics for a qualitative-based critical analysis on the methods currently used by the City of Toronto to address racism. Through an analysis of the various ways in which diversity discourse is “‘interacted’ between subjects and institutions” (Hook, 2007, p. 172), my work also provides insights into how diversity discourse coordinates and subjectivates multiple bodies and varying experiences, in the City and across multiple sites. I stimulate critical thinking into how diversity discourse and its historical, political and social conditions in the City of Toronto inform or are informed by analogous discourse in academia, and in Social Work. While this research has theoretical and empirical benefits for schools of Social Work in particular, the study contributes to the advancement of knowledge across many disciplines, including Political Science, Geography and Planning, Equity Studies, and Sociology, to name a few. The relevance of this project is even more apparent in the context of globalization, the increasing number of people from non-European ethno-racial groups in Toronto, and the salience of the language of diversity in and across socio-political and institutional spaces.

Chapter 3

A Genealogy of Diversity, Race and Power

As modernity commits itself progressively to idealized principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, as it increasingly insists upon the moral irrelevance of race, there is a multiplication of racial identities and the sets of exclusions they prompt and rationalize, enable and sustain. Race is irrelevant, but all is race.

David Theo Goldberg (1993, p. 6-7)

Introduction

In this chapter, I explain the methods of research that I have chosen for this dissertation. The central question of my research is how race is produced and organized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. To examine this question I utilized a mixed methods approach: in-depth interviews and textual analysis. The interview participants are fifteen self-identified ethno-racial/racialized City staff of the City of Toronto. A textual analysis was conducted on Committee and Council documents of the City of Toronto from 1980 to present which name and/or offered policy directions on race, racism and/or diversity. City documents were reviewed using a critical discourse analysis method. In my analyses, I read the interview transcripts against City of Toronto texts to document any similarities, differences, tensions and/or contradictions, in order to trace how texts might inform, be informed by, co-construct and/or contravene the meaning-making processes and various positionings that racialized City staff take up through the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto.

In addition to describing the research methods that I used to explore my research question, in this chapter I detail moments of discomfort during the research process, specifically concerning my own relationship to the research (and research participants) as a former “insider-

Other” in the City of Toronto.⁴ I pick up these moments again in a section entitled “Ethical Concerns”, where I unpack my decision to turn away from a focus on the “choice(s) and decision(s) of the individual subject” (Foucault, 1990, p. 95) to how the racialized subject’s sense of self in the City of Toronto is constructed by and through diversity discourse. In this section, I discuss how I continue to struggle with what it will mean and how it will *feel* to my interviewees when their experiences and feelings that they shared with me are transformed into a project which exposes their ideas of themselves as being historically and politically constituted, within the relations of diversity discourse, race and power. What will it mean to the interviewees in this study, and to racial Others in the City more broadly, when they read that exercising their individual power and/or resistance in the City of Toronto is undergirded, reproduced and contained via the discourse of diversity? What kinds of violence might this reproduce, to (again) take away and/or potentially invalidate the power and capacities of racial Others to change their lives and to pursue social and political change in the City?

As Bannerji (2000) suggests, it is time for us to explore the rather banal presence of the term diversity in our political and cultural world, in terms of what it does for us politically (p. 547). In the first section of this chapter, I explain how drawing on Foucault’s genealogical framework enabled an exploration of the productive and political workings of truth and power by unearthing the “local, discontinuous, disqualified, illegitimate knowledges” (Foucault, 1980, p. 83) of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. Foucault’s approach to genealogy analyzes and maps the conditions of possibility for certain practices, subjectivities and ideas of self (and/or subject positions) to form, as effects of power/knowledge/discourse. These practices,

⁴ I was employed as political staff in the offices of City Councillor Olivia Chow and City Councillor Gord Perks from 2005-2009, and as a social work placement student in City Councillor Olivia Chow’s office from 2003-2004. During my time at the City of Toronto, I cultivated several relationships, including relationships with some of the interviewees in this study. I also took up a specific position in relation to diversity, which I discuss in this chapter, and later in the final chapter, on agency and diversity discourse.

subjectivities and subject positions are inseparable from the politics (and regimes) of “truth” which both enable and constrain them. This approach to genealogy not only takes up the ways in which power, knowledge and discourse assume and reproduce particular truths in the world, but also the ways in which power, knowledge and discourse *become* true via the conduct and constraints of others. In short, bodies and subjects are co-produced, divided and classified in discourse via the operation of power/knowledge.

In this dissertation, I draw on a genealogical framework to (1) explicate the historical, political, social and cultural “truths” of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto and how they are reproduced; (2) to explore and document the processes and apparatuses of subjectivization of racialized staff in the City of Toronto who participate in, (re)activate, and/or resist diversity discourse; (3) to connect both processes of knowledge production and subjectivization of diversity to larger racial, socio-political forces and the ways in which they are transformed; and (4) to explore the possibilities of resistance in the power relations that restrict bodies, spaces and actions in the City. In the next section of this chapter, I expand on Foucault’s conceptualization of genealogy, and then go on to describe how I drew his analytical concepts into my research practices.

Genealogy

Michel Foucault (1984a) believed that genealogy conveyed how truth and its effects could not be separated from its processes of production. Thus, through genealogy one could draw attention to the illegitimate, disqualified knowledges of a discourse against what was taken to be its “truths”, in order to expose the processes of the production of knowledge as *political processes* (Foucault, 1980). Foucault argued:

Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault, 1980, p.131)

These truth-claims are “infused with unexamined commitments to particular moral and social orders” (Arrington & Francis, 1989, p. 4). For Foucault (1984b), the task of genealogy is to challenge the idea of a linear history, but to also to uncover how the idea of linearity is a *product* of “the accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us” (p. 81). Thus, regimes of “truth” (re-)emerge in and through battle, through a play of forces operating in particular events whereby power, essence and knowledge are re-constituted *as an effect of war*.

Valverde (2007) also describes Foucault’s genealogy as a method which conducts historical inquiries into the practices which bring subjects into being. Specifically, the purpose of genealogy is to commit to the dissipation of knowledge and of the subject by bringing to the fore all the discontinuities that are filtered in their name, thus moving “towards the destruction of the category of the subject as a locus of action, agency and knowledge” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 92). This approach thus encourages a view of our selves as being formed, understood and enacted through various rationalized objectives of power (Rose, 1996). As Prado (2000) suggests, genealogy seeks to expose these influences over our bodies, over time, which produce particular knowledges that shape our “autonomous” selves and our understanding of the world (p. 43).

In this dissertation, I take up Foucault's assumption that power radiates everywhere, through speech acts and through texts, to organize and reproduce certain "truths" via the conduct and constraints of subjects. This means "that we are all, to some degree, caught up in its circulation – oppressors and oppressed" (Hall, 1997, p. 50). In my research process, I found this position sometimes very difficult to navigate. Although this discomfort has never been fully resolved, following Stuart Hall (2000) this dissertation seeks not to abandon the notion of the racial Other *as racialized*, but to instead trace and attempt to rearticulate the relationships between subjectivity, discourse, knowledge and power which exclude, reproduce and engender intelligibility in the City of Toronto via racial thinking. This, I argue, does not erase the racialized subject, but instead exposes the conditions of his/her *various possibilities, intelligibilities and erasure(s)* in the diverse City, in the present and local context. Importantly, this approach also avoids any attempt to capture racial identities as stable, monolithic, and essential. Hall argues powerfully the importance of understanding the relationship of the subject to discourse as an *articulation*, meaning no direct correspondence, essential performance and/or transfer:

...since the de-centering of the subject is not the destruction of the subject, and since the 'centering' of discursive practice cannot work without the constitution of subjects, the theoretical work cannot be fully accomplished without complementing the account of discursive and disciplinary regulation with an account of the practices of subjective self-constitution. (2000, p. 26)

Through genealogy, this thesis attempts to trace the *various* positionings and subjectivities that are engendered, reproduced and taken up through diversity discourse, in order to understand the

self-formation and identifications of racial Others in the City of Toronto as historically constituted, over-determined, shifting and intelligible in relation to power/knowledge.

Working With Stories. As Hook (2007) argues, Foucault opposes privileging experience as a category of analysis. Tamboukou (2008) also asserts that in feminist genealogies and in the context of working with narratives, the methodological imperative is not to capture the “experiences” of a subject, but to uncover the multiple layers of regimes of truth that construct stories about life, work, and who we are (p. 287). Following Tamboukou’s (2008) line of argument, Hayes (2003) states, “what is at issue is how the subject has come to be formed, understood, and spoken about in certain ways, not the validity of the experiences of specific subjects” (p. 93). In Foucault’s later works, his objective was to explore how power is interacted between subjects and institutions, and the folding of subjective experience into “historical eventualization” (Hook, 2007, p. 172). According to Foucault, the body as a variable force is marked by different historical and political forces in different contexts, but is also subject to constant observation and surveillance in order to be subsumed within particular and localized regimes of knowledge. As Foucault suggests, regimes of knowledge and truth-claims shift in order to encapsulate the body, which directly produces the political field in which power relations are invested and re-produced (Foucault, 1984b). However, as Hook (2007) argues, “this interchange between structures and subjects, discourse and subjectivization ...cannot be reduced to a conduction of power to subjects as a ‘downloading’; these interchanges introduce a series of disruptions, not only of rationality and transparent self-knowledge, but of intention, indeed, of conscious awareness and overdetermined action as well” (p. 256). As Delhi (2003) argues in her research on parental involvement in education, only certain bodies are recruited into “active” subject positions of particular discourses and practices (i.e. as the “involved” and therefore

“good” parent), while “*others* are positioned as requiring education and ‘training’ in order to become respectable and competent” (p. 145). Oksala (2004) also asserts that the body is a permanent site of contestation of discourses and subjectivities of power, where bodily experiences transgress the limits of language, what is normal and intelligible (p. 112). The recruitment of bodies differently marked and differently positioned in space into active subject positions is thus complex and to some extent unpredictable. A key component of this thesis is to map the contradictory, embodied and subjective responses of racialized City of Toronto staff as they are recruited into the *variable* subject positions that are made available to them in the name of diversity discourse. Furthermore, I seek to expose the formation and intelligibility of diverse subjects in the City of Toronto as a continuous and antagonistic process, co-constructed with exclusion, constraint, appropriation and normalization.

Participation in the study. In the first phase of the study, I interviewed sixteen racialized City of Toronto staff who were employed at the City during the time of the study. I used a snowball sampling technique (Bryman, 2001) in order to initiate contact with people who are known to me or recommended to me based on their ability to provide the needed information, as outlined in a recruitment letter (see Appendix A). Guidelines for participation in the study included City of Toronto staff who identified as part of an ethno-racial group, as a “visible minority” and/or person of colour, who were interested in participating in this study, and who had been working in the City of Toronto for at least one year during the time of the study. Contact was initiated with participants in various departments of the City, and the total sample had no restrictions on age, gender, or position. An electronic copy of my Consent Form (see Appendix B) was sent to all who agreed to participate. The consent form contains details about the study, which was reviewed and signed by both parties before the interview commenced.

Intensive interviews were organized around an interview guide (see Appendix C) consisting of some identifying closed ended questions and a few open-ended questions. Through these interviews I aimed to elicit information about how racialized City of Toronto staff use and make sense of diversity in their work. Using open-ended questions enabled deeper conversations about diversity work in the City, as well as opportunities to probe further into moments of discomfort and/or tension. Data collected through interviews was transcribed and analyzed through coding techniques. A line-by-line analysis was conducted for the transcribed interview material in which ideas generated were placed into themes. As I read the transcripts, some of the questions I asked include: Are there any apparent differences within and/or across departments in terms of the ways that diversity is used and taken up, and what might these differences say about how power/knowledge circulates? Does gender play a role in how diversity is conceptualized? What positioning(s) did racialized City staff take up in our interviews, and how were they described/defended? Any ideas, insights or questions with respect to what is going on in the data or possible links to more general issues was recorded in what Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) refer to as “initial memos”. Miles and Huberman (1994) expand on memos to say that they help to document possible relationships, and to move towards a better understanding of categories, events, and processes. An audit trail was also used to record critical insights on negotiations of method and decisions as they evolved. Mauthner and Doucet (1998) contend that this tracing and documenting of analysis in an audit trail helps readers and researchers see what has been lost and what has been gained by these decisions.

It is important to note here that several participants expressed fears about confidentiality as well as possible reprisals for their participation in the study. Many research participants stressed prior to our interviews that they had agreed to participate on the condition that no

identifying information about them would be revealed. As I reflected back on my notes from these interviews, what came to mind was Ahmed's (2012) assertion that those who talk about racism in institutions which promote diversity often become part of the *problem* of racism. Some of the interviewees in this study went on to share their own painful experiences of racism in the City of Toronto, without probing. Some spoke in hushed tones, while others held back tears. These moments signaled both an awareness of the silencing around discussing issues of racism in the City, as well as the idea that speaking about racist experiences in the City is deemed to be "unprofessional" and/or problematic. As one interviewee (Tania) disclosed:

like, it's very hard for me to even bring this up, without me being shut down very quickly. 'Cause it's very uncomfortable. It's very, you know...hard to, hard to kind of articulate, and speak about. We can't talk about it without getting emotional, and, and offended, and this, that and the other.

Noting previously the precarious, emotional and at times contentious nature of their work, as well as how few racialized City staff there are by department, I committed to each staff person interviewed that I would not disclose any identifying information about them, including age, race, ethnic background, department, position and number of years at the City. As such, I can offer no specific information, other than to say that of the fifteen interviewees,⁵ twelve identified as women, and three as men. For this thesis, I gave each interviewee an opportunity to choose a pseudonym in order to protect their anonymity. If one was not chosen, a pseudonym was randomly assigned. All identified as either racialized or as a person of colour, with various racial/ethnic group affiliations. The number of years working at the City ranged from 1 year to 25 plus years. When interviewed for my research, all participants agreed to be tape-recorded on the condition that only I had access to the tapes, and that only I would transcribe their interviews.

⁵ One interviewee dropped out.

As promised in the recruitment letter, each participant received the raw transcripts of their interview via email, approximately eight months after the interviews took place.

I had one research participant drop out approximately three days after our interview took place. As I had made clear at the outset of each interview, both in my recruitment letter and in verbal exchange, interviewees could drop out of the research process at any time, with no questions asked. This research participant emailed me to say they would prefer not to have their interview be part of my research, and thanked me for our conversation. I did not probe further.

Working With Texts. As Hook (2001) suggests, a genealogical analysis proceeds from the consultation of ever more sources of origin and realization, to an identification of the “material components acting upon and within discourse, to an analysis of the multiple analytical ‘salients’ underlying the successful production of discourse” (p. 18). Although the diverse object and subject appear as having a point of origin and inner meaning in history, the goal of this dissertation is to inevitably reflect diversity in the City of Toronto as a series of events, bending to the will of political and racial forces and their effects. This approach challenges the presumption that diversity has a transcendental logic and truth across history.

The research method I take up in this dissertation is also guided by Foucault’s (1984b) insistence on revisiting “a field of entangled and confused parchments, on documents that have been scratched over, and recopied many times” (p. 76) to trace the historical and constituting effects of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. I refer to City of Toronto documents as “texts” in this thesis because, following Dorothy Smith (1999), texts become “active” through their reading by being seen as coordinating the activities of many to (re-)produce them, thereby extending certain social, historical and material relations (p. 135). This does not mean that texts are read and/or taken up in the same way, but that they are a mode of *production* of discourses,

intended to communicate, accumulate, authorize and/or reproduce certain meanings (Hall, 1997) and, I would argue, certain “truths”. The second phase of the study included a detailed examination of City texts beginning in the year 1995 with the de-institutionalization and de-funding of many “anti-racist/equity” programs at the provincial level by then newly-elected Premier Mike Harris. This period signified a point of entry into the collection of “a vast accumulation of source material” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 76-77), in order to observe and trace the multiple and contradictory political moments which make up diversity discourse. Foucault (1991) approaches discourse as event, where “eventualization means rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies and so on which...count...as being self-evident, universal and necessary” (p. 76). Through this point of entry and with a specific focus on diversity discourse as “event”, I began to move outwards, to locate the precontext(s), the specific historical and political conditions that frame the “emergence” of diversity discourse, but also begin to trace continuities, mutations and reversals of the discursive logics that bind the diverse object and subject against the changing social, cultural and political landscape of the city.

The “texts” I reviewed. For my research and analyses of City of Toronto texts, I chose to review and consult documents which named and/or offered policy directions on race, racism and/or diversity, going back to the year 1980. From January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2014 documents were retrieved by term (2006-2010, 2010-2014) using the basic search function of the City of Toronto “Toronto City Council and Committees Meetings, Agendas and Minutes” site (<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/findAgendaItem.do?function=doPrepare>). The search words used were “race”, “racism”, and “diversity”. From the years 1998 to 2008, City documents were retrieved electronically, using the City of Toronto’s “legacy search” website

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/legacy-search.htm>). All City of Toronto agendas and minutes of all City Council and committee documents were searched by year using the terms “race”, “racism”, and “diversity”.

Prior to 1998, the minutes of the former City of Toronto Council and Committees were available only in paper copies, indexed by year, at the City of Toronto Archives. For the years 1990-1998, I conducted an archival search of former City of Toronto Council and Committee documents using three interrelated methods: first, an index search for the terms “race”, “diversity”, “racism” “race relations”⁶, “anti-racism”, “multicultural”⁷, “diversity management”, “equity”, “human rights” “Employment Equity Act”, “Employee and Labour Relations”, and “Aboriginal”. These terms (in addition to “race”, racism” and “diversity”) were generated during my review of City documents and/or were recommended to me by City of Toronto Archives staff. The second method used to search for relevant documents was to go through the table of contents for each committee, year by year, to see if any references to race, racism, diversity or related terms appeared in the titles of the reports listed. The third and final method involved reading for references to other and/or past reports, which were usually listed under the “background information” section of each report.

From 1980-1990, the minutes of Council and Committees were no longer indexed, and the ability to search by words and/or phrases was no longer available. I first began a review of the table of contents for each Council and Committee meeting from 1980-1990, looking for the terms race, racism, diversity and/or relevant words/phrases in the titles of each report. However, about a quarter of the way through my archival search for this period, I began to see that most

⁶ based on information gathered about the “Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations” established in 1980, the term “race relations” was used quite frequently since its inception. I was also advised by staff at the Archives to conduct a search based on this term.

⁷ based on new information gathered about the “Multicultural Access Program”.

Council and Committee documents which named race, racism and/or diversity cross referenced the “Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations”. This committee appeared to be primarily responsible for addressing and/or making recommendations on issues of race, racism and/or diversity in the City of Toronto.⁸ As such, I chose to solely focus on and trace the actions/recommendations of the Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations.

Through my close examination of City texts, I was able to trace the emergence and role of the Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations in the City of Toronto. This committee was created in 1980 by the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto in response to the Ku Klux Klan which had “begun to operate publicly in the City of Toronto” (“The Minutes of the Council, October 2, 1980”, Minute No. 1394, p. 711). In Mayor Eggleton’s request to the City of Toronto’s Executive Committee in 1981 to establish the Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations, he writes “it is my hope that the Committee on Community and Race Relations will strive to increase the ability of *diverse* groups to communicate and interact effectively in eradicating racism and prejudice from within our midst” (Appendix “A” City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 7 - Clause 26; “Committee on Community and Race Relations”, January 20, 1981, p. 1054, my emphasis).⁹

One of the earlier reports of the Mayor’s Committee also makes reference to an “Equal Opportunity 1979 Annual Review”, which I found relevant and discuss in Chapter Six of this thesis. In 1979 the City conducted an “Equal Opportunity 1979 Annual Review” which reviewed the City’s efforts to achieve “equitable representation and fuller utilization of *women* at all levels

⁸ Some also reference the “East York Multicultural and Race Relations Coordinating Committee” but my search was limited to the former municipality of the City of Toronto.

⁹ In 1980, the term diversity also appears in a Toronto Firefighters' training manual which denotes the importance of “respecting diversity”. I also first saw the term “diversity management” in a report entitled “Summary of Corporate Training on Multicultural and Race Relations” (City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 20, July 3, 1990, p. 12.147).

and in all categories of the organization, as well as a full recognition of their contribution to the work of the City” (p. 8747; my emphasis). In this report, Alderman Sparrow amended a clause so “that the approach used to develop the Equal Opportunity program be considered for special groups such as the disabled and *minorities*” (City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 47 – Clause 35; July 23, 1980, p. 8809, my emphasis). There were no references made to diversity in the original Annual Review report on the status of achieving equity for women in the organization. These and other documents support the position which I take up in this thesis, which is that diversity discourse (re-)emerges as *event*, in specific and *local* contexts.

Critical discourse analysis

In this project I drew on critical discourse analysis in order to explore the socially shaped and socially constitutive nature of discourse (Fairclough, 1993, p. 134). Specifically, to read City of Toronto texts I drew on Fairclough’s three-dimensional framework of analysis, which includes an analysis of a particular discursive event as spoken or written language, as discourse practice (processes of text production and interpretation), and as social practice (within the broader socio-cultural, economic and political context(s)) (p. 136). Fairclough’s assertion is that discourse practice connects and mediates text and social practice. As he suggests, “on the one hand, processes of text production and interpretation are shaped by (and help shape) the nature of social practice, and on the other hand the production process shapes (and leaves “traces” in) the text, and the interpretative process operates upon “cues” in text (p. 136). As I read the texts I looked for “traces” and “cues” in order to bring to the surface historical and social practices that were being (re-)created and consumed through them, for the writer, for the reader, through their (re-)circulation and in the social (Fairclough, 1995). In reading the texts, I also asked: What are the broader themes that emerge in the texts? Are there any contradictions present in the texts, and

if so, how are they resolved? What do the texts reveal about (i) social identities, (ii) social relations, and (iii) values and beliefs (Fairclough, 1993, p. 134), and how have historical changes in these areas been negotiated in the texts? How do I analyze these historical changes in the context of Foucault's work on the relationships between power, knowledge, and discourse?

As noted earlier, I read the transcripts of participant interviews *against* City of Toronto texts, to trace similar and contrasting themes that emerge in order to analyze how the uses and understandings of diversity by racialized staff in the City gets taken up through formal City documents. It is important to note here that, in engaging with the *affective and emotional* components of diversity discourse, the critical discourse analysis I have employed as I read City texts must be expanded and/or altered to consider what is happening and what meanings are constituted beyond what is spoken, *and beyond how what was spoken is analyzed*. The expansion of critical discourse analysis must consider the material, the embodied, processes of becoming, as what might be occurring beyond discourse, language and meaning in talk and text; but then to also think about how what is happening in the "beyond" is brought into meaning-making structures, through research and analyses, *as reflections of the social-political-racial*. As Wetherell (2013) writes, "indeed, the turn to affect opens up crucial questions about meaning-making practices, the articulation of the somatic with these, and issues about how the speaking subject makes sense of and communicates affect" (p. 353). Separating the discursive from the affective in research becomes a huge methodological challenge precisely because once affect become grounded in textual representation and meaning-making practices, affect no longer mediates beyond meaning, language and the discursive (Wetherall, 2013).

Sedgwick's (2003) work on what the drive to the discursive does for and to the affective, the "middle ranges of agency" is also important to consider here. As she writes:

One's relation to *what is* risks becoming reactive and bifurcated, that of a consumer: one's choices narrow to accepting or refusing (buying, not buying) this or that manifestation of it, dramatizing only the extremes of compulsion and voluntariness. Yet it is only the middle ranges of agency that offer space for effectual creativity and change.

In this thesis, I attempt a "reading" and theorization of interview transcripts that is informed by a middle range of agency, in a space where there is room to connect "a depersonalized understanding of performative force" and a "psychologized and spatialized understanding of affective force" (Sedgwick, 2003, p. 90). Taking up this task has been a challenge, especially considering that my own affective and emotional orientations to this work need to also be exposed and represented in this text, as somehow located within the hegemonic, the subversive and/or the idea of "agency". These endless confrontations and negotiations between collusion, contradiction and agency have helped me to contextualize more broadly the complex conditions of power and resistance, how they might be negotiated in multiple ways by racialized City of Toronto staff in and through the institutional setting, while being carefully attuned to how I represent them in this dissertation.

Ethical Concerns

Ethics Approval for this research project was granted by the York University Office of Research Ethics Human Participants Review Sub-Committee on January 28, 2013.¹⁰ Ethical concerns arising from this research are the potential complications that might have arisen from presumptions of a common frame of reference or shared identity. As Okolie (2005) writes, there are advantages of racial Others interviewing racial Others, including a shared understanding of body language, emotions, anger, and pain of racism that would not necessarily be shared and/or interpreted in the same way by a "stranger-researcher" (p. 263). As a racialized woman and as a

¹⁰ For the period of 01/28/2013 to 01-28/2014. Certificate Number STU 2013-011

former employee of the City of Toronto, I also became aware of how identifying with racialized staff in the City might unintentionally ignore or de-emphasize the uncommon experiences, making people work to state and explain the obvious (Weston, 2004). In this case, I used a self-review to bring out my biases and pre-conceptions through journaling, in which I continuously analyzed my biases and values (Crabtree & Miller, 2004). This concern was also brought up by one of my interviewees who, when asked why diversity for him and for others becomes linked with race, suggested that he “would consider the interviewer”, that because “we share a common bond of being people of colour”, the linking between race and diversity would come up in the interview. However, upon further probing, this interviewee also recognized that in his policy work at the City and when he speaks about diversity with his colleagues, he often does mean race. While this interview segment does not eliminate the ethical concern of identification with racialized City staff, it does offer a context of how any aspects of shared, common identity might fall outside of the scope of diversity work that staff do in the organization, what subject positions they take up through diversity discourse in the City, and how diversity discourse connects with, implies and/or is taken up as race for people both inside and outside of the organization.

Another ethical concern is that staff interviewed might have also felt pressure to respond in a “desirable” manner, to avoid “losing face” (Padgett, 1998). This could have happened in situations where I was interviewing staff whom I am familiar with. However, the focus of the research is not to capture any “real” experience, but to capture the regimes of truth which shape the stories of their lives and work. As I mentioned earlier, this stance became a difficult one to take, and to maintain. I continue to struggle with the idea of “turning away” from interviewees and their narratives. However, I find it helpful to critically reflect on my own unfolding subjectivity, and the various subject positioning(s) that I take up, as a researcher, as a former

“insider-Other”, but also as someone who thought of themselves as an anti-racist agent of change in the City of Toronto. In the next chapter, I discuss the idea of belonging as longing (and desires) to be not-raced, not-strange and to belong in the City. What is important here is that critical reflections on the various subject positionings, desires and longings offered and reproduced by diversity discourse in the City do not, and should not, stop with the research participants of this thesis. I too am bound and implicated in relations of race and power, as they are incited into and reproduced through diversity discourse in the City. In short, in locating and tracing the various subject positionings of the research participants, it became equally important to locate, trace and critically reflect on my own positionings, which not only shape the interviewing relationship, but my own meaning-making processes which produce this research.

Finally, while the methodological approach to this research might not set out to help give “voice” to those who have long been silenced in research environments, so that racial Others can “theoretically articulate their oppression” (Okolie, 2005, p. 256), in this thesis I do attempt to delve into how the pain of race emotionally and affectively constitutes the subjectivities of racial Others in the City via their desires to be not-raced, not-strange, and to belong. These desires are invited and reproduced by the exclusionary practices of race which, through discursive, material and spatial interventions, continue to reinforce the non-belonging of and violence against racial Others, in the City, the nation, and across the globe.

And yet still, I struggle. I have very frequently re-visited the idea that maybe this project would be, and *feel*, less violent for me had I interviewed white City of Toronto staff, in order to situate and engage with how they participate in and reproduce diversity discourse and race in the City. I chose to interview racialized City staff because I wanted to situate the various positionings that they take up within the context of power, in order to expose its diffuse, all-

encompassing and subjectivating properties. However, I continue to find myself deeply engaging with the vulnerabilities, fears and contradictions of exposing and finding some degree of “truth” in research, whether through analyses of narratives of racial Others, or in projects where one seeks to locate how racial subjectivities are (re-)produced. Research makes the will to truth inescapable, even as we preemptively claim that the reproductions of truths are a form of social, political, and racial violence. The binds of academic research are filled with these tensions, and I continue to struggle with the idea that I must not only situate racialized City staff (and Others), but also myself, squarely in the middle of them, if I am to consider myself as a “good researcher”. This research also involved constant negotiations with locating myself both outside and inside the work, but also as someone who sought to produce a piece of work that will inevitably be taken up *in* and *as diversity work*. In my final chapter, I discuss the idea of complicity, and its multiple and unresolved complications.

Concluding Remarks – On Genealogy, Diversity and Race

As Valverde (2007) explains, “if one agrees that the default setting of both human and non-human life is war, or at least struggle, how can we sharpen our philosophical pencils so that the terms we use are not the mere models of how struggle happens, but are themselves in struggle, are themselves dynamic?” (p. 168). In this thesis, I pursue a genealogy of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto in order to expose the violent persuasion and pervasiveness of race and power, and to look to the various ruptures, wars, struggles and anxieties of diversity discourse as sites of illumination. The methodological approach that I take up in this thesis offers that diversity discourse is a regenerated *effect* of struggle; as race/racism re-organized, reproduced and reborn in the present. As such, the *meaning* of diversity is not something to be theorized. Genealogy instead exposes diversity as a discourse which loosely gathers together and

reproduces a set of historically constituted knowledges and practices that can be understood relationally and/or antagonistically. The questions that arise within this methodological framework is how and under what conditions these knowledges and practices re-emerge in the present, and how they are sustained and subjectivized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto.

Chapter Four

Diversity and Belonging: A Theoretical Approach

Introduction

This chapter introduces popular understandings of belonging, and then offers a critique which investigates the roles of affect, emotion and language as they relate to attachment(s) to a symbolic space, and to processes of inclusion and exclusion. In view of this critique, I discuss how state discourses (including diversity in the City of Toronto) invite *select* Othered bodies in to participate and to negotiate their belonging, and I introduce critical insights about emotion and identity formation(s) in relation to these negotiations. An important aspect of this thesis is the view of diversity as an invitation into negotiations of belonging in the City of Toronto, where “diverse” subjectivities are hailed into (re-)affirming particular identifications, values and meanings. However, I complicate the stability of identity formations associated with the language of diversity through an understanding of belonging as a “longing to be someone/something else” (Probyn, 1996). Specifically, I draw on belonging as a longing in order to better understand how the language of diversity both enables and contains a politics of assimilation and a politics of resistance, through negotiations of belonging in the City of Toronto. This dissertation draws on and reflects three theorizations of belonging: belonging through encounter, belonging through hailing, and belonging as a longing. It is my hope that by using these three notions of belonging, as well as locating how and when they intersect, it may be possible to better understand how subjectivities, emotions and desires are centered around and structured by diversity as a discourse, in racial terms.

In the first section of this chapter, I define three concepts which I suggest, together, draw on, frame and reproduce negotiations of belonging for racialized Others in the City of Toronto.

Specifically, I make the claim that through approaching conceptualizations of discourse, power and space *as interlocking concepts*, it becomes possible to understand how diversity discourse, as a mechanism of power, has racialized and spatialized expressions which articulate and are articulated by negotiations of belonging in the City. In articulating diversity discourse as spatially configured, expressed and negotiated, I set up a framework in which belonging through encounter, through hailing, and as a longing are also understood as being reproduced and articulated in site-specific ways. Next, I describe and then complicate common understandings of belonging by introducing the roles of emotion, affect and desire; particularly in relation to the encounter with, hailing and longing(s) of racialized Others in the City. I begin to theorize the encounter with, hailing, and longing of racialized Others in the City as *necessary* to the reproduction and reconfigurations of diversity discourse in the City, as well as to the various and complex subjectivities that are bound by it. In the final section of this chapter, I emphasize how the subjectivities and negotiations of belonging of racial Others, through the discourse of diversity, are contained and reproduced in racial terms. I suggest a way forward in which it becomes possible to trace and expose how negotiations of belonging in the City reinvigorate race in space, thus exposing diversity discourse in the City of Toronto as a racial, spatial and colonial project.

Key Concepts – Discourse, Power, Space

Discourse. What is discourse, and how does it inform the way we see ourselves, and how we belong? As Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) suggest, rather than looking for a deeper or hidden meaning behind a particular discourse, Foucault seeks to analyze “the discursive and practical conditions for the existence of truth and meaning” (p. 50). As Foucault (1981) suggests, discourse is “a violence which we do to things, or in any case as a practice which we impose on

them; and it is in this practice that the events of discourse find the principle of their regularity” (p. 67). In understanding discourse, we must also seek to understand, historically, how truth and its effects are produced within discourses which accept and make it function as truth (Foucault, 1984a, p. 60). Foucault (1970) also describes discourses as being linked through various textual forms as an ideological force, shaping knowledge of the everyday world and interests in a particular way to reify conformity. Subjects seldom pay attention to the repetition and re-circulation of discourse in the everyday. Discourse thus provides “the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 73).

Foucault also warns that discourse should not simply refer to text and talk, but to the “physicality of its effects, in the materiality of its practices” (1981, p. 66). As Hook (2001) suggests, Foucault’s conception of discourse is related more to the intersections of knowledge, materiality and power than it is to language. As such, what is required of any analysis of discourse is an examination of the social, political and historical conditions which come to (re-)produce its “truth”. Discourses also do not exist in a vacuum; they are in constant battle with other discourses and social practices for authority over truth (Mills, 1997, p. 17). Rose (1996) argues that it is in the space of war –where oppositions, contestations and alliances of regimes of subjectification occur – that “the invention of new regimes of subjectification” is born (p. 141). In these relations of war, power continually re-produces itself as acceptable forms of knowledge and “truths” in the world and about our selves (Tamboukou, 1999).

Discourse is that which produces and represses, constrains and enables behaviour, writing, speaking and thinking in the social world (Hook, 2001; Mills, 1997). As Foucault (1981)

suggests, discourse, as an instrument and an effect of power, enables the production as well as the justification of meanings, objects and subjects that are simultaneously constrained and enabled, inhibited and free-forming. He also warns that we must see modern power as more than simply a repressive force, held by particular bodies over other bodies (1980, 1984a). In order for power to take hold, it must be everywhere and come from everywhere; it is also productive, induces pleasure, and is reinvigorated through relations of domination and resistance.

The relationship between race, racism and discourse has been theorized by a number of scholars. For example, van Dijk (2002) argues that discourse produces racism. He argues that racist ideologies are learned through the text and talk of discourse, and are simultaneously reaffirmed and defended through the discourses of the dominant group. The racial representations that emerge through discourse are subsequently used to engage in racist practices, which reinforce the existence of racist discourse (p. 146). However, Ladson-Billings (2000) argues that discourses and “regimes of truth” (that which is accepted as true in society) are actually constituted through race. For example, “enlightenment notions of science and law did not work independent of prevailing discourses of racial superiority which allowed the dominant group to objectify the other” (p. 259). Stuart Hall (1996) argues that colonial discourses and texts produce, solidify and circulate knowledge about non-European, colonized peoples and cultures as “Other”. He further states that there needs to be an explication and analysis of how contemporary codified knowledge of the “Other” produced by the West is connected to colonial exploitation. Following Foucault, Said (1979) argues that Orientalism should be taken up not as a body of knowledge about the East, but as a discursive construction of the East, determined in such a way for the West to understand and conceptualize the East with

and through its own existing mechanisms of power. Said also adds that the goal of discourse is “to maintain itself and, more importantly, to manufacture its material continuity” (p. 216).

Weedon (2004) draws on Foucault to frame her discussion of humanism as a discourse. For Weedon, humanism links to other discourses of human rights and equality, to convey socio-political spaces and citizens as tolerant and welcoming. However, in the context of equal rights, equal access to citizenship and belonging, subjectivities and identities fractured along racial, gendered, class, sexual and ethnic lines navigate power/knowledge networks that simultaneously (re-)create their historical subjugation and Otherness, reinforced through hierarchical rules of recognition, and disconnect them from racist and exclusionary reading, in the absence of any acknowledgement of racial and other discriminatory forces (Weedon, 2004). Discursive fields thus constitute not only the production and meaning of different bodies, subject positions and identities, but also how we use and make meaning of them to navigate our need to belong in socio-political space (Weedon, 2004). What Weedon (2004) is suggesting is that it is within the context of discourse and language “that we take up positions as speaking and thinking subjects and the identities that go with them”, structured within relations of power, even as they may take up competing and contradictory forms (p. 18).

In this dissertation, I complicate Weedon’s understanding of discourse as a field that (*re-*)produces “different” bodies, subject positions, and identities which are taken up in various ways to negotiate belonging to argue that negotiations of belonging in the City of Toronto cannot exist independently of the power/knowledge frameworks that structure and reinforce diversity discourse, inclusion and exclusion in space *in racial terms*. Moreover, these racial terms simultaneously reproduce, inform, are reproduced and are informed by the identities and subject positions that are taken up in these negotiations. Following Rose (1996), I also want to suggest

that the “war” that occurs in the negotiations of racial Others in the City, where alliances and contestations are built, are both premised on and reinforce diversity discourse in the City. What I am proposing here is that diversity discourse is *co-produced* with the bodies, subject-positions, identities and negotiations of belonging of racial Others in the City of Toronto, which I argue further normalizes and renders *necessary* those who do not belong, in order to reproduce the racial terms under which belonging is constructed and negotiated. Therefore, exclusions manufactured and reproduced along racial lines become refracted through negotiations of belonging that incite and are incited by diversity discourse in the City.

Power. The previous section highlights how discourse intersects with race and/or racism to reproduce “different” bodies, subject positions, and/or identities in racial terms (and/or “truths”) which I have argued *co-incite and are co-incited by* diversity discourse and negotiations of belonging in the City of Toronto. Conceptualizations of discourse, including the ones noted above, discuss the idea of power; particularly as it relates to the reproduction of knowledge and/or “truths” of the Other. Drawing on Ahmed (2002) and Stoler (1995), the foregoing describes how power will be conceptualized and taken up in this dissertation, which allows for an examination of the social, political, historical and racial conditions that invite, co-, and reproduce diversity discourse as “truth” in the City. I want to suggest that the following approach to power also allows for an exploration of negotiations of belonging of racial Others in the City as being integral to diversity discourse and to the reproduction of race.

Ahmed (2002) draws on Foucault’s understanding of power in order to argue that power produces bodies. Rather than conceptualizing power as simply repressive or limiting, Foucault views power as productive; that it enables and generates certain effects.¹¹ Ahmed highlights

¹¹ See Foucault, M (1990) *The History of Sexuality*, p. 11-12.

Foucault's work on *The History of Sexuality*, particularly his idea that sexuality in the Victorian era was not simply something to be repressed, but that through its very constitution as "an incitement into discourse,"¹² sexuality generated specific knowledge as well as objects to be known. Moral parameters around sex and the simultaneous regulation of bodies were thus produced through and incited into discourse, whereby bodies became known and knowable only via categories which produce particular "truths" about objects/subjects, in sexual terms. For Foucault, discourses thus embody the relationship between power and knowledge: discourses, which categorize and entrench particular "truths" about objects and subjects as well as how people come to think about and know themselves, are conduits of power and reflect a desire for and production of knowledge which serves certain historical, social, political and powerful interests. Ahmed (2002) extends Foucault's analyses of sex and sexuality to race, particular to how race was produced and incited into discourse. Ahmed writes how the "truth" about racial Others, via categorizations and typologies of their bodies and skin, was not developed as a response to being perceived as dangerous and/or different from the white masculine subject, but instead as an effect of power which *sought to produce them as different* in order to justify and normalize the knowledge and "superiority" of the white masculine subject, as well as existing relations of power, including the violence of the colonial project.

In this dissertation, I am particularly interested in how and under what conditions diversity discourse, as a mechanism of power, continues to reproduce certain bodies as "different" in order to justify existing racial power relations in the City. Building on Ahmed's understanding of how power produces bodies, and in particular her view that "racial bodies are discursively constructed" (Ahmed, 2002, p. 54), I want to explore how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto offers a terrain in which the very "fixity" of racial Others and their bodies

¹² Ibid, p. 17-35.

simultaneously gets called into question and is reproduced via the negotiations of belonging of racial Others, *as integral to the reproduction of race and power*. In other words, I seek to examine how power is taken up, perceived and/or concealed by racial Others in their negotiations of belonging; specifically how power organizes and controls bodies in the City along racial lines at the same time that it incites (and perhaps also contains) agency and resistance.

Stoler (1995) writes how Foucault was concerned not with the changing meaning of race, “but the particular discourses of power with which it articulates and in which it is reconceived” (p. 65). Stoler explores how racial discourse appropriates and reproduces different racial expressions, even emancipatory claims; and re-casts prior representations in new forms, to a point where definitions of racism and racist expressions can become unclear, even contradictory. Stoler offers that a genealogy of racisms should thus examine why and how certain truth-claims come to be regenerated and re-attached to racist discursive and non-discursive practices, even as racial representations (and/or understandings) of individual bodies in new socio-political contexts might take on new forms, diverging from previous iterations. An analysis/genealogy of racism(s) would thus attempt to locate the reproduction of truth-claims in (and as) power/knowledge configurations, even as these truth claims are seemingly reworked and contested, and even as “new” racial representations become more fluid. Stoler (1995) asks how this continuous regeneration of truth-claims might offer an understanding of “how the polyvalent discourses on race and their effects might better be viewed as a complex process of rupture and recuperation” which has “transformed the socio-economic and the sexual politics of race (p. 200). It is in this idea of rupture and recuperation where Stoler suggests that the same statement

can be invested with two meanings, and where opposing statements can come to mean the same thing (p. 201).

I take up Stoler's analyses in this research project, to understand power as that which embeds conceptual categorizations of race in and across discourses, time and space, but that which also *collapses* a range of spatial and chronological differences and the ruptures, anxieties and/or "breaks" that each time/space dimension offers up. What I am suggesting is that the ruptures and recuperations that occur are both a reflection and *effect* of power, in that power cannot wholly and consistently contain and manage the "differences" which tug at its seams. Therefore, in this dissertation, I seek to examine how power is manifested, via the discourse of diversity, to regenerate the truth-claims that make up race and racial thinking, and how and under what conditions diversity discourse in the City of Toronto is called forth to manage and contain its own ruptures, in order to regenerate its possibility in the present. Taken together with Ahmed's (2002) exploration of how power produces bodies, I am assuming a theorization of power which, via the discourse of diversity and in negotiations of belonging, (re-)produces racial bodies in a particular way in order to manage and contain its *locally manifested* ruptures.

Space. As Jane M. Jacobs (1996) asserts, while theories of imperialism and (post)colonialism offer insight into their constitutive effects across time and space, attending to the space of the local is lacking. This is not to suggest that local spaces might exist outside or beyond the technologies of imperialism and empire, making theorizing 'from above' invalid to their formations. It is that essentialist notions of space, much like essentialist notions of identity, are constantly challenged, revised and/or re-visited through local politics, struggles and negotiations of place and race. It is through attending to the local that one can see how site-specific processes incite re-articulations of the unstable racial logics of imperialism, power and

difference that also imaginatively bound the nation and transverse the globe. As Jacobs (1996) proposes, “through attending to the local, by taking the local seriously, it is possible to see how the grand ideas of empire become unstable technologies of power which reach across time and space” (p. 158).

This dissertation draws on Jacobs’ conceptualization of the local, specifically the implications of the city as a site of “meeting” the Other which produces imperial and colonial anxieties in the Self (Barthes, 1981; as cited in Jacobs, p. 4). It is through these racial anxieties that imperialism expresses and reproduces itself in a local context. But it is also the instability of the local context that reproduces these imperialist racial anxieties. Through examining the complexities of the local, we can begin to uncover the processes of identity formation and fixing of place that come to be “known”, and thus held within imperialism’s grasp. However, it is also important to examine the challenges brought forth by local and contemporary close(r) encounters with the racial Other that shift the imperial project’s articulations (Jacobs, 1996, p. 6). This dissertation will thus be concerned with a racial project that assumes *and consumes* multiple variations in local, national, and transnational settings. As Jacobs (1999) also explains, theorizing of identity, processes of representation, and colonial discourses and anxieties which (re-)construct the racial Other (and the Self) has typically been avoided in analyses of the city (p. 1). This dissertation begins to forge a relationship between these theoretical concepts, outlined by Jacobs as mostly absent in empirical research on the city, and the production of the city that is “diverse”. This approach is taken with a view to theorizing the role of diversity discourse in responding to race and racism, in the context of the City of Toronto.

Goldberg's notion of "periphractic space" is useful to understanding as well as complicating the co-construction of race, space, and the making of subjects in the city (1993, p.

47). The significance of this concept lies in Goldberg's insistence that periphractic, or "fenced in" space does not necessarily have to mean the marginalization of persons in *physical* space; the dislocation and displacement of racialized bodies to the ends of or outside the city can be physical or imagined. Thus, periphractic space can mean limited or no access to the social, economic and political power of the city, including the rights and privileges that come with such authorized access. In this case, one is located spatially at the margins of urban society. Goldberg makes this very clear: "by restricting, *physically or discursively*, the space of racialized bodies, certain powers and privileges remain intact" (p. 47). This particular conceptualizing of space is key to understanding how the racialized discourses of the City (meaning the local state) might produce and reinforce race and racist exclusions with and through space. Specifically, how might the racialized body be periphractic in the way that it is constructed and contained as different through the discourses of the City? How might diversity discourse in the City of Toronto, which *co-produces* the bodies, subject-positions, identities and negotiations of belonging of racial Others in the City of Toronto, and which further normalizes and renders *necessary* those who do not belong, maintain racialized bodies as periphractic, given locally manifested ruptures and anxieties brought forward by the encounter, and by the partial belonging of racial Others in the City?

In the following pages, I hope to address these questions by highlighting how belonging in the City of Toronto is constructed in racial, discursive and spatial terms. Implied here is that the encounter with racial Others in the City of Toronto reproduces certain spatial and racial anxieties that are recuperated via the discourse of diversity. However, I also offer critical interventions with respect to the role of emotion and affect in negotiations of belonging, particularly as they relate to the desires to "undo" race and racialization. I contend that the

anxieties that are reproduced and recuperated through diversity discourse, through the encounter and in negotiations of belonging must also take into account how diversity reproduces and contains particular affective investments of racial Others, and how these investments might also be imbued with race and power.

Belonging

The notion of belonging has typically been theorized by scholars in relation to citizenship and identity formation, specifically how nationalist sentiments and political projects construct belonging to the nation against ethnic/racial identities who are seen to be “from elsewhere” (Antonsich, 2010; Skrbiš, Baldassar & Poynting, 2007). Drawing on Crowley, Yuval-Davis describes the politics of belonging as “the dirty work of boundary maintenance” (Crowley, 1999, as cited in Yuval-Davis, 2007, p. 563) whereby the political and ideological values and judgments that bind the imaginary nation are strictly reinforced, especially during contestations of citizenship brought by those who are deemed “outsiders”. Outsiders, or “Others”, are imagined to be a threat to the formation of “authentic” national communities, and as such are limited in processes of entry and settlement. As Yuval-Davis offers in her analysis of New Labour politics in the aftermath of the London suicide bombings (7/7), the seemingly “progressive” policies of British Labour Party politician David Blunkett, which involved commitments to “common, shared values”, loyalty, solidarity, and universal human rights, still heavily relied on strict immigration controls and continued to evoke the feelings of suspicion and threat in relations to those who did not speak English or looked or sounded like they were in the country illegally (Yuval-Davis, 2007, p. 571). The political projects that New Labour put forward thus continued the pursuit and distinctions of formal and cultural British citizenship, membership, entitlements and belonging along racial lines, separating the nation into “us” and

“them” (p. 204). As Skrbiš, Baldassar and Poynting (2007) similarly offer in their analyses post-9/11, “legitimate” forms of belonging were asserted through the further denial – symbolically, formally and/or materially – of Muslims in the West belonging to the nation state community.

Ahmed (2000) theorizes the role of the stranger (“them”) as an encounter with difference, integral to the emergence of the nation’s unified character. Ahmed analyzes multiculturalism policies and practices in Australia to argue that the nation is constructed through, and not against, difference: “the nation still constructs itself as a ‘we’, not by requiring that ‘they’ fit into a ‘standardized pattern’, but by the very requirement that they ‘be’ culturally different (that they ‘not be’ typical) (p. 96). The stranger is embraced as being part of the nation’s character as heterogeneous, and as welcoming/tolerant. Through multicultural policies and agendas, the figure of the stranger comes to represent difference (and the “right” to be different) that the nation claims as “theirs”. Ahmed also makes an important theoretical distinction between difference as embodied and difference as encountered. She argues that it is through the encounter, and through processes of recognition, that prior histories and regimes of difference are drawn upon, in order to fix the “I” and/or “we”, in relation to “them”. Difference is thus not an embodied or static representation inherent in the Other; it is defined through encounter, *by our ability to read difference each time we meet it* (Ahmed, 2000, p. 8). Ahmed posits that difference (and the refusal of difference) in the nation is read through encounter; through negotiations with racial Others as being for or against the interests of the unified nation. The social relations that mark bodies as Other are thus concealed through a national agenda that seeks to *embrace* difference as its own, as a part of its national character. Under the guise of “equality” and the right to “*express one’s identity*” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 104), some (unassimilable) bodies are contained and/or refused, in the interests of the nation, and of the “real Australian” (p. 106). The

figure of the stranger is thus *produced upon encounter*; either as a welcomed, celebrated difference that defines the multicultural nation, or as an unassimilable, expelled threat that “defines the borders and boundaries of given communities” (p. 150), and other spaces of belonging. In this vein, some strange bodies belong, while other (stranger) bodies do not.

Antonsich (2010) argues that belonging as it is theorized by many fails to address the need for recognition and acceptance of diverse people and groups, beyond the rights and benefits accrued through formal citizenship. Antonsich offers that belonging has two dimensions: place-belongingness (feeling of being “at home”) and a politics of belonging (discursive and material processes which delineate and contest insider/outsider statuses) (p. 645). An important theoretical consideration that Antonsich delves into is that belonging to place has emotional and discursive components. While Yuval-Davis (2007) explores the emotional dimensions of belonging, she does so in relation to individual and collective bodies and how they are drawn into loving “their” people and their country, and to hating and fearing racial Others who are deemed a threat to nationalist cultures and traditions (p. 564). She also suggests that such deep emotional investments are advocated and reproduced in social and political spaces, through discourses of belonging. Antonsich (2010) points out that while Yuval-Davis’ analyses is useful in understanding how emotional investments direct the politics of belonging, she leaves out how bodies become emotionally attached to place-belonging. He argues specifically that “her discussion overlooks the notion of place, as if feelings, discourses, and practices of belonging exist in a geographical vacuum” (p. 647). Antonsich draws on hooks’ (2009, p. 213; as cited in Antonsich, 2010, p.646)) conceptualization of “home” to indicate an emotional attachment, comfort and security that one feels in relation to belonging to a *symbolic* space. Antonsich questions whether our identifications and emotional attachments to “home” (as symbolic) shape

our various identities, or whether our identities shape how we see ourselves belonging to specific places, which we call “home”. Furthermore, he suggests that language can evoke feelings of intimacy and of a sense of belonging to “home”, through shared understanding(s) and meanings. However belonging is pursued, whether through varied performances of “sameness” (i.e. shared language, values, behaviours, and so on), or through the repeated threat of expulsion, there remain certain markers that prevent full integration for some. Antonsich (2010) argues that these markers expose certain bodies to discourses and practices of non-belonging, and are intrinsic to the ever-evolving discursive formulations of belonging, as contestations over space occur.

Ilcan (2002) argues that what is significant in conversations such as these (see also Kaplan, 1998; Malkki, 1999; Lovell, 1998; Stewart, 1996; Appadurai, 1996; Gilroy, 1993; as cited in Ilcan, 2002) is that the fixed and somewhat essentialized relationships between people, identity and homeland are complicated by navigating processes of inclusion/exclusion and displacement. Carrillo Rowe (2005) furthers these assertions by suggesting that since “belongings are conditioned by our bodies and where they are placed on the globe”, belonging is not always possible; but more importantly, that “people are not free to choose their belongings outside of the bounds of power” (p. 21). As such, belonging, both as a concept and as a *feeling*, is deeply complex, multifaceted and never fully complete (Ilcan, 2002). As Puwar (2004) warns, closer attention needs to be paid to how and why *certain* previously excluded bodies are now being invited, through discourses of multiculturalism, inclusion, and diversity, to come to the table and offer insights on belonging in space. It is important to recognize and situate how those who are differentially located – spatially, economically, socially and politically – form specific collectivities within the ideological apparatuses of power; specifically how contestations are

shaped by and through state politics, policies and discourses that provide (limited) “entry” for a select few (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

How do partial, politically contested and inconclusive forms of belonging shape the ways in which racial Others participate in socio-political spaces? What kinds of identities emerge through discursive notions of belonging, which seek to uphold existing insider/outsider relations; and how might state policies and discourses structure identity formation in relationship to belonging in socio-political space? Ahmed (2000) provides a critical contribution to traditional theorization of self/Other, discourse, and embodied difference. Specifically, she highlights a number of social discourses (including “stranger danger”) which depend on encountering strangers, who are, “in their very proximity, *already recognized as not belonging*, as being out of place (p. 20, Ahmed’s emphasis). It is this theorization of (non-)belonging through encounter to which I now turn.

(Non-)Belonging Through Encounter

Sara Ahmed’s (2000) theorization of the encounter moves from how the Other is constructed, to how particular modes of encounter differentiate the other, and how the past is reconstituted via how we hold others in place (p. 17). Crucially, difference is thus not embodied/in the body of whomever we meet; rather, it “happens in the encounter” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 144). Embodied and social identities are (re-)produced through such encounters, particularly in the process of expelling already marked bodies which, within transnational configurations of power and *relationally*, are deemed to be out of place. Ahmed’s (2000) ontology of strangers theorizes the making of the stranger as integral to the (re-)making of the self, as well as the “I” or the “we” inherent in national and institutional discourses, and other discourses of belonging. She advances the concept of “stranger fetishism” (p. 2) to discuss the

figure of the stranger as being discursively constructed and always already recognizable in the encounter; not as the embodiment of difference, but as a symbolic and imagined threat to the self, and to the nation. This fetishizing move obscures the (racial, colonial) histories that have produced the stranger, and the “we” whose self-image is invested in the figure of the stranger.

Through the metaphor of the alien, Ahmed describes how the stranger

is not simply the one whom we have failed to identify ('unidentified flying objects'), but is the one whom we have already identified in the event of being named as alien: the alien recuperates all that is beyond the human into the singularity of a given form. The alien hence becomes a fetish. (p. 2)

Ahmed argues that the stranger is contingent to the self; produced through the dialectics of proximity and distance, home and away, familiar and unknown. Nations and other communities of belonging thus define themselves *against* the figure of the stranger, the alien, the outsider (Ahmed, 2000).

Coleman (2015) draws on Ahmed's theorization of encounter to describe how the strange-other is produced as Indigenous in the Canadian context. As he argues, “for many Canadian settlers, Indigenous people are *too* close to home, *too* close for comfort, *too* close to the bone” (p. 274). This is precisely Ahmed's point: that Others become “strange” through proximity, through being too close (2000, p. 12). Canadian narratives of home thus rest on the exclusion and/or erasure of the Indigenous figure, which is symbolically and materially “too close”. Coleman (2015) argues that this (fear of) proximity determines how encounters are structured, how they are interpreted and by whom, as well as what existing discourses we draw on to set the limits of belonging, and to make each encounter (repeatedly) intelligible to our selves. Similarly, Thobani (2007) describes how the identity of the law-abiding national subject

in Canada is constructed against the primal, uncivilized Aboriginal. However, she extends the construction of the national identity to being against the non-European immigrant as well, arguing that even if the immigrant stranger is “included” under the rhetoric of diversity, s/he is “ontologized as stranger(s)...targeted for exclusion from entry into Canada as ‘non-preferred races’ up to the mid-twentieth century” (p. 15). Thobani traces the “non-preferred” immigrant’s quasi-inclusion, as well as how immigrant identities, subjectivities and interests have been shaped by the state’s racially organized policies. However, Thobani asserts that the immigrants’ desire to belong in the nation, and their increasing push for equality, inclusion, and full citizenship, makes them complicit in a white nation-building project that is advanced and systematized through the dispossession of Aboriginal peoples (p. 16). As such, the immigrant stranger, who is encountered and belongs conditionally, is situated below the white nationalist subject, but above the Aboriginal stranger, who is encountered marginally and continues to be targeted, politically, discursively and materially, for cultural and political elimination.

This dissertation moves beyond a racism in structural and ideological terms to question what “truth” is (re-)produced within and by the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto, through an understanding of how diversity discourse attempts to contain and reflect the varied subject positions brought forth through negotiations of belonging in the city. Following Ahmed (2000), this dissertation will thus read these negotiations in the City of Toronto, between those who belong and those who seek to belong, as *necessary* encounters, integral to articulation(s) of diversity, and to the City of Toronto’s identity as diverse. Here I wish to re-visit Ahmed’s (2000) assertion that, through the production of the multicultural nation and its attendant discourses, strangers are encountered as either being welcomed and celebrated, or as being a threat. In the case of Australia, the strangers that are welcomed and celebrated constitute the multicultural

nation, just as the strange(r) bodies do – they define the multicultural nation’s borders. As such, some strange bodies belong, while other (stranger) bodies do not. I expand on this assertion by arguing that certain bodies – and therefore certain subject positions – *must* be incorporated into belonging in the socio-political City of Toronto space that we call “diverse”, even as they might resist/reject the language of diversity, and/or even as they might fail to meet its performative requirements. This begs the questions: which bodies are being expelled from spaces of belonging in the City, and what does this expulsion actually look like? How are these expulsions framed by the discourse of diversity? Under what conditions does the stranger become *too close and too strange* in the diverse City?

Following Jacobs (1996), my approach is to highlight and trace local ruptures, instabilities and anxieties, as a way to expose how and when the strange(r) gets too close. In this dissertation, I extend current theorizations of the encounter to connect them more closely to discursive expressions of belonging in a local context. This approach allows for a preliminary exploration into the possible connections and contradictions between Canada’s multiculturalism and the diversity that is specific to the City of Toronto. The rendering of the encounter, and how it is brought to bear in everyday processes of inclusion and exclusion in spaces of belonging, is useful to my theorization of diversity discourse as both a measuring and policing tool of (in)compatible difference in the City of Toronto. In the following chapters, I pursue a local theorization of encounter which views meeting others as being necessary to the construction of the diverse City, and to the management of uncontainable difference. I argue that, even as strange(r) bodies are deemed as a threat to the diverse City, they are contained – discursively, politically, and socially –*within* its (anxious) borders. As Hall (1996) indicates, identity, subjectivity, identifications and belonging are not static or immobile. Their discursive

expressions are relational and contested and are intimately connected to political projects and articulations of space which rely on Others to be hailed into negotiate, and/or to reproduce. In the following section I discuss the concept of hailing, as it relates to belonging and to the political project of diversity in the City of Toronto.

Hailing and Belonging

Several scholars have drawn on Althusser's notion of interpellation, or hailing, to discuss subjecthood and identity, as it relates to discourse and belonging (see for example Ahmed, 2000; Butler, 1997; Carrillo Rowe, 2005; Lee, 2008; Weedon, 2004). To explain hailing, Althusser (1971) describes a common occurrence of an individual walking down the street and a police officer or another person yelling "Hey, you there!" Althusser suggests that in almost every case, the subject will turn around. This, he suggests, is the process whereby s/he comes a subject, and where subjectivity becomes a type of ideology (Althusser, 1971, p. 163). As Althusser describes, the person being hailed "knows" that s/he is the subject of the hail, and knows to respond, even if not called by name, by turning around. Althusser calls this "mis-recognition" because there is no agreed upon arrangement or relationship, prior to being hailed. Through misrecognition, Althusser argues, we are hailed into being subjects, as constituted through and essential to ideology, who practice material rituals such as turning around as an act of ideological submission (Lee, 2008, p. 198). As such, the very logic and act of hailing becomes naturalized, even mechanized.

Althusser's notion of hailing is critical to our understandings of national identity, subjectivity, and belonging in racial and discursive terms. As Lee (2008) writes: "You are not what you say you are, you are what you are hailed. And the ways you are hailed are so familiar, so *repetitive*, that you believe that your response is of your own volition" (p. 198). Lee (2008)

draws a connection between Althusser's notion of hailing and a Barthesian analysis of "doxa" – the naturalized repetition of "bad" and unlocatable discourses – which she argues is at the centre of conditioning the ideological and performative "knowing-again" (p. 199). As she argues, intersubjective (mis)recognition: how we recognize others, our selves, as well as how we identify familiar and strange, is located in the repetition of "grand (national, gendered, and racial) narratives", which then characterize, condition and police bodies and situations through processes of interpellation, including of the self (p. 201). Carrillo Rowe (2005) expands on Lee's theorization of hailing and discourse to suggest that the ways in which power hails us, *and the ways in which power is hailed by us* (perhaps, but not always, as a strategy of resistance) conditions the ways in which subjects are included differently in space. It is thus imperative to interrogate the inclusion of previously excluded bodies as a reflection, effect, and interplay of subjects being hailed, and of subjects reproducing ideology, in negotiations of belonging (Carrillo Rowe, 2005, p. 22). Carrillo Rowe poses important theoretical questions about hailing, power and belonging; particularly how attachments to and investments in identity politics in negotiations of (non-)belonging in socio-political space inhibits alliance building and cannot exist outside the bounds of power. These questions are taken up by Butler (1997) as she discusses various identity categories such as "'woman' or 'Jew' or 'queer' or 'Black' or 'Chicana'" (p. 95). Butler highlights a crucial component of Althusser's theorizing of subjectivity: that the one who is hailed might *not* turn around, may fail to hear being called, or might insist on being called in a different way. Depending on the space and the context, Butler argues, being hailed as any/all of these can be heard as:

an affirmation or an insult...there is more often than not some hesitation about whether or how to respond, for what is at stake is whether the temporary totalization performed by

the name is politically enabling or paralyzing, whether the foreclosure, indeed the violence, of the totalizing reduction of identity performed by that particular hailing is politically strategic or regressive or, if paralyzing and regressive, also enabling in some way. (p. 96)

However, even if the subject refuses the name s/he is called by, Butler insists that the subject is still constituted by the name s/he is called, through the markings of gender, race, class other classifications. As such, one does not exist through recognition (as reciprocal), but *through being recognizable*, through being codified. In this vein, subjects become objects through discourses which produce and limit the possibilities of a given identity, within the confines of power.

Ahmed (2000) similarly explores the act of hailing and (mis)recognition in relation to the constitution of the stranger in the spaces of non-belonging. As she offers, public discourse becomes the mechanism by which we can identify and recognize members of a shared community when, for example, we travel elsewhere. Those who belong to the same nation can draw on national imaginaries (shared stories, rituals, expressions and images of the nation) to hail others into national subject-positions, against the bodies of outsiders/strangers. The nation is thus constructed discursively, symbolically, and materially, along racial lines (p. 99).

In this dissertation, I build on the work of these scholars to investigate how diversity, as a discourse, hails the racial Other into negotiations of belonging. I argue that particular identity categories and subject positions are (re-)produced in these negotiations, that diversity simultaneously invites and attempts to contain. Seen through this lens, it is possible to trace why certain types of subject positions, identities, and performances of identity are permitted to pass through the boundaries of belonging in socio-political space, through an understanding of how

they are taken up through the repetition of the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto. I also want to offer that the act of hailing, and of the invitation into negotiations of belonging *also create opportunities for a re-writing and revisions of history in the present, in racial terms.*

Diversity and the encounters it incites/invites offer up material opportunities to refresh historical and ideological contexts. A racial history becomes relevant when the Other interacts with and encounters the subject. However, in the present day, this cannot be accomplished without first inciting the desire for belonging in the Other. What is yet to be discovered is how negotiations of belonging actually come to meet this desire, when in practice it is these acts that reproduce relations of race, and thus of non-belonging itself.

Be-longing

Derek Hook (2011) makes a critical intervention into the theorization of racism, nationalism and identity by arguing that what needs to be taken seriously is the role of affect and emotion in symbolic/discursive systems which determine facets of subjectivity. Hook offers this example:

I may express myself in a discourse of non-racist, multi-cultural tolerance, I may well feel genuinely emotionally committed to such values – identifying with such ideal-ego values at a imaginary level – yet I might, nevertheless, experience a set of anxious, affective, bodily reactions in relation to the physical proximity of certain others. (p. 111)

As Hook suggests, in our attempts to theorize identity, discourse and belonging, affect and emotion should not read as reflecting “outsider” (as object/Other) *versus* “insider” (as a separate and distinct “I”) relations, but instead that neither side is distinct, neither has a fully separate identity. As such, affect (non-commensurability with discourse) and emotion (relative commensurability with discourse) engage in a dynamic interplay to reflect and contain this *lack*

(p. 109). Intersections of discourse, affect and emotion thus create politically complex negotiations of belonging. In Hook's (2005) terminology, "technology of affect" refers to the ways in which we position our emotional responses to align with certain social norms, modes of inclusion/exclusion that then materialize during close(r) encounters with "difference" and negotiations of belonging, as situated in socio-political space. As Hook writes:

We may as such assume certain affect-positions (fear, anger, irritation, love) which then become the proof of affect for a given ideological proposition, for a categorical relationship of entitlement, exclusion, belonging, etc. So: that I feel threatened by an influx of immigrants is proof enough of their moral dubiousness, proof enough also of why they – and others like them– should be prevented any rights of access. (p. 88)

Furthering Hook's analysis, Ahmed (2004) is concerned with "how language works as a form of power in which emotions align some bodies with others" (p. 195), and suggests that hierarchical, racial and colonial power relations that are discursively constituted and performed are naturalized and concealed in "the production of the effect of likeness and unlikeness ... this separation of others into bodies that can be loved and hated". (p. 54)

Ahmed (2004) states that emotions "*do things*" (p. 119). By this, she means that emotions work to "stick" (historically constituted) subjects together, through a "re-opening [of] past associations that allow some bodies to be read *as the cause of "our hate," or as "being" hateful*" (p. 120, my emphasis). In this context, we can begin to theorize, as Ahmed appears to, how the encounter is deeply affective, in that it does not rely on embodiment of difference, but on a continuous threat of proximity. However, emotion (love, hate, fear, and so on) is also affective, in that it travels backwards, *to find its causes and justifications*, and sideways to where "we" are bound together through particular discourses, *against Others*. As Ahmed (2004) writes:

We can see that the affectivity of hate is what makes it difficult to pin down, to locate in a body, object, or figure. This difficulty is what makes emotions such as hate work the way that they do; *it is not the impossibility of hate as such, but the mode of its operation, whereby it surfaces in the world made up of other bodies*. In other words, it is the failure of emotions to be located in a body, object, or figures that allow emotions to (re)produce or generate the effects that they do. (p. 124)

This theorizing “challenges any assumption that emotions are a private matter, that they simply belong to individuals, or even that they come from within and *then* move outward toward others” (p. 117). Emotion is tied intricately to others, and gains power through circulation and signs. Accordingly, affect works through the circulation of discourses and “the more they circulate, the more affective they become, and the more they appear to contain “affect” (p. 120).

Race comes into existence through those who hold the authority to make race, and who, through the making of race, become entitled to hold that authority. However, race and racialized discourses cannot simply be reduced simply to talk or text, although authoritative speakers do draw on these resources to enact racist practices and re-enact racial privilege. What is important here is that belonging has discursive, material, affective and emotional components. In line with Hook’s (2011) analysis, what is required is an examination of the affective and emotional reactions to difference that force a constant state of re-negotiation in specific times and contexts. What is also required, however, is an understanding of how racial Others (re-)negotiate the discursive expressions that contain the affective and emotional reactions of those who belong, as they negotiate their own (non-)belonging, identities and emotions in socio-political space. How do racialized Others constitute their identities and subjectivities in negotiations of belonging, and through what kinds of emotional attachments/investments? How are these attachments and

investments effected by the discourse of diversity? How might emotion engage with encounter to (re-)create and redeploy various racialized subjectivities within the discourse of diversity?

To help answer these questions, this thesis draws on Probyn's (1996) analyses of emotion and belonging. Probyn (1996) theorizes belonging in terms of the emotional investments, attachments and potential (re-)creation of selves that are evoked through "a desire for becoming-other, a longing for someone/something else" (p. 5). "Be-longing" is thus a yearning that not only restricts identities from being static and/or stable, it exposes the impossibility of "ever really and truly belonging" because individuals and groups are perpetually moving between being and becoming (Probyn, 1996, p. 19). Carrillo Rowe (2006) expands on the work of Probyn to move belonging from a politics of location, to a politics of relation: where and with whom we build our affective ties, and under what political conditions (p. 16). Her theorization of belonging involves a constitution of the self away from individuality, and towards our "longings to be with" (Carrillo Rowe, 2006, p. 17). For Carrillo Rowe, a moving towards an-other shifts away from the desire for the fully realized western Self. The longing to be with is what becomes "being", instead of the individual, competitive, isolated, separated Self as "being". A critical component of Carrillo Rowe's be-longing is intersectionality, and a recognition of how one's oppression and privilege is tied to an-others', making belonging a dynamic and shifting process. Subjectivity is thus an effect of longing, of being in between that is based on mutual responsibility and accountability, across power lines (2006, p. 18).

In this thesis, I offer that "longing to be/come" is an affective technology. The implication generated by this theorization is that diversity, as a discourse, contains the emotional and affective reactions of racialized Others who are encountered in and negotiate spaces of

(non-)belonging, and that this containment leads to the (co-)construction and materialization of multiple expressions of racialized identity and belonging in the City. Thobani (2007) writes: “as Fanon himself experienced while living in France, the racialized marking of the body cannot be overcome, no matter the sophistication of one’s deportment, the undetectability of one’s accent, *the depth of one’s longing to belong*” (p. 171, my emphasis). I want to argue that diversity, as a discourse, incites the desire for “longing to be someone/something else”, specifically a deeply affective and emotional longing in and for racial Others to be *not-strange*. I draw on Butler’s (1997) conceptualization of identity as injury, specifically the attachments to wounds which Butler calls the “self-colonizing trajectory of certain forms of identity politics” (p. 197), to undergird the affective longing to be not-strange, *not-raced*. However, I am suggesting that whatever form(s) this longing takes, and whatever political agencies and subjectivities are produced, they do so within the confines of power. As such, I am concerned with how diversity discourse draws the insider and the outsider in to negotiate and to imagine new forms of belonging, with the understanding that the various subjectivities that are caught up in the processes of yearning are both regulated and reproduced through diversity discourse, *as racialized subjects*.

Weedon (2004) posits that a particular discourse is employed in socio-political space in order to encourage specific subjectivities, identifications, values and attachments, to “give individuals a singular sense of who they are and where they belong” (p. 19). This, she argues, is one of the ideological functions of identity: to inhibit multiplicity and relationality of subjectivities. In this thesis, I advance the idea that diversity discourse organizes and reproduces race through an invitation to racialized Others to constitute themselves as not-strange, while simultaneously reinforcing racial divisions through their material presence and engagement. An important aspect of my thesis is to take up this longing to be not-strange as a deeply affective and

emotional desire to belong, and as one that can only be provoked in and through spaces where racialized bodies do not belong. I offer that it is through the act of being present in space(s) of non-belonging that the racial Other simultaneously effects race and *feels* (perhaps temporarily) transported across racial lines. In the following chapters, I attempt to make sense of how deeply affective and emotional longings to be not-strange emerge as co-articulated with affective and emotional responses to strange encounters, through the discourse of diversity. The multiple and varied ways that diversity evokes such co-determinations, and through what kinds of spaces of (non-)belonging in the City this is accomplished, is left to be determined. I also seek to engage with the kinds of subjectivities, identifications and values diversity discourse inspires, in relation to (non-)belonging in the City of Toronto. As such, I am left with this question: How does race grow strong, most often in spaces where Others do not belong?

Conclusion: On Discourse, Race and Belonging, as Co-constructed in Space

In this chapter, I have outlined a plan to conceptualize diversity discourse in the City of Toronto within a theoretical framework that explores the shifting racial logics inherent in the production of discourse, space, difference, belonging, Othering, and the body. Through this lens, I hope to gain insight into how diversity can simultaneously threaten, transform and re-imagine the City of Toronto. In this chapter I have also discussed current theorizations of encounter, hailing and be-longing, as they each relate to the (non-)belonging in socio-political space. I have drawn on (co-)constructions of identity, discourse, subjectivity, and emotion/affect to reveal how negotiations of belonging, and the ways in which we are all made intelligible as subjects, and are situated within historical, social and racial relations which are imbued with power and its effects. These ideas are applied throughout this dissertation in order to explore how diversity discourse organizes and reproduces race in the City of Toronto. However, the theoretical aim of my thesis

is to build on current theorizations of encounter, hailing and be-longing, to examine how they intersect and converge in particular ways, at particular moments, to produce diverse objects and subjects in the City, *as a local socio-political space*. An important aspect of this dissertation is thus to understand and convey how local space produces specific articulations of (non-)belonging that reflect and reproduce larger historical and political projects of race.

While I seek to critically examine how the City of Toronto reifies racialized and discursive expressions of nation, state, citizenship, identity, belonging and difference, in the following chapters I also investigate how the City insinuates itself in the re-negotiating and re-making of these expressions. In developing an account of how race transforms and extends in conjunction with emerging conceptualizations of the city, I hope to theorize and elaborate on race and diversity discourse as co-articulations in and of the City of Toronto. As such, I argue that race and the City are *mutually constituted and productive categories* that stretch across time, from the colonial and spatial organization of the centre and the periphery, to the making of the contemporary, global and diverse City.

As Brah (2000) argues, race, class, gender and sexuality are inscribed in and constituted by one another, arising through a particular set of political, economic, and social circumstances that have difference expressions in different spaces, but are also *produced* through different spaces. This dissertation asks how the political, economic and social organization of space produces and reproduces race and racism in the City of Toronto through diversity discourse. Drawing on Kirby's analysis of the mapping subject (1996), I contend that diversity discourse is a construct which attempts to respond to and "map" that which is unknown in space, in order for it to be known and repeated *as race*. As Kirby suggests, the cartographer typically removes himself from the landscape, mastering his environment through mapping, to occupy a superior

and separate position in relation to the land (p. 48). However, as Kirby describes, when the cartographer is lost, he is unable to maintain this position of superiority. He no longer has mastery over the space and cannot avoid the affects and effects of the landscape that surrounds him. While diversity discourse maps the space of the City so that it can be known to the mapping subject, and he can maintain his position of superiority, he cannot always be prepared for strange(r) encounters and what they might bring. What is equally important here is that diversity discourse locates the authorized (mapping) subject as *separate and distinct* from the diverse City; and gives him the security and stability to venture towards the outside and *to bring the outside within*. Armed with diversity discourse, the mapping subject (who I argue in the next chapter is the somatic norm; he who is seen to “rightfully belong” in the space of the City) thus goes out to meet and contain the multiple challenges before him in the City.

The tendency for governments, organizations, and the media to emphasize diversity over anti-racism suggests the desire to organize the space of the social, political and economic in a way that re-generates historical forms of privilege and status that come with dominant subject positions; and the discrimination that comes with Others. As such, Mills’ “global white supremacy” is a political system of racial justice that would radically re-evaluate mainstream conceptions of diversity in the City of Toronto (1998). It is not the case, by applying global white supremacy, that we necessarily assume that everyone is racist. The goal of global white supremacy, as a political and theoretical framework, is to explicitly draw out the racial character of systems. Race is understood to have its own social ontology and autonomy, to be extremely pervasive in nature, and to structure systems to be advantageous to whites. Global white supremacy would explicate how histo-racial ordering privileges or disadvantages individuals and groups, across the globe and in local spaces. In global white supremacy “what seems like a

neutral starting point is actually already normatively loaded” (1998, p. 106). The task is to thus understand diversity discourse not only as a spatial and racial project which reproduces and organizes race, but also as one that reinvigorates the normative boundaries and authority of white identity, supremacy and belonging. It is my argument that the authority of diversity discourse can only be granted by and through the denial of full subjectivity and belonging of racial Others in the City of Toronto, and thus through the repetition of colonial and racial discourses of difference.

In the next chapter, I propose a conceptual framework which connects belonging for racial Others in the City via the discourse of diversity with the reproduction of racialization and race. In this chapter, I describe how the idea of the *performativity* of diversity discourse came up part way through my analyses of interview transcripts and City of Toronto text, specifically as I began to trace how diversity discourse (re-)produces negotiations of belonging of racialized Others in the City in racializing terms. Through the various themes that come forward in the analyses contained in Chapters 6, 7 and 8, I draw on my conceptualization of performativity in order to trace how diversity discourse in the City re-cites and is incited by certain racial norms/“truths”, which produce and are reproduced by the various subject positions that are available in diversity’s name. I also show how performativity enables a binding of diversity discourse with emotion, affect and the desires to be not-strange, not raced and to belong in the City. In the final chapter, I revisit the ideas of performativity and binding to describe how agency might be possible via the *detachment of desire and discourse*. I expand on the idea of agency as detachment to discuss how the “denaturalization” of racial norms, diversity discourse and the diverse subject might shift how and under what terms belonging for racial Others is negotiated in the City.

Chapter 5

The Performativity of Diversity



Introduction

The picture above depicts the May 12, 2014 meeting of the “Deputy Mayor’s Black Business Professionals Roundtable”, spearheaded by former City of Toronto Deputy Mayor Norm Kelly (centre, seated row) and former Chair of the Economic Development Committee, City Councillor Michael Thompson (immediately right of centre, seated row). The objectives of this Roundtable, as noted in the official report of the Roundtable meeting, were to listen to the participants, form partnerships, and to address the issues Black business owners and operators face by introducing “meaningful policies” to help them succeed (City of Toronto, 2014a, p. 5). The report opens with message from Deputy Mayor Norm Kelly:

Toronto has a diverse business community that plays an enormous role in the vibrancy of Toronto's economy and social fabric of our communities. Governments must listen to

business community stakeholders to develop strategies that will promote an equitable and business-friendly environment.

At the Deputy Mayor's Black Business Professionals Roundtable, we took an important step towards the formation of a stronger partnership with some of Toronto's Black business owners and operators. At the meeting, stakeholders took time out of their busy schedules to work with decision makers to develop solutions that address some of the issues facing their business community. The contributions from the participants form the basis for this report and for any initiatives that arise from it. The conversation has only just begun. (City of Toronto, 2014a, p. ii)

Following the Deputy Mayor's introduction is a note from City Councillor Michael Thompson, which closes with:

Diversity is Toronto's strength ... what we learned and shared at the Black Business Professionals Roundtable will go a long way toward building productive ongoing collaboration and instituting effective support services. (City of Toronto, 2014a, p. iii)

After reading this report, I was left with several questions. How were these particular "Black Business Professionals" selected? Did they have existing relationships with the City of Toronto, and if so, in what capacity? Racism was not mentioned anywhere in the report, including in the summary notes and findings. Was racism never an issue for Black business owners and operators? However, of most concern was how the contributions of the Roundtable participants culminated in a set of recommendations which reiterated many of the same goals/initiatives that proliferated in City reports which name and/or offer policy directions on diversity, as far back as

the 1990s.¹³ These recommendations, including “building education and awareness”, “skills development workshops”, and “creating a business professionals mentorship program” for the Black business community (City of Toronto, 2014a, p. 10), were offered up as ways to help “*their* ability to grow and operate efficiently” so that *they* could be successful as businesses in Toronto (City of Toronto, 2014a, p. 9; my emphases).

In this chapter, I hope to address some of these questions, as well as others that came up during my data collection and review process, by offering an approach to diversity discourse and belonging in the City of Toronto which draws on the notions of performativity and racialization. It is important to note here that I developed this conceptual framework during my explorations of interview data, which I read against City of Toronto texts that offered recommendations on diversity and/or racism in the City. I use this framework specifically to supplement my theoretical approach to belonging in the City, and to structure and strengthen my analyses of interview data and City texts. This framework also serves as a point of reference to revisit when working through the various facets of my analyses, including my observations.

At some point in my review of interview data, I became aware of the multiple and at times contradictory positionings that racialized City staff took up with respect to diversity in the City, particularly around how diversity shaped understanding(s) of their own belonging. What

¹³ See for example “City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 9 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 6 on March 23, 1992, Clause 24 – Equal Opportunity Corporate Review for the Period 1986-1990”. The City, in order “to maintain its leadership role and its accountability to the diversity community it serves”, sought equity via “increasing the number of native people, people with disabilities, racial minorities, and women in the civic workforce” (City of Toronto, 1992a, p. 69). Recommendations also included “establishment of a corporate fund for internship/bridging/apprenticeship positions”, “training and development strategies give designated groups employees the knowledge, skills, and experience” (p. 69), and “innovative on-the-job skills training” (p. 75). Similarly, “City of Toronto Policy and Finance Committee Report no. 3, Clause No. 3, 2003 - The City of Toronto Plan for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination” responds to the Ornstein study which indicated labour market and economic disparities between racialized communities and the European-origin population that are explicitly not based on education levels, and suggests that “implement mentoring programs to assist employees and immigrant workers” (2003a, p.6) would help issues of under/unemployment for racialized communities. The point here is that equity issues and/or lack of hiring and retention of these groups becomes about their “lack”, rather than institutional barriers i.e. racism, sexism, etc. I go on to discuss this “lack” in more detail in the next three chapters.

became increasingly clear during my reading of interview data was that racialized City staff articulated their understandings of diversity and their belonging in various ways, but that these understandings invariably rested upon their desire(s) to “transcend” exclusions based on race/racism. At the same time, I began to take notice of how City of Toronto texts re-circulated the same “ideas” and/or recommendations on how to address diversity and/or racism, regardless of the context, which were also consistently linked to statements of the City being a “leader” on tackling issues of diversity and racism. What I sought to understand, as these themes emerged, was how racialized City staff’s various and at times contradictory understandings of diversity, belonging, and their desires to transcend race/racism are taken up and reinforced in a City which repeatedly claims to be a leader in addressing issues of diversity and/or racism. How and under what conditions do racialized City staff become “good” at talking about and/or addressing issues of diversity and racism in the City? How do the desires of racialized City staff to transcend exclusions based on race/racism shape the City’s claims to lead this transcendence, and vice versa? What happens to experiences of racism when the responses in City texts get normalized and/or reproduced by racialized Others in the City, as a negotiation of their own belonging, intelligibility and articulation? Who becomes responsible for addressing issues of race and continuing experiences of racism in a City whose leadership on diversity issues is premised largely on their absences?

Following this introduction, I expand on Butler’s (2011) notion of performativity and Ahmed’s (2002) theorization of racialization in order to contextualize the various and at times contradictory positionings of racialized City staff, the repetition of responses in City texts, *as well as how they are co-articulated*. I will first pursue an in-depth discussion of Butler’s (2011) conceptualization of performativity in order to begin to chart the terrain whereby diversity, as a

discourse, comes to reproduce and organize race as “a regulatory practice that produce the bodies it governs” (Butler, 2011, p. xii). I pursue this line of analysis to show how “race” is not simply what one has, or is – but it is one of the norms by which an Other is understood, categorized and becomes intelligible. I then discuss Ahmed’s (2002) theorization of racialized bodies, particularly how racialization *effects* race via the essentialization of bodies. I want to make the argument that diversity as a discourse re-circulates the normative and regulatory qualifications which make Other bodies in the City intelligible in the present via processes of racialization. Finally, I complicate the performativity and racializing practices of diversity discourse (as what diversity discourse *does* to and with racial Others in the City) by bringing in Chen's (1999) idea that subaltern bodies "bolster" themselves in various ways to negotiate hegemonic boundaries and the negative stereotypes which reinforce their exclusion. In this section of the chapter, I offer a framework for understanding what racialized City staff *do* to (and with) diversity, particularly how racialized City staff engage in bolstering tactics to reinforce their belonging in the City, as “insider-Others”, via the discourse of diversity. I want to suggest that the bolstering tactics of racialized City staff both confirm and transgress the boundaries of race and power, as well as the discourses that police them.

Within this chapter, I also challenge Ahmed’s (2012) conceptualization of diversity as non-performative, which she defines as “the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse *does not produce* the effects that it names” (emphasis original, p. 117). By grounding my analyses in a detailed investigation of how diversity in the City of Toronto reproduces race and racial thinking, I am able to make visible the regulatory, racial norms that are “indissociable” (Butler, 2011, xiii) from the materialization of diverse (raced) bodies, texts and speech acts. Specifically, I contend that the moral, colonial, and civilizing narratives and practices that

underlie the construction of racial norms are the same that not only make diversity *and what it names* possible, but also (re-)produces its effects.

On Performativity, Racialization, and Diversity Discourse

Sara Ahmed (2002) and Judith Butler (2011) have both pursued important theoretical explorations of the productive power of discourse, particularly in relation to the materiality of bodies. In this chapter, I draw on and connect the work of these two authors in order to theorize the performativity (Butler) of diversity as intrinsically tied to racializing processes (Ahmed) which, through encounters and negotiations of belonging of racialized Others in the space of the City, reproduce particular truths and knowledge that reconstitute race. This theorization importantly considers that processes of racialization and performativity both rely on and reproduce a set of regulatory norms which are incited into discourse, in order to ensure their repetition and resignification.

In her theory of gender performativity, Butler (2011) problematizes the congruence between sex (i.e. male) and gender identity (i.e. man/masculine), to expose a forced regulation of sexuality in which gender is performatively recited and reconstituted within the bounds of heterosexuality. By drawing on Foucault's conceptualization of a "regulatory ideal", Butler is first able to describe how "sex" is not simply what one has, or is; but is a "regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs, that is, whose regulatory force is made clear as a kind of introduction productive power, the power to produce— demarcate, circulate, differentiate— the bodies it controls" (p. xii). Thus, "sex", as an ideal, forcibly materializes (or fails to materialize) certain sexed identifications as an effect of power; through a set of highly regulated and repetitive discourses and practices. As Butler espouses, the materiality of the body (as "sexed") thus cannot be understood apart from the regulatory norms that reproduce "sex" as norm within

which one becomes viable and intelligible (Butler, 2011). Furthermore, cultural constructs of gender that are imposed upon (and perhaps expected of) a sexed body can no longer be understood as natural linking of (gender) identity with bodily matter. Rather, gender becomes a dynamic interplay of material and discursive practices which condition how the subject is qualified, understood, included and/or abjected in cultural life. Butler holds that subjects are categorized and become intelligible through a certain “matrix of gender relations” (p. xvi) which are consistently reiterated in and reproduced by discourse and have been grounded as material practices, through bodily acts such as manners of speech, modes of dress and bodily gestures. It is through repeated action, whereby regulatory norms are reproduced and re-lived materially and discursively, that gender becomes performative. However, Butler is clear that these gendering “acts” cannot be contrived simply as a willingness, performance and/or appropriation of regulatory ideals, but instead exemplifies the conditions in which all acts and speaking subjects come into being; through a reiteration and reciting of gender norms. Those who stand outside or reject this matrix of gender relations are never fully “outside”: although abjected, denied articulation, and their humanness questioned, those who are outside are integral to the construction of gender in that the foreclosures and erasures enabled in their name reproduce gendered (human) against *not properly gendered (inhuman)* (Butler, 2011, my emphasis). As Butler further articulates, “such attributions or interpellations contribute to that field of discourse and power that orchestrates, delimits, and sustains that which qualifies as ‘the human’” (p. xvii).

Butler’s notion of performativity enables an exploration of how the performativity of diversity re-circulates normative and regulatory qualifications in racial terms, so that the diverse subject in the City of Toronto becomes intelligible and identifiable via racial thinking. I also suggest that negotiations of belonging for the racialized Other in the City of Toronto are limited

to the matrix of diversity, whereby the racialized Other becomes an articulate(d) subject - through speech and through text - only to the extent that diversity and what it names is reiterated, reproduced, and cited by them, and through them. Following Butler (2011), I seek to demonstrate how the performativity of diversity in the City of Toronto might be thought of as citationality and resignification, in that “it acquires an act-like status in the present, and conceals or dissimulates the conventions of which it is a repetition” (p. xxi). I argue that performativity is thus not simply about the actions of a subject, nor of singular “act” that is performed. Rather, by examining performativity as the power of discourse to re-produce particular phenomena and to regulate, constrain and enable the materialization of bodies, it is possible to trace how diversity reinforces racial thinking through re-signification(s) of “us” (diverse/not quite strange) and “them” (“stranger strangers” –see Ahmed, 2000, p. 106) in negotiations of belonging in the City, *particularly through the continued disavowal and erasure of other, non-diverse identifications*. In this project, I seek to make visible how, when and why these erasures take place.

In my analyses, I expand on Butler’s notion of performativity so that it becomes possible to understand how diversity, as a discourse, re-circulates normative and regulatory ideals and practices which makes racialized Others intelligible in the City. By drawing on performativity, I am not suggesting that diversity is necessarily performed or acted by racialized subjects in the City. I am suggesting, however, that diversity offers the bounds under which one can identify/perform; that identifications and foreclosures are enabled in diversity’s name which form, assume, limit and appropriate speaking subjects in the City of Toronto. As Butler argues, “the subject is [also] constituted through the force of exclusion and abjection, one which produces a constitutive outside to the subject, an abjected outside, which is, after all, ‘inside’ the subject as its own founding repudiation” (2011, xiii). This understanding of the constitution of

the subject is vital to my conceptualization and analyses of diversity in the City of Toronto as a performative *through an invitation to negotiate belonging*, in that diversity simultaneously invites and refuses articulation of the abjected racial outside(r), but is dependent on the presence of this outside(r) for the re-articulation and normalization of diversity in the present.

How might Butler's conceptualization of sex (body) and gender (identity) as performatives apply to race and racial identities? It is important to note, as Hall (1996) does, that race cannot simply be inserted in the place of gender, in Butler's theorization of performativity. Instead, I draw on Ahmed's (2002) conceptualization of racialization so that it becomes possible to understand how racial identifications and subjectivities are invested with meaning via a mix of material and discursive practices that reproduce the racial body through processes of racialization. I also take Ahmed's theorizing one step further by putting her work in conversation with Butler's, in order to suggest that race, as a product of power, is incited into discourse via diversity, and it is through the resignifications and repeated citations of diversity that the racial subject/body is qualified, understood, included and/or abjected in the City of Toronto, to the point that the linking between diversity and the raced subject/body appear natural. It is to Ahmed's work that I now turn.

A key theoretical insight that Ahmed (2002) offers with respect to race, racialization and the (raced) body is that race *is an effect* of racialization, not its cause. Ahmed draws on Foucault to describe how power produces bodies:

We can evoke here Foucault's (1978) notion of power as *productive*. Rather than seeing power as repressive, that is, as constraining, delimiting or prohibiting what bodies can do (which is not to say that some power does not operate in this way), Foucault argues that power produces

certain effects; it is both generative and enabling (1978, pp. 11–12). If

power is productive, then power also produces bodies. (Ahmed, 2002, p. 48)

As Ahmed argues, colonialism succeeded in its violent quest through racializing processes, particularly by *producing* colonized bodies as already uncivilized, morally degenerate, inferior, Other, and otherwise inherently different to the white, masculine subject. Through colonialism, “the racial body” became an object of knowledge through processes of racialization and power, whereby skin colour was invested with meaning to mark out racial bodies as discursively and productively raced (as uncivil, morally inferior, Other), and to secure “Black” and “white” as racial identities with “essential characteristics” (Ahmed, 2002, p. 47). In the colonial project, the grouping of humans and identities in this way was necessary to the violent acquisition of land and of peoples, and was the very foundation of race, racial thinking, and the incitements of race into discourse. Incitements of race into discourse was the mechanism whereby colonizers could bring colonized bodies into fields of knowledge constituted by them (the white masculine subject), and could thus claim a certain “truth” about racial Others that subsequently justified the colonial project as a civilizing mission. Although race is not an intrinsic property of bodies, because the racial body is discursively produced, Ahmed posits that the “essence” of the racial body, as constructed through processes of racialization, does not entirely disappear. Essence, she argues, “*is an effect of construction*”, because race becomes “an effect of the very way in which we think, know and inhabit the world” (p. 47, my emphasis). The production of this “essence” thus becomes a site of critical interrogation, specifically “how is it that bodies come to be lived as having essential characteristics” (Ahmed, 2002, p. 47).

Ahmed also offers that processes of racialization constitute both body (self/Other) and space (belonging/non-belonging) in everyday encounters. It is at this critical juncture that Ahmed

can be brought into conversation with Butler. If, as Ahmed (2002) suggests, racialization imputes a certain “essence” of race onto bodies, where bodies come to be seen and known as “having” a racial identity (p. 47), and, as Butler’s (2011) theorization of performativity claims, regulatory norms become reiterated, cited and reproduced through discourse and as material practices; how might performativity and essence converge so that racial subjects/Others become intelligible in the City only via how they are known, encountered, and/or subjectivated by and through discourses of race/power? I want to return to the contents of the “Deputy Mayor’s Black Business Professionals Roundtable” report that I briefly outlined at the beginning of this chapter, and ask the following: How does a meeting which seeks to address the issues Black business owners and operators face, end up with a set of recommendations that reiterate *their* lack or need for training, skills development, and mentoring?

I argue that diversity discourse, as a racialized and racializing discourse, hails racialized Others into negotiations of (non-)belonging in the City, and that it is through these negotiations (encounters) that diversity also becomes performative, through repeated citations and resignifications of the colonial sentiments (norms) that are both offered up and concealed in diversity’s name. I expand on Butler (2011) and Ahmed (2002) to offer that the racial Other in the City of Toronto is thus (re-)produced, read and re-written as having a certain “essence”; which is incited into and re-circulated by diversity discourse, so that the racialized Other emerges and comes to be known through the matrix of race. As I posited in my theoretical framework chapter, diversity discourse incites in racial Others the desire for “longing to be someone/something else”, a deeply affective and emotional longing to be *not-strange, not-raced*. I also suggest that negotiations of belonging, as incited by and through diversity discourse in the City, have certain “re-racializing” effects/affects for racialized Others, particularly through the

threat of abjection and exclusion. I want to stress here that in my analyses that follow this chapter, my intention is not to delve into the psychology of racialized Others in the City – whether they are being the exception(al), like no Other, or in consultation at the City. Pursuing this line of analysis would simply reproduce colonial violence; to bring racial Others into existing fields of power/knowledge so that they become “known”. Rather, by examining how encounters reproduce various subjectivities (i.e. being welcome or being a threat) within the confines of power, it becomes possible to make visible how racialization and performativity collude to make racial Others intelligible and/or articulate(d) in and through the discourse of diversity, *in order to reproduce and organize race*.

Although the approach I am pursuing with respect to the confluence of racialization, performativity and diversity discourse involves tracing how racial Others become intelligible and/or articulate(d) in the City via reproductions of race, I am also interested in tracing the complex ways in which racialized City staff “achieve” and maintain their status as insider-Others in the City. If what makes diversity discourse in the City of Toronto performative is that it relies on and reproduces the matrix of essence, racialization and race in order to materialize racial Others/ bodies, how do racialized City staff negotiate and/or escape the matrix? In what ways do they *elide* exclusion/abjection, while possibly reproducing its terms? I am thinking here of Chen’s (1999) research project on how hegemony shapes the lives of Chinese American men. In his project, Chen investigates how Chinese American men use various strategies and negotiation tactics to “achieve” a variation of hegemonic masculinity most traditionally associated with the white, middle class, heterosexual male. Chen describes these strategies and tactics as “hegemonic bargaining”; trading, exchanging, or benefiting from privileges of race, class, gender, generation and/or sexuality to “bolster the masculinity” of Chinese American men in

order to deal with the negative stereotypes of them being men (p. 585). While I am less concerned with the specific ways in which racialized City staff trade or exchange their privileges, Chen's idea that subaltern men¹⁴ draw on specific social advantages to distance themselves from historical conceptualizations of gender, race, class and/or sexuality deserves some attention, especially given that drawing on social advantages and distancing from negative stereotypes *requires particular conceptualization(s) of the hegemonic figure and of the racialized Other*. During the initial review of interview data for this thesis, I became increasingly curious about how historical conceptualizations of the hegemonic figure and/or the racialized Other might inform, reproduce or be mediated by the bolstering tactics of racialized City staff, as they negotiate their belonging and status as "insider-Others" in the diverse City. I ask: in what ways do racialized City staff bolster their belonging in the City, and how might their bolstering tactics contribute to, rely on and/or disrupt the(ir) reproduction of diversity discourse and race in the City of Toronto?

In the next three chapters, I turn to interviews with racialized City staff and to City texts to pursue an in-depth exploration of how the performativity and negotiations of belonging that diversity incites intersect to (re-)produce racialization and racial thinking in the space of the City. I also trace the various forms of bolstering that racialized City staff engage with as they navigate diversity discourse, race and belonging in the City. In Chapter 6, "Being The Exception(al)", I build on Puwar's (2001) brief description of racialized civil servants and their need to "be [seen as] exceptional in order to be recognized as capable" (p. 661), in order to show how being exceptional in the City of Toronto is premised on racial terms, and produces and is produced by

¹⁴ Chen refers to the term "subaltern men" when describing the hegemonic bargaining of Chinese American men, but does not fully articulate what his definition of subaltern entails. I assume he means non-dominant, outside of the hegemonic norm, but this articulation gets a bit tricky as other aspects of identity come into play during the 'bargaining' process, which allows Chinese American men to "access" some variation of hegemonic masculinity.

the psychic desires to be/come someone/something else, as not strange/not raced, and to belong. In my analyses I discuss how diversity discourse invites subjects into such be-comings through a reinforcement of racialization and racial thinking.

I continue the theme of reinforcing racialization as a negotiation of belonging in Chapter 7, “Being Like No Other”, where I highlight how staff are produced as and take up the positioning of being exceptional (as not like “them”/other Others/stranger strangers) via engaging with stereotypes and/or having “specialized knowledge” of racial (other) Others. I show how racialized staff employ stereotypes and specialized knowledge of the Other as bolstering strategies, to further reinforce separations between “us” and “them” in negotiations of belonging, and to *distance* themselves as racial “insider-Others” from racial other Others via establishing trust with and proximity to the somatic norm.

In Chapter 8, “Through Consultation”, I draw on interviews with racialized City staff in order to trace how the desires of racial “insider-Others” to invite racial Others into consultation processes to make race-claims both authorizes and is authorized by diversity discourse in the City. I discuss how the (necessary) encounter with racialized Others in the space of the City incites a process of negotiation, appropriation, and constructing out which reinforces and legalizes diversity as “truth”. I also draw on Farley’s (1997) conceptualization of race as a form of pleasure to expose how invitations to participate in consultations in the City perpetuate material relations of dominance and subordination which re-cast racialized Others as bodies to be consumed and pacified through a denial of race and racism. I conclude by arguing that the reiterative and citational practices of diversity both incites and is incited by the confluence of the encounter, negotiation, pleasure, denial and reproduction of race.

Throughout my analyses I explore how the space of the City shapes bodies, and how racial bodies in the City shape the City as a 'diverse' space. Specifically, I trace how and under what conditions the presence of racial Others in the space of the City *requires* the reproduction of racializing practices in order to deny the existence of race/racism in space. The themes of performativity, racialization and space thus enables an understanding of intelligibility and articulation for racial Others in the City as being co-constructed with diversity discourse and the reproduction of racializing practices and race, which are spatially reinforced via the threat of abjection and non-belonging.

Chapter 6

Being the Exception(al)

All the interviewees shared the view that they really had to be exceptional to be recognized as capable.

Nirmal Puwar (2001, p. 661)

Introduction

Puwar (2001) discusses the ways in which racism is institutionalized through the designation of the somatic norm, which she defines as the “natural” association of white, male, upper/middle class bodies with power and space. Puwar’s work investigates what kinds of disruptions occur when “different” bodies enter elite spaces such as the senior civil service in Britain. Interviews with Black civil servants revealed, in part, a sense of “disorientation” and “infantilisation” that they experienced in interactions with their white colleagues, in response to a non-white person occupying a senior position (Puwar, 2001, p. 659-660). Puwar argues that these are some of the ways in which racialized bodies are marked as matter out of place, or “Space Invaders”, because they are not seen to be the natural occupants of these positions (p. 659). Interviewees also described how they felt a combination of pressure to demonstrate excellence, beyond what their job duties required of them, and a sense of hyper-surveillance, because they were always suspected of lacking competence and capabilities. In short, Black civil servants in Britain had to be exceptional.

In this chapter, I take up Puwar’s (2001) brief interlude on being exceptional, specifically as it relates to how racialized Others occupy or negotiate belonging in the space of the “diverse” City of Toronto. For Black civil servants in Britain, the suspicion that they *lacked* skills or capabilities required for the job was the basic premise for the disorientation of their colleagues

and the infantilisation of Black civil servants (i.e. expectations that they were in much junior positions). However, equally meaningful was how this perceived lack incited pressure for Black civil servants to perform and assimilate (i.e. to acquire specific social, normative codes). Puwar makes two important points with respect to performance and assimilation: first, “that the process of *‘becoming’* or performing upper/middle-class etiquette is simultaneously a performance of a particular variant of whiteness and a *disavowal of blackness* (p. 663, my emphases); and that “the coexistence of their post-colonial black bodies these white elite positions is dependent upon their acceptance of the *invitation* to masquerade and ‘mimic’ whiteness (p. 664, my emphasis). I want to expand on these two important points in this chapter, in order to suggest that “being the exception(al)”, as a bolstering tactic/negotiation of belonging in the City of Toronto, is premised on the disavowal of the “insider-Other’s” strangeness and/or lack, through resignifications and citations of the racial norms that are invited by, incited into, and concealed through diversity discourse. As such, “being the exception(al)”, as subjected to and subjectivated by diversity discourse, becomes the means by which racialized subjects in the City simultaneously *refuse and reinscribe racialization*. In the pages that follow, I draw on interviews with racialized City staff and City texts to offer up and discuss how “being the exception(al)”, as a form of belonging, is negotiated by moving ‘beyond race’.

Moving ‘Beyond Race’

Ahmed (2012) writes that institutional commitments to diversity work to simultaneously invite and silence discussions of racism, while making those who do talk about racism the cause of the problem in that they interrupt the positive commitments and feelings that diversity inspires. I build upon Ahmed’s (2012) assertion that diversity simultaneously invites and silences discussions of racism by introducing how diversity reinforces discursive and spatial denials of

race/racism in the City via negotiations of belonging in the City and through hailing the desire(s) to be not-strange, not-raced. For example, in my interviews, racialized City staff immediately drew connections between diversity and race/ethnicity, but in multiple ways which seemed to obscure the implications of these connections in relation to their own work and/or bodies in the City. Many staff discussed how the connections between diversity and race are made by others (i.e. bureaucratic and political staff, residents of Toronto), *but not by them personally*. Their particular approaches to and how they use diversity in the City seek to move diversity “beyond race” via strategically introducing new terms to expand its meaning (i.e. equity, inclusion, intersectionality), or using their own experiences/positions in the City to attempt to deny the existence of race/racism in the City altogether. In these interviews, either position afforded racialized staff the ability to define themselves as the exception(al) as a negotiation of their belonging in the City.

However, as the following pages will demonstrate, being the exception(al) via moving “beyond race” occurs in multiple, complex and sometimes contradictory ways. I show how these multiple, complex and contradictory ways signify and collude with the performativity of diversity discourse, particularly by demonstrating how racialized subjects become intelligible and articulate through the racial norms that are incited into and *concealed* by diversity discourse, which concurrently hails the desire(s) to be not-strange, not-raced, and to belong *against* imagined and abjected racialized Others in the City. I also show how the various bolstering tactics which racialized City staff engage as they negotiate/maintain their “insider-Other” statuses are premised on the *refusal* of racialization, and yet because these tactics are authorized *against* abjected (other) Others, they simultaneously *reinscribe* racialization. As such, I want to suggest that the bolstering tactics of racialized City staff are co-authorized with the racial norms

and practices that are incited into and reproduced by diversity discourse, to co-produce the exceptional racial subject, and the exceptional City. Although it is important to trace under what racial terms diversity discourse welcomes and excludes, and how staff might take these terms up as they negotiate their belonging in the City, it is also important to consider that racialized City staff, as insider-Others and as “experts” on diversity and racism, can simultaneously confirm *and threaten* the bounds (and binding) of diversity, racialization and race. In the pages that follow, I trace processes of refusal and reinscription in the transcripts of interviews with racialized City staff, and in City documents, in order to show how moving “beyond race” and belonging in the City is premised on the reproduction of diversity discourse, its racial terms, *and the need for the ongoing maintenance of racial and spatial boundaries in the City.*

Circular Discourses - Equity, Inclusion and Intersectionality. Throughout our interviews, racialized City staff expressed strong commitments to “equity”, “inclusion” and “intersectionality”, and how diversity is a problematic or “benign” term without an incorporation of these principles. Many spoke at length about how they understand diversity in the City in more broad, inclusive and critical terms, to include intersections and analyses of race, gender, sexual orientation, ability, age, geographic location, class/income, Aboriginal status, and/or immigrant status, and how these identities impact how individuals access and participate in the life of the City. In staff narratives, their understanding(s) of diversity were positioned *against* those of “outsiders” and other City staff who in their view tend to conflate diversity with race/people of colour. It is their deeper understandings of diversity, ‘beyond race’, that allow racialized City staff to define their own diversity work, as Nicole does, as “strategic” and “much more systemic, structural ... in order to change the organization”. Nicole describes how she strategically inserts equity into diversity: “Well, that’s by redefining diversity and therefore

redefining how we do work around it. And constantly inserting the in, unequal access...the in, unequal opportunities, the general inequality... be it on the basis of gender, or race, or immigration status...or um, sexual orientation, or Aboriginal status, of poverty, or language, or whatever the case may be.” As Nicole goes on to say, by including equity in her diversity work, “in a sense, I’m giving meaning to diversity in a way that I don’t think it has been before.”

At the same time, staff stories about how they integrate equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality in their work in order to strategically shift the meaning of diversity reveal complex, and at times contradictory, moments. For example, Daphne shares how her experiences doing international social justice work, being involved in social movements, and her work at the City brings her into contact with different people and analyses that encourage her continuing growth, understanding and push to see diversity as “being about achieving systemic equity”. When she hears the term diversity, Daphne describes how “race is probably the image that pops up first in my head...then my other piece triggers to say actually no, I believe that it’s a broader concept than that.” However, she explains that when she uses the term diversity in the City, “I have used it, in the ways that most people use it, meaning...racialized people. And then I’ve also used it in the way that I think it actually should be used, which means um, difference on a multi, multiple points of identity, not just based on race”. When she reconnects with people from her hometown, Daphne also explains how she sometimes feels like she’s in a bit of a “time warp” and gets frustrated because they still see diversity as being synonymous with people of colour.

The complex work and desire to move diversity ‘beyond race’ can also be found in Lisa’s account of diversity. Lisa discusses how important it is to her that diversity encompasses inclusivity and intersectionality - how various identities intersect to create unique experiences within and among individuals and groups. She describes how, because of her experiences of

being a woman of colour coupled with her activism work, the first thing that comes to her mind when she hears the term diversity in the City is “women, and intersectionality of women”; however, she notes that her definition is expanding because of the various communities she works with. Although Lisa feels that the general public “thinks of racialized people” when they see or hear the term diversity, she explains that she has different intentions when she uses the term diversity (which she acknowledges she uses “very rarely”): to hint at intersectionality, or because there might not be room to list all marginalized groups in a particular document, or for political reasons, “not wanting to name who you’re trying to address in a policy”. Lisa also explains how she is quite aware of the fact that the public and other City staff might not see or understand what her intentions are, because she does not make them explicit.

Flora also tries to expand the term diversity “to embrace, you know, inclusion” but to also push for an understanding of diversity which includes how white people are diverse too:

I think, well first of all, white people need to acknowledge that they have their own ethnicity. I think for the, for always the, the mention of ethnocultural without an, and, and it being the other, right? So the, the, the, the default position in, in North America, because of the colonial context, and because of, you know, you know, white supremacy, and the history of white supremacy, is that white is the default.

Flora feels that she has been successful in showing how diversity is “not measured just by race” by showing her colleagues how there is diversity, difference and intersectionality in every community, including women, LGBT communities, Aboriginal communities, and disabled communities. She describes how she has had “breakthrough moments” with her colleagues, and that this “happens all the time. It happens more often than you, than one thinks”. However, Flora also describes that when she sees diversity written in City reports, “most of the times I think it’s

been used as a way of describing multiculturalism, you know, in, Toronto in a multicultural context”.

City staff also describe their work of inserting equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality into conversations and reports on diversity as being confusing, uncertain, difficult, and challenging. Although her understanding of diversity includes dimensions of identity which intersect and interconnect, Salma articulates the difficulty she sometimes has in describing intersectionality to her colleagues:

When we talk about diversity, I don't know that we talk about the intersectionality. Sometimes when...sometimes I think when you bring it up, like there's been situations where we've tried, or I've, you know, in training sessions, you try to sort of bring up, um, sort of, what you mean by intersectionality. And it can sound very academic, depending on how you're explaining it. So I think sometimes, depending on who your audience is, maybe that's um, either it's just, it's too academic, it's a bit of a turn off for folks. Or if it's not just sort of phrased in a way that people can really understand ... but um, I don't think we do a very good job of it.

What becomes striking here is that as City staff describe their broader and strategic understandings of diversity, it is staff's investments in *being the exception(al)* in the City that appear to drive our conversations about diversity. Using terms such as “equity”, “inclusion” and “intersectionality” are seen, and felt, to be “outside the bounds of power, antithetical to its effects” (Hook, 2007, p. 70). Many are tenacious about positioning themselves and their work as being different from or as an exception to the way diversity work is or has generally been done by others at the City, specifically how diversity means race and/or people of colour *for them, not me/us*. For example, Nicole shares that, although she sees things shifting, “I think the way *the*

City looks at diversity is ethno-cultural diversity.” When she talks about diversity with colleagues at the City, or reads diversity reports, Salma states that she does not think that her way of thinking on diversity is “aligned with certain, what *they* are talking about, when they talk about diversity”. Patricia also explains:

And I find that *they* use the term diversity ... as a sort of catch-all phrase when *they* actually mean race. The reason I think that that, I’ve actually not really thought about that...until this second. And, top of mind, I think it’s come to be because race ... I think, for the most part, people feel, ok we’ve done the woman thing, women are, yeah, we know we have work to do, but it’s kind of taken care of, and so then the next thing, issue to deal with is race. So, people started focusing on improving racial diversity within organizations, um, and just started using the term interchangeably, and then, almost as a substitution.

Yet for some, positioning themselves as the exception(al) holds strong despite how they actually use diversity in their work. For example, even though she identifies as being separate from “them”, and means to use diversity more broadly, to convey inclusion of multiple identities, in practice Patricia notes that she “tend(s) to use it more in the context that the rest of world uses it, which is, we’re really talking about cultural diversity, and race” even though she links diversity to multiculturalism, which for her are both “encoded in racism”. Kevin recalls that even though he understands diversity to mean multiple identities, when he talks to his colleagues about diversity and writes about it in reports, he generally means race/people of colour, unless he specifies otherwise (which, he says, he rarely does). Kevin further explains that he uses diversity because it’s a sanitized word, “sanitized meaning it’s not using that term, colour”, but that using the term diversity in this way is also *strategic* on his part because “it connotes that it [a particular

project] is a priority...because *we* [public servants] should be reacting to disadvantaged communities”. Stacey explains how for her, diversity means access, equity, and representation of “the composition of the...the community you serve”, and that “it’s not about race”. However, when I ask Stacey if she uses the term diversity in her work, she replies: “I use it in every single management meeting that I have, in terms of...being mindful of things that we do. We’re a diverse group. And there are cultural differences that we need to be aware of. And we have to be respectful of”. In these interviews, staff commitments to equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality, in order to move diversity ‘beyond race’ in the City, underscore their own investments in being the exception(al) in the institution. These commitments and investments also appear to override any of City staff’s complexities in negotiating and in some cases reproducing diversity as race in practice.

Matus and Infante (2011) offer that discourses of diversity gain currency in higher education through being circulated with “other attractive terms, such as equality, equity, integration, and inclusion” (p. 294) in order to underscore and re-circulate the universal values of equality and democracy inherent in western, nationalist conceptualizations of citizenship. Matus and Infante suggest that, as part of this complex *web of discourses* which signal particular and desirable meanings around identity and/or equality politics, diversity is thus repeated and re-circulated in institutions of higher education, through diversity policies and practices, largely without question. In examining how equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality interact with diversity, I take up and expand on Matus and Infante’s (2011) understanding of diversity as being part of a web of discourses, in order to posit that terms such as equity, inclusion and intersectionality operate as technologies of affect, by binding emotions to these particular discourses, *against others*. Furthermore, I build on Ahmed’s (2004) idea that affect intensifies

through the repetition and circulation of discourses to suggest the emotional investments in moving ‘beyond race’, in being the exception(al), and to be not-raced/not-strange become increasingly contained in discourses of equity, inclusion, and intersectionality *through their very repetition and re-circulation*. In other words, the more equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality discourses circulate, the more they contain signs of moving ‘beyond race’. I argue that it is this *containment of affect* that conceals the (racial) histories that shape these particular discourses and the discursive network in the City of Toronto which facilitates the performativity of diversity and the repetition of racial norms that are incited in(to) its name.

The idea that particular emotions and desires to be the exception(al) and to move ‘beyond race’ are bound together and *travel* to attach to certain social norms or, in this case, to a web of discourses, resonated with me as I reviewed the transcripts of my interviews with Nicole and Salma. During our interview, Nicole discusses a strategy she is taking part in to embed equity, access, and human rights language and goals in a major City document that, for her, would create a “huge, fundamental, structural shift” within the organization. Nicole is critical of *past* iterations of diversity, human rights, equity, and access because “diversity management was a tool for the rest of us, to be managed...human rights basically was a complaints driven process...employment equity was all about, you know, let’s get a few more coloured bodies, or diverse bodies, and we will meet our agenda...and the access and equity people, which became diversity management, were all about, you know, whatever, you know, how can we give grants to equity-seeking groups”. However, Nicole is also quite passionate about the current proposal she is working on, where she employs these same terms to “bring structural issues to the table, under the guise of diversity”:

And that's why I'm not mentioning diversity by itself, I'm calling it access, equity, diversity and human rights. To me, diversity without equity, access and human rights is meaningless. Then it becomes just window shopping. Um...so that's why I insist on calling it...it's a mouthful, I say E...AEDHR, but you've got to call it AEDHR because it is important. Because to me the access, equity and human rights pieces are far more important than the diversity pieces.

Salma echoes Nicole's belief that in order for the City to understand how structural inequalities affect "the quality of people's experiences, um, both within the organization, and members of the public", the City needs to broaden its conceptualization(s) of diversity to include terms such as equity, intersectionality and inclusion. For Salma, diversity implies representation, specifically the City's ability to say that a particular percentage of the organization's staff is comprised of people from diverse groups. Without an analysis of how many of those people are in management level positions or senior levels, or an understanding of what their experiences are, Salma explains that diversity is just about numbers and counting: "so what if 40% of our staff are comprised of, of, you know, people from racialized communities? What is the quality of their experience as staff people within the City? What is their level that they're able to achieve, in terms of moving up in professional development? Are they mentored more so, less so, than other staff?" As Salma also explains, the City's diversity strategy engages diverse groups in the public via "translations, we publish newsletters and make some ac, information accessible in various languages. So we can easily, sort of, look at those suc, as successes, right?" Adding an analysis of equity would, for Salma, measure the *impacts* of these services on diverse groups:

Not just say, we do consultations with diverse groups, 'cause we outreach in this, this, this and this way. But if we're finding that there are groups that are never represented,

and are never present, do we make efforts to find out what...why that is? And what the barriers are to why they're not coming? And then actually do something to address that. This is why it is important to Salma that she "try to mainstream or embed equity, diversity and, like, and inclusion in to staff. And I think that, *in the past*, I don't know that we've done a very good job of...trying to embed the equity and inclusion aspect". Salma also describes how she feels a certain amount of freedom in being able to use these terms, to "express some of those more critical aspects of our work" on diversity. Similarly, Patricia explains how the City's motto "Diversity Our Strength" is "just a load of bullshit. Uh, I think it's a PR term that, uh, is banded about when convenient, by, mostly at the political level", but that *she* (among few others) sees it as a "call to action" to capture the different experiences of different populations (as she describes, "LGBT, visible minorities, whatever") in the workforce.

As it is with some other City staff, being the exception(al) in the City relies on the mobilization, repetition and circulation of equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality discourses. Furthermore, equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality discourses are employed by staff in an attempt to move previous iterations of diversity in a strategic direction, 'beyond race'; to broaden the concept of diversity to include other identities, and/or through complicating a "benign" diversity - a superficial understanding of race/people of colour - to include an analyses of power and structural barriers. For Nicole, including these terms brings power and inequality into conversations about diversity, and calls for a "strong anti-discrimination infrastructure" to be put in place. However, even as Nicole and other staff advocate for expanding diversity to include analyses of equity, inclusion and intersectionality, in our interviews, several moments of tension came up around what these terms would actually mean for addressing issues of race/racism in the City. For example, while Nicole insists that the City adopt "access, equity, diversity and human

rights (AEDHR)” language so that power and structural issues can begin to be addressed in an authentic way, she also explains that she is using AEDHR language in a strategic way, because if she were to use the term “anti-racism” in City documents, “no one would read it”. For Nicole, using AEDHR language is a way to strategically address issues of race and racism in the City, *without explicitly naming racism in the City*. When I asked Patricia what would happen if she deliberately made links between diversity and “anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-homophobic practices, for example”, she responds, “I, we, we, we’d probably get blown out of the window”. However, as she goes on to explain, *not naming* “isms” (such as racism) and their relationship to power “is a great way of avoiding the issues, right? If we can’t name them, if we can’t talk about them, then we don’t have to do anything about it.”

Stacey also explains that even though she pushes for access, equity and human rights language (as Nicole does), when you are having conversations about achieving equity, “it’s [for] white females. It’s nobody else”. Edward describes a moment on the TTC (Toronto Transit Commission) where he watched people with various disabilities interacting with people from various ethnic backgrounds, all from different age groups, and how proud he was “in the diversity of my city”. However, Edward also remarks that when the City talks about being diverse and inclusive, “it is evident that we follow like, who we’re colonized by, the British norms, like, that’s what’s pushed forward, and everything else is, kind of secondary”. Edward goes on to describe how diversity and inclusion should include “race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability, disability, and class as well”, but then returns to the idea of inclusiveness to mean whiteness as the norm:

But I think...because we can't eliminate history, right? We can't forget about the fact that, you know, we were colonized, and so forth. So like, we all kind of assimilate to what's the general process, and workings of like, a day-to-day.

What became interesting in my interview with Edward is that after he describes inclusion in the City to mean assimilation to the white, British norm, he also believes that the City is diverse “on paper” and needs to be more *inclusive* “in practice”. Edward explains how “on paper”, diversity means ads “with the Hispanic guy, the Asian female...” but that incorporating *real* inclusivity would mean “putting everyone on an equal playing field”. When I ask Edward to explain how real inclusivity would do this, given that his analysis of inclusivity means whiteness as the norm, he laughs and responds, “it's not inclusivity, it's kinda more so like control. I don't know. It's, it's...you put me on the spot here, Shana.”

I want to offer that racialized City staff's complex and at times contradictory positionings are a reflection of how tightly their belonging as exceptional racial insider-Others is bound to and *policed by* the recirculation and re-citing of diversity and other discourses of the institution, and thus the occlusion of race. I argue that what also becomes occluded as racialized City staff take up of equity, inclusion, and intersectionality discourses in order to move ‘beyond race’, to be not-raced, not-strange and to belong in the City is that they are *produced* as exceptional subjects, in order to facilitate the reinscription of racialization and race in the City. What I am suggesting is that racialized City staff's intelligibility, articulation, and belonging is premised on their mobilization, repetition and re-circulation of institutionalized discourses which *contain*,

*regulate and disavow that which “stands outside” of them, in racial terms.*¹⁵ The production of the exceptional racial subject, as one who moves ‘beyond race’ (‘us’ – diverse, not raced, not strange) thus authorizes the abjection of racial other Others, stranger strangers (“them”) because they are not capable of inhabiting these discourses, and therefore lack the ability to move (in various ways) ‘beyond race’. It is through the production and authorization of the exceptional subject that the racial other Other in the City is frozen, “stuck in the past”, and abjected because s/he is resistant or *lacks* the ability to *progress*.¹⁶

I also want to suggest that inhabiting discourses of progress is a way in which some racialized City staff bolster their belonging in the space of the City. What is important here is that staff engagements with “new” discourses of equity, inclusion and intersectionality not only reinforce claims by racialized “insider-Others” that they are the exception(al), and they are moving diversity ‘beyond race’, but that they as exceptional subjects have also moved *beyond the limits of their own race*. They become the exception(al) for excelling beyond the capacity and scope of their predecessors and colleagues, those who are seemingly “stuck” in the narrow confines of diversity which articulate a superficial understanding of people of colour. As Salma notes:

“So there, you know, there needs to be...people in senior levels as well, that are from racialized communities, because they offer perspective and experience, hopefully. Not all

¹⁵ The production of exceptional racial subject is precisely how diversity discourse (and the web of other discourses that circulate with it) becomes performative. Being an exceptional racial subject is premised on the re-citing of discourses and their racial norms which limit how the racial subject can come into existence and be intelligible. Therefore, s/he is exceptional (as a racial subject, this means intelligible) only to the extent that s/he *inhabits* and reproduces the discourses which have to power to regulate and constrain its constitutive outside.

¹⁶ This is how the colonial project is justified – the idea that racial Others are uncivilized, backwards, abnormal, barbaric etc and need to be “saved” by those who are civilized, progressive, natural, normal.

of them do. *Just because they are from racialized groups doesn't necessarily mean they're going to think progressively either, right?*

This is where racialization is both refused and reinscribed – to be the exception(al) racial subject in the City via “new” and progressive discourses is to simultaneously transgress and *confirm* the limits of one’s race.

Although the production of the exceptional racial subject also regulates and polices how racism is taken up by racialized staff in the City via the threat of abjection, moments of tension that racialized City staff have in our interviews also indicate that the discourses of diversity, equity, inclusion and intersectionality cannot fully contain that which *exceeds* their boundaries and subjectivizing ideals. As Hook (2007) explains, there are particular kinds of affective investments which remain inextricably bound to racism, so that even as racism becomes less explicit, loosely articulated, even deniable at its point of enunciation, the amplification and conduction of these affective investments continue racism’s historical effects in the present. Hook suggests that racism is thus a discontinuous interchange between particular political, discursive rationalities and individualized sentiments, “where each sets in motion a dynamics of implication for the other, most apparently perhaps through the conductor of affect” (p. 265).¹⁷ I want to complicate Hook’s analyses by revisiting Fanon’s experience of living in France, which I describe in Chapter Four. As Thobani (2007) summarizes, Fanon’s experience indicates that the racialized markings of the body cannot be overcome, no matter the depth of one’s desire to belong. As she describes of Fanon’s encounter with a young white child, “even a young white

¹⁷ Here, Hook draws on Bozzoli (2004) to argue that the downfall of apartheid was its extreme political rigidity and overformalization of its political and racial logics which disallowed any potential for racist ‘free-play’ and/or the possibilities for “quasi-independent” articulations of racism (p. 257). For Hook, there must be a psychoanalytic dimension of human motivation (passion, attachments, investments) involved in analyses of power and subjectivity, which account for the shifting manifestations, expressions, and/or disruptions between disciplinary power and individual conduct.

child had the power to reduce the adult Black man to little more than his ‘epidermal schema’” (p. 172). What I would like to suggest here is that the “currents” that move between discourse, desire and affect, between race, power and subjectivity in negotiations of belonging for racialized City staff are open to transgression as long as the body is seen, felt and/or experienced as raced, and as *out of place*. At the end of our interview, Stacey recalls her experience of being racially profiled at an international airport, and how this made her think that no matter how much you want to define yourself and who you are, “the preconceived notions” people have of you as a racialized person will always be there. For Stacey, diversity in the City *enables* these preconceptions. Unless you can somehow prove you are the exception to the rule, “you go for a job interview and the assumption is, oh...you know. It’s not I’m happy to see you, and I’m this and that. It’s like, oh...another one”.

Edward also shares his experience of feeling like he was the “exceptional to the rule” as a racialized staff person at a community meeting, because, in addition to his presence being somewhat surprising to several of the attendees, “my interactions with her [one attendee] *should’ve been different, I should’ve been acting a different way*”. Corey describes the conversations that often take place when the City promotes racialized staff into higher positions: “did that person really deserve the opportunity? I mean, *really*? Or is it just about fulfilling the ‘optics’ of diversity?”

For racialized staff in the City, these historico-racial experiences and encounters of the body figure in *and in excess of* the discourse/affect paradigm, the hegemonic ideas we have of ourselves and political and discursive logics that staff navigate in negotiations of belonging. In our interviews, the tensions that are articulated by staff are moments when the *body as raced and out of place* betrays the discourses which seek to contain and occlude experiences and encounters

with race and racism, as well as the affective desires that are incited and reproduced by them. It is also in these moments of tension that it becomes possible to trace the production and terms of authorization of the speaking racial subject in the City *against* the containment and erasure of the racial other Other, in racial terms. Therefore, I argue that these moments of tension are powerful moments because they expose the anxieties of diversity discourse, its disguised racial terms, and the role of race and power in the (re-)production of and desire to be the exception(al) in the City.

I was interested to explore how discourses of equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality are taken up in City of Toronto policy documents, specifically to examine how these texts interact with, constitute and are constituted by the varied and complex positionings associated with moving ‘beyond race’, and thus with being the exception(al) in the City. While there are countless City documents that refer to equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality, I was particularly interested in those documents that introduce these terms as a way to *shift* conversations around access (or lack thereof) and/or race in the City; to support and/or reflect the view of many staff that the insertion of these terms is strategic and *progressive* to in a variety of ways move diversity ‘beyond race’. However, given that staff exhibited moments of tension which would suggest that these discourses do not actually produce what they name, I was also interested in how discourses of equity, inclusion and intersectionality addressed experiences and encounters with racism in the City. It is to these documents which I now turn.

The language of equity in City of Toronto documents is used largely to convey issues of employment for racialized and/or marginalized groups – what the City calls “equitable representation” (or lack thereof). For example, in 1975, the City of Toronto created an Equal Opportunity Program to achieve “more equitable representation and fuller utilization of women and men at all levels and in all categories of the organization, as well as a full recognition of their

contribution to the work of the City (City of Toronto, 1980a, p. 8747). In the 1980 Annual Review of the Program, Alderman Sparrow put forward a recommendation that the program be extended to include “special groups such as the disabled and minorities” (p. 8809), which was expanded in 1984, in response to the work of the Royal Commission on Employment Equity, to include an increase in the number of “native people, people with disabilities, racial minorities, and women in the civic workforce” (City of Toronto, 1992a, p.69). The 1986-1990 Equal Opportunity Program review indicated that changes were needed, specifically that initiatives needed to be expanded in the City of Toronto in order to reach *equity*, because:

- (A) People with disabilities have not been hired at the same rate as other designated groups;
- (B) Designated groups have been, on the most part, hired into temporary positions, but they are underrepresented in external hiring into the permanent workforce;
- (C) Designated-group employees have less seniority and have historically faced systemic barriers to employment; they do not, therefore, have equitable access to internal opportunities for mobility and promotions within the civic workforce (City of Toronto, 1992a, p. 69, my emphasis).

To address these problems, to achieve equity, and “in order for the City to maintain its leadership role and its accountability to the diverse community it serves” (p. 70), recommendations were put forward and approved by City Council, which included the following:

1. That City Council authorize the establishment of a corporate fund for *internship/bridging/apprenticeship positions* to enable designated groups to gain access into occupations where they are underrepresented.

2. That City Council authorize the Executive Director of the Management Services Department to ensure that training and development strategies give designated groups employees the knowledge, skills, and experience to compete successfully for management vacancies in the permanent workforce. (City of Toronto, 1992a, p. 70, my emphases)

What becomes interesting here, and in most City documents that discuss equity in terms of the (under-)representation of racialized and/or marginalized groups, is that systemic barriers to employment faced by these designated groups becomes (or remains) coupled with *their lack of* skills, knowledge and experience; rendering them essentially incapable of achieving and/or competing for certain positions within the organization unless they are mentored/trained by those who are more established, *more capable*. In the Equal Opportunity Program Review, the identification of lack stands in spite of the comments on the Program, submitted by the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations, a citizen committee struck by Mayor Art Eggleton in 1981, to "deal with problems concerning the visible minority community, especially racism" (City of Toronto, 1981, p. 1054):

Whereas racial minorities have increased their share of the civic workforce from 8.2% in 1986 to 13.5% in 1990, in the permanent employee category they have increased their share only from 7.4% to 10.7%...it is also a concern that salaries among racial minorities in the civic workforce have been declining relative to whites.

In the case of Native people...in the permanent civic workforce, Native people are represented by less than half their proportion in the city labour force as a whole (2%).

Despite improvements, the City of Toronto still lags behind other employers in the hiring of racial minorities and Native people. (City of Toronto, 1981, p. 75)

Furthermore, less than two months after the submission from the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations, which describes the multiple ways in which racialized and Native communities *continue* to experience barriers to accessing and sustaining gainful employment in the City of Toronto, the City issued a "Response to the Provincial Discussion Paper on Employment Equity", which presented the City "as a role model" for establishing the Equal Opportunity Program. Although the program had its shortfalls, the response report outlined how City Council responded to them with a revised process "which has been a cornerstone of the City's management and employment practices" and "has been very successful in increasing the representation of designated groups in the workforce" (City of Toronto, 1992b, p. 35).

The language of equity is also used in City of Toronto documents as a way to continue frame barriers to access in terms of language difficulties and/or "cultural" differences, alongside (or in spite of) experiences of racism and/or discrimination that are brought forward by Toronto residents and/or community groups. In May of 1991, the City of Toronto created the "Multicultural Access Program" (MAP) in response to problems that members of ethnic and racial minorities had encountered in getting access to municipal services (City of Toronto, 1990a). Consultations with racial and ethnic groups began as early as 1984, but particular emphasis was placed on inviting new immigrants who, *because of their cultural and language backgrounds*, had difficulty in getting adequate access to services (City of Toronto, 1990a, p.

152; my emphasis).¹⁸

During the consultations, several issues were reported:

1. Lack of information on City services. Many racial and ethnic community members are not aware of the services that the City provides.
2. Underutilization of ethnic media and ethnic community agencies.
3. Insufficient numbers of multicultural/multilingual staff in direct City services.
4. Inadequate sensitization of receptionists and other City staff to cultural and language differences of their clientele, which, in many instances, results in perceived racial overtones, discrimination and inhibition by racial and ethnic community members who seek access to City services. (City of Toronto, 1990a, p. 155)

During the implementation phase of MAP, Mr. Allan Rodney, of the Native Canadian Centre, submitted his concerns about the focus of the program:

That the emphasis on multiculturalism may obscure the real issue of concern to Native people which is *the issue of racism*. The document is very soft in its treatment of racism and should be more explicit in its condemnation of racism and the City's intention to eradicate racism at both an institutional and a personal level.

That by addressing Native concerns under the rubric of this policy the City may be guilty of treating us as if we are just another ethnic group (City of Toronto, 1991a, p. 251; my emphasis).

Mr. Rodney offered several recommendations, including the following:

¹⁸ One of the City's immediate responses to issues of access was to initiate City-wide, multi-day trainings for staff from various departments, which was called "Corporate Training on Multicultural and Race Relations". These trainings were called "Diversity in the Workplace" (Buildings & Inspections department), "Cultures" and "Managing and Working with Diversity" (Finance department), and "Managing Diversity" (Fire department), to name a few (City of Toronto, 1990b, p. 147-148).

Recommendations of Concern to the Native Community

Recommendation 1.2 – We believe that the MAP recommendations cannot be implemented without adequate provision being made to ensure accountability to the ethno-racial communities of the City. *It cannot be assumed that racism does not reach into the very chambers of City Hall itself, and that it will not manifest itself either at an institutional or personal level among those responsible for implementing these recommendations.* (City of Toronto, 1991a, p. 325; my emphasis)

In response to Mr. Rodney and others' assertions that program was not adequately addressing systemic barriers to access and racism in the City, an external consultant was hired in 1991 to do an evaluation of MAP, who "was concerned that the name of the program implies that it is responsible solely for cross-cultural understanding and multiculturalism, as opposed to a more generic sense of service equity across, and within, all citizen groups" (City of Toronto, 1992c, p. 120). The consultant recommended that the program be re-named "the Service Equity Program" (SEP), which would "make City of Toronto services available to racial and ethnic groups (including facilitating access to services by removing barriers that may be caused by organizational complexity, language differences or discrimination), provide better information on City services in a variety of languages and media, increase the extent to which the workforce in City departments reflects the racial and ethnic makeup of Toronto's population, and review Corporation policies and procedures to ensure they do not present discriminatory barriers to racial and ethnic groups" (City of Toronto, 1992c, p. 120).

The recommendations of *training and mentoring/internship programs* for designated groups are put forward, in the interests of achieving equity, in direct response to the submission from the Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations which outlines *racism*

in the hiring, retention and pay practices at the City. Similarly, the name change from “Multicultural Access Program” to “Service Equity Program” adds recommendations to address racism and/or systemic barriers, but maintains that *language issues and the lack of “ethnic matching”/representation* are core issues with respect to access for racial and ethnic groups in Toronto. Although the concept of equity advances policy objectives regarding representation, it does so within the context of hiring and the counting of ‘Other/strange’ bodies, and in many cases their absence is linked to the lack of training, skills and/or expertise that they have.¹⁹ These responses/recommendations persist and are re-circulated in and across City documents, in spite of, or in direct response to, claims of racism in the City.

In these documents, as with many others that advance the concept of equity, there are shifts in policy recommendations to address racism and/or discrimination in the City (as identified by “outsiders”), in the form of commitments to review City practices and services for potential barriers to access. It is important to note that in the last few years equity has been inserted in City documents to convey the desire to advance *systemic* change across gender, racial, economic, health, social and environmental lines, for groups ‘beyond race’ i.e. “race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, mental health, and housing status, among others” (City of Toronto, 2014c, p. 3). For example, the “Pilot Project – Implementation of an Equity Lens and Equity Impact Statement” (City of Toronto, 2006a) seeks to include equity impact statements for each

¹⁹ See for example “The Talent Blueprint 2014-2018 (Toronto Public Service Workforce Plan) (City of Toronto, 2014b) where the City initiated a new Employment Equity Workforce Survey, “for employees to identify themselves as a member of an equity seeking/diversity group(s)” (p. 3). The purpose of the survey is “to create effective strategies to increase representation to the level matching the population of the city of Toronto” (p. 5). Also see the “Aboriginal Employment Strategy” (City of Toronto, 2014c), which “supports the City’s ongoing commitment to equity and diversity “ (p. 1) by ensuring “that the representation in the Toronto Public Service workforce mirrors the representation of Aboriginal peoples in the City through the development and implementation of recruitment and employment programs and initiatives” (p.3). Recommendations in the Strategy also include mentoring, skills training, and apprenticeships “for Aboriginal residents to meet qualifications for specific City of Toronto jobs” (p. 5).

report to Council, to ensure that City departments both identify and remove barriers to access in their policies and programs, and to ensure that equity considerations are included in decision-making processes at Council. However, examples of proactive equity strategies given to staff to remove barriers to access (again) include “language translation, accessible location, diversity training, hiring and retention of diverse staff” (City of Toronto, 2006a, p. 2). Although some of the more recent documents insert equity to define and analyze the *racialization* of social issues such as poverty and mental health, they do so in order to pursue and expand on conversations about “community safety”, “crime” and “gun violence”, linked primarily to racialized youth, in order to “improve the quality of life for residents and enhance Toronto’s reputation as a world class city” (City of Toronto, 2014c, p.3).²⁰ The pursuit of equity in these documents, while advancing the need for systemic changes and more investments in particular neighbourhoods/communities, also maintains a continuous linking with race, with violence, and thus with lack.

It is also important to note here that the City simultaneously describes itself as being successful, a leader and/or a role model in relation to equity – in short, *as an exceptional space* - in and across several City documents, spanning several years.²¹ For example, in 2009, the City crafted a “Diversity and Positive Workplace Strategy” in response to “DiverseCity Counts Report: A Snapshot of Diversity in The Greater Toronto Area”, released in May 2009 by

²⁰ See for example “Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy 2020 – Recommended Neighbourhood Improvement Areas” (City of Toronto, 2014), and the “Toronto Youth Equity Strategy” (City of Toronto, 2014d).

²¹ In response to the onslaught of hate crime activity related to the heightened presence of the Ku Klux Klan in Toronto (City of Toronto, 1980b), the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto established the annual Access and Equity Grant Program, to “promote respect and value for the City’s ethno-racial communities and to strengthen positive race relations in the City” (City of Toronto, 2000a, p. 2). Each year that the City (and/or its former municipalities) have allocated grants to not-for-profit community organizations so that *they* may “advocate for the removal of legislative and institutional barriers...with the objective of promoting institutional change” (City of Toronto, 2000a, p. 4), reports describe *the City* as playing a leadership role in equity, inclusion and “creating a positive and welcoming environment for Toronto’s diverse communities (p. 2), because it partially funds these organizations.

Ryerson University, which details the “underrepresentation of visible minorities in the supervisory level at the City of Toronto” (City of Toronto, 2009a, p. 4). The City’s response was to implement a strategy that would build upon its current “*leading edge*” best practices in equity, which include the Black African Canadian Employment Equity Pilot Project (providing individual mentoring to Black/African Canadian employees), Career Bridge (internships for internationally trained professionals) and the Profession-to-Profession Mentoring Program (mentoring immigrants program) (City of Toronto, 2009a, p.4) to meet its equity objectives at all levels of the organization. The Strategy thus continues to link the issues of equity, representation and/or lack of mobility with a lack of skills and training that, in this case, Black/African Canadians, immigrants, and internationally trained professionals might have, and furthermore embeds the City’s leadership in its ability to recognize and address this lack. At the same time, in this document the City Manager recommends an initiative to train City supervisors and managers on “Inclusion in the Workplace: Race”, and “Duty to Accommodate” (p. 2), to “capitalize upon the Human Rights Office’s trends analysis to provide training to prevent complaints” (p. 5). While this recommendation hints at the presence of racism within the organization, no details are provided on why this particular recommendation is offered, what the “trends” are, what the complaints are, or why these trainings are specific to *race*.

Over the course of my document reviews, it became apparent that the City becomes an *exception(al) space* through occluding or erasing experiences and examples of institutional racism which create and reinforce barriers to access and the privileging of positions within the organization. Equity in City of Toronto documents thus becomes about hiring, counting and mentoring of racialized bodies and not, as Salma alludes to, an analysis of barriers to promotion(s) within the organization, or understanding experiences of being out of place.

Language and cultural difficulties continue to be identified by the City as core barriers to access despite claims from “outsiders” that *racism* is the issue, and has yet to be addressed. Bannerji (2000) argues that as an ideological tool, diversity re-packages un- or underemployment into issues of culture rather than as evidence of racism. I want to extend Bannerji’s analysis to propose that the City’s continued leadership in the area of equity is co-constructed with racializing practices which are premised on the essentialized inferiority of racialized bodies and the naturalization of the somatic norm (the white, male, upper/middle class body) in space, as the rightful bearer of knowledge, success and power. The discourse of equity in the City of Toronto, as part of a complex web of discourses, re-circulates racializing norms by suggesting that issues of unemployment should be resolved by mentoring, creating an *encounter* where racialized bodies have the opportunity to mimic the culture of those who are entrusted with power and civility. It is in and through this same circulation of discourses that Black business professionals also become intelligible in the City of Toronto. When Black business professionals are invited to the City to discuss issues they face which impede their success as business owners and operators in Toronto, racism is not the issue: their lack of training, skills, and knowledge of City processes are.

The language of inclusion in City documents follows the same trajectory of equity, in that it co-constructs racialization, lack and exceptionality. Although the term inclusion generally means to expand discussions of marginalization ‘beyond race’ (in this case to include all human rights-protected groups), inclusion in City documents is generally used in the context of human rights issues and complaints in the City, many of which focus on race/racial barriers.²²

²² See “City of Toronto Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination”, 2003, p. 28: an inclusive framework means “not only issues of race, but also those of ethnicity, faith, gender, disability, immigrant and refugee status, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues, Aboriginal issues, and those of other human rights protected groups”.

Furthermore, even as there are institutionalized mechanisms to deal with human rights complaints with respect to race/racism, and even as there is evidence of these complaints in the City, the City continues to “convert” racism into issues of culture via the language of inclusion. For example, the City’s Human Resources Action Plan on Access, Equity and Human Rights 2007– 2008 (City of Toronto, 2008) lists several initiatives for the City to achieve diversity and inclusiveness in the Toronto Public Service, including to expand initiatives for people with disabilities, to strengthen relationships with the Aboriginal community, but also “to increase understanding of managers regarding their obligations under the Ontario Human Rights Code and to prevent and eliminate racism and racial barriers in the TPS” (p. 5). In the Plan, the Mentoring program that assists Black African Canadian employees is listed as an initiative which is “effective in addressing issues of *systemic discrimination*”, yet the program is also listed as beneficial for City staff who “learn mentoring and coaching skills and increase their understanding of *cross-cultural issues*” (p. 9; my emphases). Page 12 of the Plan also includes a note that the City won several awards for participation in this Mentoring program in 2007.

In the “Recreation Service Plan 2013-2017”, “inclusion” is one of four guiding principles that, for the City’s Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department, means ensuring that everyone has a chance to access and participate in programs and services that are planned in a way that “recognizes diversity and encourages participation of marginalized and racialized people and groups” (City of Toronto, 2012, p. 8). To determine the current status of inclusivity in recreation services, a survey of residents was conducted which asked if recreation centres were “welcoming to newcomers, accommodating to those with a language barrier, and meeting the culturally-diverse needs of Torontonians” (p. 57). Potential barriers to access and participation in the City’s programs and services are again framed in terms of language difficulties and cultural differences,

not racism. What is also interesting here is how the City's Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department relays the responses to this part of the survey: that the majority of the respondents agreed that recreation services are welcoming and accommodating, "*however some people from racialized backgrounds were less satisfied*" and "*recreational access for the Aboriginal community is a gap*" (p.57; my emphases). This is the only place in the ninety-two page document where barriers to access in terms of *racism* is hinted at, yet are not addressed further here or anywhere else in the report. In the report, these "hints" are immediately followed by these two quotes:

"It is very challenging to get information and know what is available as a newcomer. I needed someone to introduce me. It was easier after I knew my way around. I imagine it would be even more challenging if I didn't speak English."

– Survey respondent

"I want to see diverse images because that tells me I will be accepted and accommodated in the programs. Diverse staff also help to make the programs more accessible to diverse residents."

– Survey respondent. (City of Toronto, 2012, p. 57)

Although the term intersectionality is rarely seen in City documents, it pursues an understanding and prioritization of gender that is also premised on and co-articulated with (racialized) lack and the City as an exceptional space. During the public consultations for the City's Plan of Action to Eliminate Racism and Discrimination, the Chair of the City's Community Advisory Committee on the Status of Women, City Councillor Pam McConnell, introduced the concept of intersectionality as a way for the City to account of the different experiences women and men have in the City's programs and services. She asked that a gender-

based analysis tool be developed which could examine the differential impacts of policy and services on gender and gender identity as they intersect with various aspects of identity, and which would ensure that the City does not make women's issues peripheral when discussing issues of racism (City of Toronto, 2002a). Councillor McConnell also asked that the principles of intersectionality be expanded beyond race and gender, to "be applied to the analysis of the needs of our diverse communities" as they intersect with gender (City of Toronto, 2002a, p. 3). At the same time that Councillor McConnell was introducing the concept of intersectionality at the City, she put forward a Notice of Motion to the October 2002 meeting of Toronto City Council regarding the case of Amina Lawal and, more broadly, Sharia Law in Nigeria. The Notice of Motion asks Toronto City Council to convey the concerns of Torontonians regarding the case to the Prime Minister, and to help petition the government of Nigeria to ensure that the "horrific sentences against Amina Lawal" are not carried out (City of Toronto, 2002b, p. 2). The request is preceded by the following statements:

WHEREAS the people of Toronto have been in the forefront of efforts to create a compassionate society and have demonstrated a long commitment to women's equality and human rights; and

WHEREAS in March 1883, Toronto City Council supported the founding of the Toronto Women's Suffrage Association at a meeting held in Council Chambers; and

WHEREAS in 1909, a member of Toronto City Council presented a petition of more than 100,000 signatures to the Premier of Ontario in support of women getting the vote; and

WHEREAS in 1973, the City of Toronto established a Mayor's Task Force on the Status of Women, which brought about major changes in the delivery of municipal services,

particularly health care for women and children, day care, employment equity and equal pay; and

WHEREAS Amina Lawal, a 30 year-old Muslim woman was sentenced to death by stoning by a Shariacourt at Bakori in northern Nigeria, for having a child outside of marriage; and

WHEREAS the sentence on Amina Lawal has provoked a world-wide wave of shock and revulsion;

WHEREAS the sentence imposed on Amina Lawal constitutes torture and is cruel, inhumane and degrading and runs counter to international human rights standards; and

WHEREAS Toronto City Council takes a leadership role in the fight of all forms of discrimination and is committed to human dignity, social equity, social justice and solidarity... (City of Toronto, 2002b, p. 1-2)

The Motion's juxtaposition of Toronto's leadership in the area of women's rights and Nigeria's "inhumane and degrading" treatment of women suggests, again, the co-construction of lack, exceptionality, and racialization, under the guise of intersectionality which seeks to centralize women's issues in the City. Councillor McConnell's introduction of intersectionality aims to prioritize issues of gender, as they are compounded by various "diverse" identities; however in practice, the privileging of gender in the City allows for a reconstruction of lack through a continuation of colonial and Orientalist thinking which positions "them", or "stranger strangers" as primitive, backwards and uncivilized (Said, 1978), *against* "us", the diverse City. This positioning of "them" and/against "us" is also *spatialized*, in that the City is re-constructed as a space where the principles of equity, dignity and social justice for women is shared by all

who belong and/or those who have been welcomed, *who have successfully negotiated their belonging*, against those who are abjected, “outside”.

I also argue that the demarcation of the diverse City of Toronto as an exceptional and civilized space is accomplished through the language of intersectionality, which sets up what (or more precisely, who) counts as “gender” in the City, and how experiences of racialized women are taken up in City reports, in racializing terms. For example, the City’s Parks, Forestry and Recreation Department issued a response to the report “If Low Income Women of Colour Counted in Toronto” (Kholisa, 2003), which uses the concept of intersectionality to in part identify the need for low-income, immigrant and refugee women of colour to access more public recreation opportunities, in order to make their lives more viable. The City’s Parks, Forestry and Recreation issued a response which offers several gender-based recommendations, because “‘Women’ are an identified target group within the access and equity agenda. As such, Parks and Recreation is committed to increasing the variety and number of recreation opportunities (i.e. sports, fitness, and other activities) for women” (City of Toronto, 2004, p.3). The department’s responses include several initiatives to increase the number of recreation opportunities for women, including the number of women-only programs (the latter of which is a recommendation of the “If Low Income Women Counted in Toronto” report), but does not specify further how the intersection of race and gender create specific experiences for *racialized women*, particularly how they access (or do not access) the City’s recreation programs and services. However, as *cultural* initiatives, the department offers to continue its multilingual outreach campaign, to ensure that staff at all levels reflect the diverse communities served, and “to provide new Canadians, especially those from warm climates, opportunities to learn and play Canadian winter sports” (City of Toronto, 2004, p. 3).

I am reminded here of Smith's (2010) assertion that equity in the Canadian academy becomes about "gender equity" – specifically the privileging of white women – and (or against) the "other Others", or the "diverse". Smith offers that the pursuit and prioritization of hiring and retaining women in the academy becomes almost exclusively about white women, which not only perpetually defers equity for "other Others", but also attaches the academy's hegemonic whiteness to merit; to "qualified" whites, and thus, to less qualified Others. Expanding on Smith's (2010) analysis of equity and whiteness in the academy, I want to suggest that although racialized staff in the City draw on discourses of intersectionality specifically to re-engage and re-center analyses of gender in the City's development of policies and practices, and to follow the historical trajectory of advancing the needs of and "equal opportunity" rights for women in the City,²³ what becomes occluded is that these policies and discourses are largely premised on the advancement and privileging of *white* women. What I am suggesting here is that if the intersection (or interjection) of gender via intersectionality reproduces racialization and race in the City, it becomes possible to see how racialized staff who bolster their belonging as "insider-Others" through the discourse of intersectionality and the idea of "progress" become implicitly bound to a project of bargaining with and bolstering the belonging of white women.

While the concepts of equity, inclusion and/or intersectionality may advance critical insights regarding systemic barriers to access, in order to move diversity 'beyond race', as part of a complex web of discourses they also remain inextricably bound to conferring lack onto Other/strange bodies, and to designating the space of the City as exception(al), both of which I argue are co-constructed via racial thinking. Thus, the issue of racism in the City gets erased and/or overwritten by continuously imputing a "certain essence" (Ahmed, 2002, p.47) onto

²³ As I have shown, the City's "equal opportunity" policies dating back to at least 1975 focused on the prioritization of hiring women. "Disabled" and "visible minorities" groups were added to these policies in the 1980s, in response to Employment Equity initiatives at the Provincial level.

racialized bodies via racializing processes, which is incited into a complex web of discourses in the City. I argue that this “essence” is one of lack. There are two points I want to make in this regard: one, that conferring lack (whether through language, skills, knowledge, and/or civility) becomes the mechanism by which the City re-circulates the racial norms that *reinscribes* racialization of the Other, in order to disavow the racist and racializing practices that would threaten its status as the exception(al). In other words, the normalization of (racial) lack, incited into equity, inclusion, intersectionality and diversity discourses, is precisely what allows racism to simultaneously flourish and be concealed in the City. The second point I am making is that those who “stand outside” of this complex web of discourses, or more precisely, those who call attention to the racist and racializing practices in the City, are integral to the reproduction of this web via their negotiations of belonging in the City *in and through these very same discourses*. Negotiations of belonging for the racial outsider, the stranger stranger, and/or the non-diverse Other are invited by the discourses of equity, inclusion, intersectionality and diversity, through a repetitive engagement of the affective desires to be/come not-strange, not-raced, but it is through the simultaneous *presence and abjection* of the stranger stranger that the City’s exception(al) status as a “leader”, “role model”, and as “accountable to diverse communities” becomes not only possible, but *performative*. It is thus through the acceptance of the invitation to negotiate (which the discourses of equity, inclusion, intersectionality and diversity hails) in tandem with repeated citations of being exceptional that the City can claim to be moving ‘beyond race’ and/or to be ‘not-racist’, while at the same time rendering unintelligible those who speak of race or racism in the diverse City.

Puwar (2004) asks what happens when those who are not the somatic norm (“space invaders”) occupy certain spaces where they are seen not to belong, and describes this as an

encounter that for Others can be negotiated in ways that are complex *and* collusive. As part of their work, racialized City staff are charged with redeploying the language and practices of the institution, in this case to reaffirm the City's leadership in the areas of equity, inclusion, intersectionality and diversity. What becomes interesting here is that the discourses that re-circulate and re-cite lack in the City are also bound to racialized City staff's understanding of themselves as exception(al), as beyond capable, as progressive, *as not lacking*. Racialized City staff thus take up the "new" languages of the institution as a *refusal* of racialization (in the form of lack, or "blackness", as Puwar describes), at the same time that these languages are historically rooted in *reinscribing* racialization in the City. These "new" discourses also help to reinforce the City's claims that it has transcended its racist past, and has become a preemptive authority/leader on issues of diversity and racism, which not only shapes how claims of racism in the City are taken up, but also *normalizes* the threat of abjection for other Others, stranger strangers, who dare to make these claims. I want to argue that the production of the exception(al) racial subject in the City *and* the production of the exceptional City are co-articulated with racialization and the abjection of (other) Others who make claims of racism in the City.

Although there are at times moments of deep contradiction in terms of what these discourses actually *do*, it is because many City staff understand themselves to be *agentic* subjects who use these discourses in strategic ways to move 'beyond race' that these contradictions appear less relevant. Davies (2000) offers insight into the complex and at times contradictory positionings of City staff within the discourses of equity, inclusion, intersectionality and diversity. She suggests that desires (for freedom, autonomy, or in this case, to be the exception(al), not-strange, not-raced) which construct notions of our "essential selves" as pitted against power are not actually individually constituted, independent, or "personal", although they

may *feel* that way. Our desires and our essential selves instead “signify both the discourses and subject positions made available within them, through which we have been constituted and through which we have constituted ourselves” (Davies, 2000, p. 55). As Davies (2000) also suggests, “desires are made relevant through continuity of discourses” (p. 66).

For racialized City staff, the affective desires to be the exception(al) and to move ‘beyond race’ *are produced and made relevant* in the City through the repetition of equity, inclusion, intersectionality and diversity discourses, to a point where any contradictions and anxieties are repeatedly overwritten, in speech acts and in texts. At the same time, racialized City staff who re-circulate these discourses also appear competent, qualified, expert and/or exceptional in the City. They bolster their belonging through the idea of progress in order to fulfill (in part) the desire to be/come someone else, not-raced, not-strange, and not imbued with lack, *against* the figure of the other Other who is incapable of progress.

As such, I suggest that the desire to move ‘beyond race’ in the City is contingent on and constituted through the repetition of this complex web of discourses, and thus *on the reproduction of race itself*. I argue that the complex subjectivities and practices that are evoked in and through these deeply contradictory positions should not be seen as a “problem” of racialized City staff, but instead as a site of illumination into the powerful and constitutive force of discourse, which simultaneously constitutes the perception of an individual “essential self” (Davies, 2000, p. 64) with authorship over one’s meanings and desires, and conceals how that essential self actually comes to be spoken into existence via existing structures of power. Therefore, I am also suggesting that the contradictions and anxieties embedded in and actualized through these discourses do not preclude the possibility of “strategy” or “agency” for racialized staff in the City; instead *they are the beginnings of what makes agency possible*. As I have

shown, there are moments of tension which indicate that even as staff are *produced* as the exception(al), the production can never be fully complete. In an interesting turn, the psychic and discursive refusals of racialization are met and challenged by the material effects of the encounter, where bodies are reproduced as raced and out of place. In other words, the subjectivization of the exception(al) subject which depends on the re-citing of diversity, equity, inclusion and intersectionality discourses as a refusal of racialization cannot fully contain the *materiality* of race.

As Davies (2000) argues, agency is effected when the subject becomes aware of and refuses the containment of meaning and desire, to “resist, subvert, and change the discourses themselves through which one is being constituted” (p. 67). Agency occurs when one recognizes that desire is spoken into existence through discourse, and then moves within and between discourses, and uses the terms of one discourse to modify, refuse, or contradict the other; to go beyond the rationality of our continuous and “essential selves” and our desires to expose the positions and practices that are mired in contradictions (Davies, 2000). I take Davies’ understanding of agency one step further by suggesting that an awareness of these contradictions also make visible the powerful investments in and continued relevance of race and racialization in the diverse City, to a point where the emotional and affective longings to move ‘beyond race’, to be the exception(al), and other multiple, complex and contradictory subject positions are exposed as being contained and reproduced by these very same investments, and the discourses they are incited into.

This section of the chapter has explored how diversity discourse is reinforced by existing in a web of other discourses, which I have argued all circulate and point (back) towards the same thing - racialization and the reproduction of race. What this network of discourses does is create

a constellation of meanings that incite repetition and reproduction of unquestioned notions of diversity through policies and practices in the City. Tying diversity to other circulating discourses, even as they may seek to broaden/expand/challenge what diversity represents, only reinforces the saliency and relevance of the term, and thus to what is incited into it: racialization and racializing practices in the City. The following section will explore how racialization and racializing practices in the City of Toronto are simultaneously invoked through diversity discourse via a denial of race and/or racism. As this next section will demonstrate, the accounts of racialized City staff reveal how the denial of race/racism becomes a way for them to contextualize and/or negotiate their belonging in the City of Toronto, especially in the context of how the City is imagined and written as a diverse, “post-racial” space.

The Denial of Race/Racism. Puwar (2004) draws on the accounts of Black civil servants in Britain to describe how bodies constitute and are constituted by spaces. In this part of the chapter, I trace how the exceptional racial subject and the exceptional City space are *co-constituted* through the denial of race/racism, lack and the racializing norms of diversity discourse. For some racialized City staff, moving ‘beyond race’ and being the exception(al) can also mean denying the existence of race and or racism in the City, especially as they negotiate and contextualize their belonging in the “diverse” institution. In my interviews with staff, the denial of race and/or racism in the City produced multiple and contradictory positionings, which conveyed significant tensions between notions of a post-racial, “colour-blind”, diverse City and subject position, and how race and/or racism in staff’s work lives is actually encountered, articulated, and managed. For some, these tensions and contradictory moments appeared to rise as staff described where, when and for whom race/colour did not matter; although their experiences, feelings, and/or *encounters* might dictate otherwise. The affective components of

diversity discourse, the desire to be not-raced, not-strange, either collided or colluded with the denial of race/racism in these moments, particularly as staff described their belonging in the City. For example, diversity for Tania means “different cultures, different races...what brings us together” and she describes the City as “welcoming, open, and open-minded”. However she also explains how her identity and sense of belonging in Toronto is intricately connected with how she views experiences of racism, including her own:

I have that kind of mentality, so...I guess I don't even really allow myself to see anything but ...like, of course, *I'm Toronto*. Like, I'm the city of Toronto because I...was brought up here. Yeah, so I don't really see it. *I don't let myself see...* like even with the, when you were asking me about the outsiders, like, there is obvious racism and there is stuff, but...I'm like, no. Like, it's ok. Like only see...the good. Is that weird? Does that make sense?

This spatial and embodied sense of identity and belonging that is configured by and through “not letting oneself see” race/racism in Toronto creates several complex moments in my interview with Tania. For example, although she acknowledges that as City staff, she is “filling the [skin colour] quota... I guess at certain points, I know I'm being used for...for my, because of my background”, Tania is determined to “find the silver lining” by focusing on the fact that she was hired for her friendly personality, that she has a well paying job, and that she is *on the inside* at the City. However, Tania also identifies feelings of discomfort that are associated with her being grateful that she was “accepted” in the City:

And so I was just, I was happy that [supervisor] accepted me as well. *Hey, that's weird, that I would think that! That I had this whole like, oh, they accept me.* ‘Cause for me it's like, oh! Yes, ok! And then, now that I'm here, I'm gunna show them what I can do. And

then I do the best that I can. But it's like, to get there, I guess I just...I'm like, ok, fine, I'm here because, yes ok, I have these assets, whatever. ...and now I'm just like, I'm gunna do the best that I can.

It is in these ideas of “not seeing” and “acceptance” that it becomes possible to see the co-production of the exceptional City and the exceptional racial subject through the denial of race/racism. Both the City and the racial subject are produced as exceptional through the moments of refusal (“not-see”) and reinscription (“acceptance”) of race and racialization. However, Tania's narrative also provides a key insight into Puwar's theorization that bodies constitute and are constituted by space. In the City of Toronto, this co-constitution is a *constant negotiation* between bodies and spaces, infused with affective disjunctures (i.e. “Hey, that's weird that I would think that!) which collide and/or collude with spatially and discursively bound denials of race/racism. This collision/collusion paradox resonated strongly with me as I reflected on my interview with Michelle. In the words of Michelle, diversity means “men, women, different colours, people from all over the world, in one place...we have a mix of everyone...you can't judge anybody by, you know, their skin colour, or their name, and anything...it's just so wonderful. I just love the mix”. For Michelle, the City's motto “Diversity Our Strength” means that, regardless of background, culture and/or religion, Torontonians can come together, live together, work together, because “you're not Black, you're not white...you don't have to be separated by these boundaries”. Michelle clarifies further:

Well, we definitely, like, I know, I mean, we look at each other, people look at me and say oh, she's [ethnicity], or she's [skin colour]. That's for sure. But, you know, it doesn't...I, what I've found is at the City of Toronto, I haven't been um, limited from growing in my career, or going anywhere, or not being welcome here because of my skin

colour, or anything of that sort. So everyone's friendly, you know, you could see a Chinese person walking down the hall, they'll get treated the same as the white person or the Black person.

Throughout our interview, Michelle remains committed to the idea that although racism exists in Toronto, in the space of the City of Toronto the colour of someone's skin does not matter and furthermore, that "difference is even appreciated!" However, the distinction between what happens "outside" of the City and what happens in the institution itself, particularly as it relates to the existence of race/racism, seemed less clear for Michelle in certain moments. As she initially describes, "well, obviously there's stereotypes and racism everywhere. Um, I guess it's just where you are. Um, we're in a professional environment where we understand that, you know, everyone deserves respect and should be treated with equity". However, Michelle also observes that the area in which she works is "very, very white" and recalls one incident where three candidates of colour applied for a senior position alongside one "white guy, and well, he got the job... but perhaps this was just because he was the better, more qualified candidate". As she goes on to say:

But yeah, it's very white [here], for sure! Although, I, I, I...I gotta mention to you, um...a friend of mine, she was working here for a little bit, in our office, part-time. Um, she wore a hijab, and everything. And, nobody looked down on her. Nobody looked at her funny, or nobody said anything, ever. Everyone, she got treated the same as I got treated. And I just feel that that's because, you know, everyone here is *educated* (my emphasis).

In Michelle's view, the absence of racism in the City is attributed to a level of educational training which she assumes City staff (including herself) have acquired, which

enables the City to move ‘beyond race’, but which also enables politicians and staff to see her and Others in the City as *not-raced*. An important point to consider here is that Michelle bolsters her belonging in the City via her educational achievements, as a way to bring her closer to the hegemonic white, male, middle/upper-class figure who naturally occupies a “professional environment” where respect and dignity are preserved; and to distance herself from negative stereotypes associated with “uneducated” racial other Others, who make claims of racism inside the City because they *lack* respect and civility.

However, Michelle’s frequent return to her observation that the City is a very white space suggests momentary slippages in the spatially and discursively bound denials of race/racism that frame the City’s self-narrative and her own sense of belonging in the City. Again, I want to suggest that it is in these moments where diversity discourse, desire and affect cannot contain how the body is seen, felt and/or experienced as raced, *as out of place*. Yet, when I ask Michelle to offer an explanation as to why the City is a very white space, Michelle responds: “I don’t know. I don’t know what it is, to be honest. I don’t know why it’s like that”. In our interview, Michelle refuses to acknowledge the existence of racism in the City.

The spatially and discursively bound denial of race/racism become further entrenched in Michelle’s understanding of her own positioning as the exception(al), as someone who was hired because she is educated, a “good person, hard-working”, not because of her race, ethnicity, and/or capacity to work with and speak the language of specific communities. However, Michelle also shares a story about how her white boss was commended for “hiring a [ethnicity] woman who could reach out to the [same ethnicity] communities”. She feels that hiring her is what makes him “really appreciate diversity, because he has someone that’s not white that’s working for him” and that this is what makes him “stand out” and *not racist*. Thus, in Michelle’s

view, the presence of her “diverse” body in the City is what makes her boss *the exception(al)*. Although not made explicit, Michelle’s reference to “better” qualifications of whites in the institution, alongside how she links her own hiring/presence in the City to being educated, a “good person, hard-working”, associates (the absence of) racialized bodies with discourses of lack – of education, of competency, of “goodness” – which also solidifies her own positioning as the exception(al) in the City. Yet what is also noteworthy in Michelle’s account is how, at the same moment that Michelle is made exceptional through the denial of [her] race and racialization, her boss’ exceptionality, as being “not-racist”, is conditional upon the reinscription of race and racialization; in particular how she is encountered as a racialized body in a space where she, and Others, *are seen not to belong*. Michelle’s racialized body in the space of the City thus becomes the site of an illuminating paradox, where once again the exceptional City and subject position and the desire(s) to move ‘beyond race’ are *co-produced* through diversity discourse with race, racialization, lack, and non-belonging in space thus implied.

The complexities of negotiating belonging in an exceptional space which is co-articulated with the discourse of diversity and its simultaneous denial and reinscription of race and racialization become further evident as racialized staff describe their encounters with racial (other) Others in the City. For example, Michelle shares how helping racialized people to access City services can sometimes be challenging. Frustrated by the various assumptions that “they” make, including the assumptions that they are talking to a white person over the phone, and/or that if they do not get the help they want, they are being discriminated against, Michelle refers to claims of racism from Others as “a card that people try to use”. At the same time, Michelle is equally frustrated by those who assume that she will help them, be more sympathetic to their

needs, and/or “play that card...because I’m [ethnicity], or because I’m [skin colour]”. In another example, Stacey describes what happens when she uses the term diversity in the workplace:

So whenever you mention the word diversity, they automatically think, oh my god, I have to do something for these people. So they don’t get it. The same thing, like I mean, I explain this all the time to people, I said...equity and access mean, equity means I need access just like everybody else. I don’t need to be jumping the cue to get service. If I’m to say, oh, if I’m a visible minority or whatever, whatever barriers that are in there to imp, that is impeding me from getting service, you need to remove.

However, at the same time that Stacey is critical of how diversity is interpreted by some in the City – as certain bodies “jumping the cue to get service” - she also echoes Michelle’s frustration that racialized people who share the same background as her (in Stacey’s case, other racialized City staff) will often “circumvent their supervisor” and “*jump the cue*” to gain direct access to her for help with work issues. Stacey is adamant that she “never looks at people in terms of race”, and expresses her concern that “everybody else sees us as their race, and, and that’s the first that comes to mind. It’s not that you’re competent, you’re skilled, you’re educated, you’re everything else”. At the same time, Stacey says it is quite common for “visible minority” staff in her department to want direct access to their “visible minority” superiors, but that she values competency and skills above all else. As Stacey remarks, “if you’re not skilled at your job, forget it! I’m not rewarding you for bad behaviour”.

In my interviews with Stacey and Michelle, it is possible to see how encounters with racialized bodies who hint at or speak of the existence of race/racism in the “diverse” City trigger and reinforce racial thinking which, for some City staff, leads them to separate “us” (diverse/not quite strange/exception(al)) from “them” (“stranger-strangers”, non-diverse) *as* a negotiation of

belonging. This separation of “us” and “them” also reengages with the simultaneous denial and reproduction of race/racialization that is performed by diversity discourse in the exceptional City, through speech acts and through texts. However, I also want to suggest here that reinforcing the separations between “us” and “them” is an *effect* of the production of the exceptional racial subject which, as I have argued, cannot fully contain the materiality of being raced and out of place. What I am suggesting is that although racialized staff bolster their belonging in the City through drawing on the education, skills and civility that they have attained in order to have *earned* their place in the institution, against those who feel they can take advantage and “jump the cue” because of their lack of civility, it is important to consider that these bolstering tactics also serve to psychically contain the effects and affects of being raced and out of place.

I want to also suggest it is in moments when affective disjunctures are made visible, and/or moments when experiences with race/racism in the City collide with the spatially and discursively bound denial of them, that the boundaries between “us” and “them” become less clear and less maintained for some racialized City staff, thus threatening their status and belonging as the exception(al) in the City. For some City staff, any threat to the denial of race/racism simultaneously reinforces a threat of abjection, which implies certain “re-racializing” effects/affects. Naming race/racism in the City thus contains a threat of *undoing* being the exception(al), and the work of being not-raced, not strange. The threat implied is of *becoming* “them”; the “stranger stranger”, the non-diverse Other, the outsider. Alison describes how, even though she has a lot of friends at the City and she gets along with everyone, she is not invited to dinners or BBQs with management because she feels that management does not yet know if she will “play ball...have their backs”, or if she will call attention to how diversity in the City of

Toronto is just “lip-service”. In short, Alison feels like she is not invited to special events, or promoted within the organization because management does not know if they can *trust* her: “whether when the chips are down, I’m going to align myself with them, or am I going to be the person that’s going to be the whistleblower, right?” As Patricia offers, “because they [City staff] *trust* me, and they know I’m not going to hurt them with calling them racists, or whatever...they like me, and they trust me, so I don’t get any backlash. And I also am able to, to have those conversations in a way that will take them up to line, without taking them over...without threatening them”. For racialized staff in the diverse City, the refusal to take risks beyond that “line” and to remain silent on issues of race/racism is a condition of *trust* and belonging in the City.

In “Moving ‘Beyond Race’”, I have described how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto, as a performative, both contains and enables the affective desire(s) of being not-raced, not-strange, thus offering up multiple, complex and contradictory subject positionings in its name. I have posited that is through the *containment* of affective desire(s) to move ‘beyond race’ (to be not-strange, not-raced) that the racial histories and reinscriptions of racialization that are incited into diversity discourse in the City of Toronto become repeated and concealed. Through circulation with other discourses and through the denial of race/racism, diversity discourse continuously hails and re-signifies these desires, at the same time that it reinscribes racialization through conferring of lack onto other Others “outside” (spatially and/or discursively) of the City. I suggest that this conferring of lack, incited into the matrix of diversity, simultaneously *protects and polices*²⁴ “insider-Others” exception(al) status and belonging via their continued (but precarious) intelligibility and articulate(d) subject positions in the City. I have also argued that

²⁴ I use the term “policies” as opposed to using Foucault’s notion of self-discipline to denote a particular force in which insider-Others’ belonging and subjectivity is held together *against* abjected “other Others”, which requires a *continuous maintenance of the spatial and racial boundaries of belonging* via the reproduction of lack.

the City as an exceptional space is premised on the same terms: the refusal of race/racism within its borders requires a reinscription of lack onto racialized bodies. In other words, to maintain the City's leadership and exceptionality in the area of diversity, the City refuses its own racism via reinscribing racialization; in order to address *their* lack, not *our* racism/racist practices. In speech acts and in texts, "diversity" thus *performs* the separation those who belong from those who do not, "us" from "them", the exception(al) from the lacking, the stranger stranger, the other Other, *in racial terms*. As I have explained, the exceptional City is co-produced with the exceptional racial subject via the discourse of diversity, to authorize the reproduction of racialization and race in the City of Toronto.

I have also argued that racialized staff are *produced* as exceptional, intelligible and articulate(d) racial subjects who have in various ways transcended the limits (lack) of their own race in order to attain a certain degree of belonging in the City. The production of the exceptional racial subject thus reinforces and is reinforced by the discourses of the institution which justify the abjection of racial other Others and the denial of race/racism through reinscriptions of racialization and lack. However, a key insight I want to offer here is that, in the idea that racialized City staff have transgressed the limits of their own race, it becomes possible to see the *fragility* of diversity discourse, racialization and race. Although racialized City staff, as "insider-Others", rely on various bolstering tactics to be the exception(al) as a negotiation of their belonging in the City, what is important to note is that their (partially) included bodies also become the sites in which the racial terms and rigid boundaries of inclusion and exclusion become exposed as *penetrable*.

On Being the Exception(al) – Final Thoughts

In this chapter, I have discussed the various ways in which diversity discourse in the City of Toronto becomes performative via re-circulating racial norms, through speech acts and through texts, that subjectivate and are subjectivated by encounters with racial Others in the City. I have offered that diversity discourse hails racial “insider-Others” into subjectivity via various iterations of what I call “being the exception(al)” - a status that separates “us” (as insider-Others, diverse) and “them” (other Others, stranger strangers), that is both afforded by and dependent upon negotiated, conditional access and entry into spaces of (non-)belonging, and that is co-constructed with the abjection of racial (other) Others via the reinscription of racialization. In the subsection entitled “Moving ‘Beyond Race’”, I have described how the affective desires of racialized Others in the City to *become* not-raced, not-strange, and to belong become increasingly produced and contained within the discourse of diversity (and the web of discourses that enact and are enacted by it), through repetition and recirculation. The containment of these desires not only reproduces and is reproduced by diversity in practice, it also works to conceal the racial histories and norms that are bound to negotiations of belonging in the City, and the various, complex and at times contradictory positioning that are afforded in these negotiations. The desires to move ‘beyond race’ also incite a denial of race/racism in the City, which bind the subjectivity and intelligibility of racial Others in the City to spatial and discursive occlusions and/or erasures of racism, which are premised on the continued abjection of other Others/stranger strangers in the City. However, as I have shown, the explicit denial of race/racism produces moments of tension in speech acts and in texts, moments which I argue expose the precarious nature and limitations of diversity discourse, and which also bring into

question the production and psychic separation(s) of “us” and “them” that the encounter and negotiations of belonging seeks to guarantee.

Next, in a chapter entitled, “Being Like No Other”, I discuss how this separation between “us” and “them” via exceptionality in the City is further reinforced through the active practices of *countering* racializing ideas; what Ahmed (2012) calls “maximiz[ing] the distance between you and their idea of you” (p. 160) as a negotiation of belonging. I argue that the work of “maximizing the distance” simultaneously naturalizes the somatic norm and racialization in space. I draw on narratives from City staff as well as City of Toronto texts to highlight how any “truths” that are conveyed about racialized Others in the City, specifically how and under what circumstances they do or do not belong, serve to fix the “stranger strangers” in racial terms, and in space. I argue that these repeated attempts to “fix” and/or essentialize racial (other) Others also become an integral part of how staff bolster their belonging in the City, in that they serve to simultaneously reinforce *distance and proximity* in relation to the somatic norm.

Chapter 7

Being Like No Other

Introduction

Ahmed (2012) argues that a consequence of racism in “diverse” institutions includes careful modes of self-presentation, in particular a constant and deliberate distancing from the racializing ideas and stereotypes that are imposed upon bodies who appear to pose a problem (i.e. who dare to speak about racism), or who are “out of place” (Ahmed 2012, p. 162). For example, being a Black male in institutions of whiteness means having to repeatedly defend oneself against perceptions of Blackness, which are always/already invested with threat. Ahmed (2012) argues that what diversity “does”, through the combination of hyper-surveillance and self-presentation, is to make speaking about racism deliberately dangerous, if not impossible.

In this chapter, I expand on Ahmed’s (2012) theorization of self-presentation as a consequence of racism in diverse institutions, to offer that modes of self-presentation for racial Others in the City of Toronto both invest in and are invested with racializing norms which reproduce the figure of the stranger stranger *and* the somatic norm in space. I examine how self-presentation in negotiations of belonging in the City in part implies establishing various levels of trust in the institution via *disavowals* of racialization; even as the exceptionality afforded through these disavowals *reproduces* the racialization of “other Others”. As such, I argue that the positionings afforded via “being like no Other” in the City requires both an explicit rejection of (other) Otherness *and* a reproduction of race via positionings against threatening, uncivilized others Others in the City. These positionings, that constitute and are constituted by diversity discourse, thus rely on the resignifications of “us” and “them” and the repetitions of racial norms that re-create the conditions under which subjects become articulate(d) and abjected in the City.

Following this introduction, I examine how City texts ground and reinforce the belonging of racial Others in the City via the co-establishment of trust, hyper-surveillance and self-presentation. I then describe how racialized City staff draw on stereotypes and/or “specialized knowledge” of racial (other) Others in order to bolster their belonging in the City, as mechanisms to distance themselves (“us”) from racial other Others (“them”), and to demonstrate their civility, trustworthiness and proximity to the somatic norm. Finally, I return to City texts to show how even in attempts to address and/or *challenge* stereotypes, the City reinforces the essentialization and racialization of bodies, naturalizes the somatic norm in the space of the City, and re-confirms the space of the City as exceptional. In this chapter, my aim is to trace how “being like no Other” in the City is authorized through the racial norms which are incited into and reproduced by diversity discourse. I show how establishing trust and proximity to the somatic norm as a negotiation of belonging for racial Others is dependent on the simultaneous refusal/disavowal and reproduction of racialization and race which both inspire and are inspired by diversity discourse in the City.

For example, in 1993, The Toronto Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations wrote a letter to the Toronto Neighbourhoods Committee recommending that the City offer congratulations on the “orderly and peaceful” nature of the Anti-Racist Demonstration held on June 28, 1993. For the Committee, this was “proof that the Coalition of Anti-Racist Organizations has reclaimed the advantage in its efforts to fight white supremacist racist organizations” because it “*marshaled* over 2,000 anti-racists of all colours” (City of Toronto, 1993, p.10, emphasis added). In the letter, there is specific reference to the success of the organizers being attributed to the establishment of “a good liaison with the Metropolitan Toronto Police” (p.10). Although not made explicit, the congratulations issued to the organizers relies on

the implication that “anti-racists”, anti-racist action, and claims of racism in the diverse City typically exhibits conduct that is infused with *lack* (of civility/civil behaviour, order, peace), which has direct racial, colonial and normative implications. However, in this case, racialized Others/organizers are partially welcomed in negotiations of belonging and are singled out in City reports for their fight against racism *outside of the City* (“white supremacist organizations”) coupled with the establishment of *trust* with Toronto Police. Therefore, they become like no Other through maintaining the City as an exceptional space of innocence (diverse, not-racist) *against* the figure of the essentialized, abjected (other) Other, *who makes claims of racism inside the City*. Furthermore, it is through the encounter with those who belong in the City (in this case, Toronto Police) that differential inclusion of racialized Others in space becomes possible and permissible. I want to suggest that disavowal, specifically the process which I call encounter-disavowal, becomes the mechanism by which these relationships are cultivated and reproduced. These relationships, built on the co-construction of hyper-surveillance and self-presentation, are set up *against* the essentializing, racializing tropes that eject stranger strangers (which I will call encounter-threat-abjection) from the diverse City. In short, the organizers’ success is framed in terms of the disavowal of racialization via proximity to those who impart civility, which reproduces and justifies their partial belonging in the diverse City, and which simultaneously justifies the exclusion/abjection of stranger strangers (i.e. violent, backwards, uncivilized bodies) who stand outside of these relations.

The civilizing relationships that impart (partial) belonging of racialized Others in the City, and that legitimize and are legitimized by the co-construction of hyper-surveillance and self-presentation are further evident in the establishment of the Toronto Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations (City of Toronto, 1981). This committee was initiated so that a

“committee of 12 members, picked on the basis of their knowledge of and commitment to fighting racial discrimination” could “root out racism as much as possible”, due to the increased presence of the Klu Klux Klan in Toronto (City of Toronto, 1980b), the onslaught of Ontario Human Rights complaints specific to racism, and the fraught relations between police and “visible minority communities” (City of Toronto, 1981, p. 1054). The latter two areas point to racism *inside* the City, which directly interfere with the delineation of the “diverse” City as an exceptional (not-racist) space. However, the report(s) offer several indications of how potentially “problematic” contributions of racialized Others on this committee in terms of racism inside the City are already constructed out of the encounter(s) via partial belonging and proximity to civilizing bodies and practices. For example, in the report explaining the justification for the committee, former Mayor Art Eggleton writes:

As the old saying goes, “*Charity begins at home*”, and our own house must be in good order if we are to effectively solicit public support in the struggle against prejudice and discrimination. I believe that the Committee on Community and Race Relations can assist in this endeavour by working with us to *make the City of Toronto a model employer, undertaking whatever programs are necessary to sharpen our responsiveness to the employment needs of minority communities.* (City of Toronto, 1981, p. 1054, my emphases)

Issues of racism in the City, even though they are listed in the report, again get re-framed through issues of representation of racialized Others which, through the discourse of diversity, become coupled with *their lack* of skills, knowledge and experience. This re-framing reproduces colonial relationships where those who are entrusted with power and civility are infused with the *moral* sensibilities (i.e. “charity”) to “save” Others, but also again maintains the City as a

“diverse”, exceptional space through the occlusion of racism. This occlusion is furthered by Mayor Eggleton, who transposes the responsibility to deal with issues of racism onto racialized Others outside of the City, as something that needs to be worked out by them, but also something that the committee and its members can *mediate/help* with:

It is my hope that the Committee on Community and Race Relations will strive to increase the ability of diverse groups to communicate and interact effectively in eradicating racism and prejudice from within our midst. Serving as a “Broker” between conflicting groups, it will help improve inter-group relations in Toronto. (City of Toronto, 1981, p. 1055)

As Puwar (2004) suggests, “space invaders” cannot risk their claims to professionalism by being “too different and radical” (p. 123). I want to suggest here that framing the role of the committee and its members as a “broker between conflicting groups” establishes a co-constructed relationship of hyper-surveillance and self-presentation, mediated by the (partial) belonging of racialized “insider-Others” via disavowals of racialization, affectivities and emotions associated with being raced. Members of the committee become regulated by and articulate through their status as “brokers” inside the City, and by the space of the City itself, in order to not draw attention to their own bodies as raced nor to make claims of racism inside the City. The policing of potential claims of these committee members is further enforced through their continued engagement with “diverse groups”, those who need to the City’s help “*to communicate and interact effectively*” and who remain outside/abjected *because* they lack the skills and civility to communicate and interact effectively when it comes to issues of racism.

This idea of racial outsiders needing (racial) “brokers” to mediate public discussions of racism resonates with Mayo’s (2002) examination of the relationship between the promises of

civility and the maintenance of power relations. Mayo argues that civility and the parameters of civil behaviour focus on the primary goal of preserving social bonds and interdependent relations, which not only limit how and what social discussions can take place, but *who* participates (and belongs) in social and public interactions as well. As Mayo explains:

Civility draws people into interactions in which they mutually agree that it would be better to interact than to resort to violence or to ignore one another. On the other hand, civility requires, in its most formal sense, an agreement on ways of interacting that also maintain the social distance between actors and *circumscribe the issues that can be brought into the civil interaction*. (p. 172, my emphasis)

Interactions (and actors) are deemed uncivil when they disrupt the power relations which construct the social interaction, as well as the requirements set out in which these forms of relation must take place. Therefore, those who “complain” about difficult social issues (i.e. racism) are uncivil because they lack the ability to contain and/or repress their “anger and self-righteous behaviour”²⁵ (Mayo, 2002, p. 172) for the good of civil society, and because they circumvent the parameters of *what can be discussed, and how it can be discussed*. Naming racism in the City becomes an example of uncivil and untrustworthy behaviour precisely because it transgresses the racially-constructed bounds of the “how” and “who” that form the relations of civil interaction in the City. Furthermore, the establishment of civil behaviour, (partial) belonging and cultivated relationships of trust inside the City – wherein racialized Others become “brokers” – serves to monitor and police any claims of racism inside the City, and simultaneously reinforces and elevates the desires to be the exception(al), to be not-strange, not-raced, and to be like no Other in the City.

²⁵ I would argue that “anger and self-righteous behaviour” is determined via race, racialization and dominant perception.

The establishment of trust, self-presentation and hyper-surveillance that co-constructs the status of being like no Other is further exemplified in the establishment of the City's first and only "Diversity Advocate" position in 2000, a role fulfilled by former City Councillor Sherene Shaw. As the City's only racialized female City Councillor, it became Councillor Shaw's responsibility to "act as the City's primary spokesperson and advocate on diversity issues" in part to reflect the City's motto "Diversity Our Strength"; to "promote, support and enhance Toronto's position on Diversity, and Access and Equity strategies, both locally, nationally, and internationally"; and to show support for the elimination of violence and racism, and all barriers to human rights (City of Toronto, 2000b, p. 23). The position also entailed a responsibility to "consult with the five City-wide Advisory Committees on Access and Equity" (Aboriginal Affairs, Disability Issues, Status of Women, Race and Ethnic Relations, and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues; all disbanded in 2001) in order to "eliminate an overlap of issues" and to create a "Diversity Advocate Action Plan" which would coordinate, consolidate and enhance access and equity issues initiatives brought forward by the Advisory Committees and community groups in the City (City of Toronto, 2001a, p.1). In essence, Councillor Shaw was to act as a spokesperson and representative for the five advisory committees and local community groups who identify barriers to access in the City; and "to bring these concerns to City Councillors, the Mayor, the Access and Equity committees and staff, as deemed appropriate" (City of Toronto, 2001a, p.4).

What is important to note here is the City's Chief Administrative Officer's recommendations for the Diversity Advocate Position, which include that Councillor Shaw meet with the five advisory committees, hold consultations with community groups, and to "work with staff on specific initiatives in the Council Action Plan, such as the *mentoring program for*

foreign trained professionals; strategies for building the economic capacity of communities; and responding to planning and regulatory issues regarding places of worship for the City's diverse communities" (City of Toronto, 2001a, p. 2, emphases added). Councillor Shaw responds to these recommendations:

As the Diversity Advocate, I have reviewed the CAO's report and am in concurrence with the proposed approach. This approach builds upon the existing structure established by City Council and can provide a mechanism for co-coordinating issues across the various advisory committees and our diverse communities in Toronto. (City of Toronto, 2001a, p.3)

I want to suggest that Councillor Shaw's appointed role as Diversity Advocate - which already requires a degree of civility and a disavowal of racialization in order to establish trust - is one which sets up the interlocking of self-presentation and hyper-surveillance in order to continuously *produce and police* her positioning through and *against* the continued abjection/disavowal of other Others in the City. As I go onto discuss later in this chapter, the continued abjection of other Others also makes up the process and content of the City's Plan of Action to Eliminate Racism and Discrimination, which was led by Councillor Shaw in her role as Diversity Advocate. I argue that civility, trust and proximity (and the increased degrees of belonging implied) is also negotiated and established via Councillor Shaw's role as a spokesperson for the City's five advisory committees, as well as her membership in the Status of Women Community Advisory Committee, created in early 2000 to address women's issues in the City. As a racialized *and* gendered "insider-Other", Councillor Shaw's performance as Diversity Advocate in the City is thus co-produced and managed by proximity, hyper-surveillance and self-presentation in and across multiple sites. Councillor Shaw's membership on

several committees creates several opportunities to produce, exhibit, reaffirm and appropriate existing modes of “professionalism” which, managed through the discourse of diversity, deny the existence of race/racism in the space of the City at the same time that they reinscribe racialization and lack onto other Others. The reinscription of racialization is exemplified through the Councillor Shaw’s concurrence that the Diversity Advocate’s responsibilities include working with multiple advisory groups, but to specifically work with City staff to further *mentoring programs and build “their” economic capacities*, which diversity discourse historically and specifically attaches to racialized Others and “their” essence of lack. The production and positioning of being like no Other, in this case as the City’s only Diversity Advocate, is thus again co-constructed with and dependant on an establishment of civility, trust/proximity that is negotiated via disavowals of racialization, co-articulated with reproductions of racialization in the City. I want to suggest that this establishment of civility, trust and/or proximity to the somatic norm, co-constructed with the re-citing of racial norms, is inextricably linked to the production and repetitive engagement (hailing) of the desires to be not-raced, not-strange, and to be like no Other via the discourse of diversity in the City.

In the next part of this chapter, I discuss how “being like no Other” via proximity to the somatic norm, trust and belonging is expressed in interviews with racialized City staff through evocations of racial stereotypes and/or knowledge/truths about “other Others” in the City. Building on Ahmed’s (2012) conceptualization of self-presentation as a distancing from stereotypes, I demonstrate how racialized staff in the City describe and bolster their exceptional status(es) via *evocations* of racial stereotypes and/or knowledge of other Others, in order to extricate themselves from racial norms, and to redeploy them onto other Others in a way that confirms their own belonging against “their” (stranger strangers’) abjection in the City. I also

show how the specter of the racial stereotype further confines and reproduces staff's desires to be not-strange, not-raced within the discourse of diversity. Next, through a close examination of City of Toronto texts, I demonstrate how the City's aim to *counter* racial stereotypes is framed and accomplished within the confines of diversity discourse, and is therefore co-articulated with the simultaneous denial and reproduction of race in order to maintain the space of the City as innocent. Finally, I bring together my analyses of interviews and texts to make the argument that the positionings associated with being like no Other in the City *requires* the stereotype and/or knowledge of the (other) Other in the City.

The Stereotype. Bhabha (1994) argues that in order to maintain separation and subservience of the colonized, stereotypes were deployed. The function of the stereotype is to define the other, to articulate difference and to see the other as a fixed object and inferior, in racial terms. This is what Bhabha calls "productive ambivalence" (p. 67). The stereotype, which constructs an essentialized identity of the other, also functions to create a phantasmic identity of the colonizer as enlightened, rational, and always in control. However, as Bhabha argues, the need for constant repetition of the stereotype questions the very fixity that the repetition sets out to guarantee. What is claimed about the Other must be repeated because it cannot be proven. Repetition of the stereotype also contains the anxiety of the colonizer's identity – seemingly in control and yet not in control at all.

In this section of the chapter, I complicate Bhabha's analysis of the stereotype by underscoring how discursive and spatial negotiations of belonging for racial Others in the City of Toronto reproduce essentializing/racializing characteristics which inform and maintain separation ("us" and "them"), thus transgressing the dichotomy of "colonizer" and "colonized". Specifically, I argue that the racializing characteristics that inform the racial stereotype can also

be drawn on by racialized City staff to (re-)produce a particular kind of “knowledge” of “them”, as a function of the desire to be not-raced, not-strange, and to belong in the City. I suggest that racial stereotypes are invoked in the City as a bolstering tactic of racialized City staff in order to *distance* themselves, as “insider-Others”, from essentialized characteristics and ideas. At the same time that staff bolster their belonging via re-citing stereotypes, I argue that the re-citing of stereotypes reproduces particular truths and knowledge of other Others, which reconstitute race in the City. It is in the reproduction of these truths that diversity discourse becomes performative. For example, Corey explains how his presence in the City provides good “visual optics” in terms of “diverse hiring”. Although Corey in some ways feels that he is being used to promote the existence of diversity in the organization, he also explains that he also uses his position “as a positive example...who was given an opportunity” in the City to be a “walking example” and a leader for others from racialized communities:

...and, and for me, I’m leading in terms of [long pause] let’s go. Come. This is where I was, let me tell you what I used to do, and how I got here. And when I go to different communities, I have no qualms about telling them, I grew up in a simil....because, when they see me represent the different...optically, I present a different thing to them. Um, because now my, my pants not baggy...my boots are not, shoes are not tucked into my boots, my clothes are not tucked into my boots...so this is who I am now.

Corey also believes that showing people from racialized communities that he “not, um [long pause] a father with a baby mama” inspires people from racialized communities to believe that “it doesn’t have to be that way” for them, either.

Kevin describes his belonging and leadership in the City as a staff person of colour who “knows these [marginalized] communities”. Although Kevin feels that diversity in the City

generally means “people of colour” and celebrations of cultures, Kevin uses diversity in his work because he feels that it evokes feelings of guilt in others, which helps him to get “buy-in from the upper tiers” and the allocation of necessary resources because “we are, we are all public servants here, and what should...you know, should we be doing...we should be...reacting to disadvantaged communities with lots of potential”. Recalling a multi-departmental neighbourhood improvement project he was a part of, Kevin also explains some of the frustrations he had with moving it forward in a way that had genuine concern for the needs of the community, beyond the typical “diversity actions”:

“because their action out there is translators...you know, we had a meeting with 8 translators and...and when I hear...you know, when...when I was told to do this, I’m like, ok. I get why it should be done. But...you know, there’s a sense of relief from their face that they had done it”.

For Kevin, moving beyond typical diversity actions included having to mentor a white staff person on how to build trust with the residents (mostly of colour) in this neighbourhood:

I wasn’t sure, you know, and...what I was sure of, or I told him, don’t ever wear a suit and tie. ‘Cause you look like a lawyer. Do you know what I mean? Like, first and, like, very first principles, very simple things. Or, um, you know, don’t do PowerPoint presentations, sit amongst...do you know what I mean? Just, like, little things like this, I communicated to him.

These difficulties also lead Kevin to thinking about pursuing an area of study to learn how “to govern yourself as a [department position], when you’re communicating with people of, you know, different...races? Races, I don’t...races. I hate, I don’t like that word”. He also feels that there should be some type of training established for staff “when they go out to racialized

communities” so that they can establish trust with “them”: “We’re not...he would’ve otherwise not come in a suit and tie, if he was trained properly. So, training is training by fire, right?”

It is in these moments of describing their (negotiations of) belonging and leadership in the City that Corey and Kevin draw on and re-bind essentialized characteristics and knowledge of Others so that they can establish themselves as leaders and/or experts in the City on and for racialized communities. In other words, at the same time that racial stereotypes and knowledge/truths are evoked in order to bolster the belonging of racialized staff in the City, and to re-solidify belonging via separations of “us” (not-raced, not-strange, *like no Other*) from “them” (not-diverse, stranger strangers, other Others), staff also demonstrate their *capability*, even exceptionality, because they have (or are perceived to have) “specialized” knowledge which helps racialized communities, because they *know* racialized communities. Corey describes talking to his white colleagues about how to engage a particular community of racialized youth:

Don’t pretend you like hip hop, or reggae, or dancehall, because they will sniff that out in a second. And once your credibility’s gone? You’re a joke to them. They just look right by you, like, shhh, get outta here...come in our neighbourhood and, thinking *you wanna save us* and da da da, and you know hip hop slang, why because you watched BET a couple of times? Get outta here. They sniff that out [laughs].

In teaching his white colleagues on how to interact with “them” (racialized youth), Corey not only draws on stereotypes which distance himself from them, but he also demonstrates and shares his knowledge of what they *will* say and do. However, at the same time, Corey is critical of how white staff in the City want to “save” racialized communities, and rely on racial stereotypes themselves. Although not made explicit by Corey, it appears as though his particular

knowledge of these communities *must always exceed* those of his white colleagues, in order to maintain his status as a racial “insider-Other” in the City, and to distance himself from lack.

Trinh (1989) writes that the role of native informant is to convey information to outsiders about a native culture; but always and only in a way that the colonizer can expect and anticipate within his own knowledge systems. This invitation thus positions the native informant as not-quite “all knowing” (Trinh, 1989, p. 70), which brings into question the idea of *and desire for* representation in neocolonial relationships. I want to expand on and perhaps complicate Trinh’s conceptualization of the “native Other/native informant” to suggest that this “knowing” is taken up in the City as form of productive ambivalence, and is also what brings racialized staff (further) into proximity with the somatic norm, who is the true bearer of knowledge and power, and who has the right to space in the City. I argue that this form of productive ambivalence, and the positionings offered by it, is what constitutes and is constituted by the performativity of diversity discourse. However, I also argue that this capacity for knowledge is integral to the *production* of the exceptional racial “insider-Other” in the City. Racial Others are invited into and become exceptional “insider-Others” in the City because they *become* the “voice[s] of truth” that the white male longs to hear. The “knowledge” that racialized staff impart re: other Others marks the separation between “us” (as “capable” and like no Other) from “them” (abjected racial Others outside of the City) in negotiations of belonging, but it is this knowledge that also legitimizes the knowledge and authority of the somatic norm. As such, I also want to suggest that the necessary re-citing and repetition of these racial “truths” by racial “insider-Others” not only exposes the ambivalence and precarious natures of this “knowledge”, and of diversity discourse, but also of how belonging is negotiated in encounters with, and as, racial Others in the City.

This knowledge/capability/exceptionality paradigm and the levels of proximity to and authorization of the somatic norm it brings is similarly described by Nicole, who discusses how her “legitimacy” and “credibility in the community”, and the vast knowledge and perspectives that she brings from working with marginalized communities works in her favour. Nicole explains how she feels that because of her credibility in the community, and because she “know(s) what the community issues are”, City staff *pay closer attention to what she has to say*. However, later in our interview, Nicole describes how her image, how she talks, and the way she carries herself makes her seem more familiar than (other) Others:

Like because I...the way I dressed, my body language, the way I talked, the idioms, that I used the jokes I crack, whatever the case may be, I’m much more accessible to their image of themselves, I’m closer to their image of themselves than I am further away from it... because I can speak English, I can access society in a particular way. But it’s more than English, it’s the way I am, I don’t...appear as threatening, I’m familiar.

Puwar (2004) writes of the idea of “social cloning” in institutions, where the somatic norm is reproduced and maintained at certain levels of the organization because people look for successors who have the same mannerisms, gestures, ideas, social connections and politics as themselves. However, as we witness influxes of diversity policies in institutions, where certain degrees of tolerance are awarded to incorporating difference, social cloning is performed through a desire for difference with “an unspoken small print of assimilation, a ‘drive for sameness’” (Puwar, 2004, p. 124). Those bodies which are seen to be “out of place” thus become subject to a form of policing, a subterranean “blocking” that qualifies endorsement(s), support and belonging via determinations of mutual recognition. Social cloning in diverse institutions also separates “familiar” from “unfamiliar” strangers (Puwar, 2004, p. 128). Nicole describes herself

as familiar to show that there can be inequality in diversity, based on distance and proximity to “them” (i.e. the somatic norm in space). This is how and where she finds marginalities are constructed in diversity, which go largely unaddressed in the City’s conceptualizations and celebrations of diversity.

However, I want to extend Nicole’s identification as “familiar” to suggest that it is her proximity to the somatic norm via a degree of social cloning and her “credibility” in and knowledge of particular communities which reinforces the relationships between a disavowal of racialization, specialized knowledge and belonging in the City. I also argue that Nicole’s “familiarity” is compounded by her *civility*, in that she does not make explicit claims of race/racism in the City. Although stereotypes are not directly drawn on in our interview, the “credibility” Nicole speaks of is taken up in the City as a form of specialized knowledge of other Others, of “them”, but is also spoken of as an indication of her exceptional status in the City; both in terms of how she is seen by others and how she sees herself. However, I again want to argue that Nicole is *produced* and becomes the exception(al) in the City because of her “knowledge/truths” of racialized communities and what her knowledge does for productive ambivalence and the naturalization of the somatic norm in the space of City. Therefore, Nicole’s “credibility” is not only what brings her closer and makes her more “familiar” to the somatic norm, it also further legitimizes *his* knowledge, authority, power and belonging in the space of the City.

In City of Toronto texts, there are several recommendations to *counter* negative stereotypes. For example, The City of Toronto Plan of Action to Eliminate Racism and Discrimination (City of Toronto, 2003a), which included an extensive consultation process and final report led by Diversity Advocate Sherene Shaw and a reference group of other City

Councillors, begins with the claim that “Toronto is one of the most diverse cities in the world and has gained an international reputation for the successful *management of its diversity*” (City of Toronto, 2003a, p. 2; emphasis added). The 2000 Ornstein study that sparked the Plan concludes that for ethno-racial minorities with similar education, the levels of unemployment and poverty is significantly higher than for persons of European origin. The City of Toronto Plan identifies these labour market and economic disparities that may be experienced by racialized communities, and makes the suggestion to:

...integrate into the City’s labour force development plans co-operative strategies to address unique needs of diverse communities to ameliorate labour market and economic disparities, *implement mentoring programs to assist employees and immigrant workers*, continue outreach and information initiatives so that businesses from diverse communities have access to the procurement process of the City and agencies. (City of Toronto, 2003a, p. 6; my emphasis)

Again, the City recommends that mentorship opportunities would alleviate what might be otherwise conceived of as *racism*, creating an encounter where racialized bodies have the opportunity to mimic the culture of those who are entrusted with power and civility. What is interesting in this part of the Plan is how the City disseminates strategies to help those who have not succeeded, and then immediately juxtaposes them with need to publicize those who *have* succeeded, in order to fulfill “the need for the public to accept and value diversity”:

(the Plan will) publicize and celebrate the success and achievements of diverse people and communities to *counter negative stereotypes* and help the public understand their contributions to Toronto; and provide information on City services in plain language, multi-lingual and alternative formats...(City of Toronto, 2003a, p.6, emphasis added)

By positioning the successes and achievements of Others *against* those who require mentoring, outreach and information, the City again neglects to examine its own agency in reproducing colonial discourse and racism through the promulgation of lack. The juxtaposition of those who need mentoring *against* those who have succeeded is again premised on the separation of “them” and “us”, whereby success is achieved via proximity to the somatic norm (i.e. mentoring, outreach). Furthermore, the coupling of mentoring with “continued outreach and information initiatives”, and celebrating the successes of diverse peoples alongside “providing information in plain language” re-circulates diversity discourse which identifies lack of knowledge and language skills, while concealing and continuing to deny racism in the space of the City. As such, racialized staff need not make claims of racism in the workforce because there is no racism; those who are not succeeding simply need to learn from those who are established, those who are the somatic norm; in order to succeed, *to be racially palatable*. This civilizing practice, disguised as a mutually beneficial opportunity afforded by diversity, in reality is “a mannered racism, even exaggeratedly mannerist, civil to a fault, behaviour by the book” (Goldberg, 2009, p.342). The performativity of diversity discourse again re-circulates the premises of lack via engagements with racial stereotypes that set up that lack *against* the inherent civility of the somatic norm, in order to displace claims of racism in the City.

Though in texts the City seeks to counter negative stereotypes, Hook (2005) asks: what is the basis upon which one shows up the stereotype as false? What is the truth that makes the falsity of its appearance apparent (p. 709)? Additionally, in whatever critical attempt to challenge the workings of a stereotype, one can end up reifying characteristics as stable and fixed. Thus, moves to counter stereotypes might work in a similar way to constructing stereotypes: identities become “real” without engaging in multiple, contradictory experiences which characterize

colonial relationships and environments. Following Hook (2005), I argue that although the desire to *counter* negative stereotypes, the City draws on “knowledge/truth” paradigms in a variety of ways to re-circulate productive ambivalence and to naturalize the somatic norm in negotiations of belonging via the discourse of diversity. For example, in 1990 the City sought to address the chronic ill health of Aboriginal communities in Toronto, as well as them being “unable to access existing non-Native health services for many reasons, including lack of knowledge, communication problems, lack of insurance coverage, intimidation, stereotyping, suspicion of agencies, cultural insensitivity and discrimination” (City of Toronto, 1990c, p. 1.139). The City’s response to these issues was to institute a scholarship program to increase the number of Aboriginal students in the healthcare education system, in order to hire more Aboriginal health care workers in the City. By advancing the solution of representation of Aboriginal health care workers, the City again promotes itself as an exceptional space via the denial of racism and colonialism, co-articulated with the lack of knowledge, skills, and education that is inherent to “other Others/stranger strangers”, which explains the lack of presence of Aboriginal staff in the City, and which naturalizes the somatic norm in space. Thus, in order to counter stereotyping and discrimination that Aboriginal communities face in the City, but to also maintain the City as an exceptional space, the City relies on particular knowledge/truths of Aboriginal communities,

particularly their essence of lack.²⁶

The denial of racism in the City via countering racial stereotypes is again seen in the City's explicit condemnations of the Toronto Police Association's "Stereotyping of the Hispanic Community" (City of Toronto, 1999b) and of Maclean's Magazine "Too Asian?" article, published in 2011 (City of Toronto, 2011). The Toronto Police Association's poster "asks voters in the provincial election to 'help fight crime by electing candidates who are prepared to take on the drug pushers, the pimps and the rapists', and links this message with a picture that depicts a Hispanic gang" (City of Toronto, 1999b, p.1). The statement by City Council condemning the poster, "which promotes racist stereotyping and hostility against the Spanish speaking community" was also touted as one of the many ways in which City Council "demonstrated its political leadership, enhanced its public image, and helped to inspire community attitudes in keeping with the City's commitments in the fields of access, equity, race relations and diversity" (City of Toronto, 1999b, p. 3). In response to Maclean Magazine's "Too Asian?" article, which advances the idea that Asian students are limiting the opportunities of non-Asian students in Canadian universities, Councillor Mike Layton demands an apology from the magazine for their

²⁶ As I have shown in this chapter, the lack of representation of racial Others in the City is linked to their lack of knowledge, skills, experience, and so on. However, the recent "Aboriginal Employment Strategy" (City of Toronto, 2014d), which "supports the City's ongoing commitment to equity and diversity" (p. 1) focuses specifically on the representation of Aboriginal peoples, and seeks to accomplish this "through the development and implementation of recruitment and employment programs and initiatives" (p.3). The strategy directly links the absence of Aboriginal staff in the City to their lack of knowledge and skills. The idea of representation of Aboriginal staff (tied with lack) is included in several City documents, including the "Multicultural Access Program Implementation" report (City of Toronto, 1991), which recommends that "an Aboriginal staff position be established to assist in the design, development and delivery of appropriate training programs for City staff as well as to initiate community outreach programs and conduct research to assist the City in the development of appropriate services for the Aboriginal community; and the "Urban Aboriginal Economic Development" report (City of Toronto, 1998), which advocates that the City develop procedures "to appoint an Aboriginal Councillor who would be elected by the resident Aboriginal population". Similarly, in response to human rights complaints about discrimination in hiring practices, Toronto Fire Services responds with a commitment "to a workforce that reflects the community we serve and encourages [in part] applications from Aboriginal peoples" (City of Toronto, 1999a). The point is that none of these initiatives address the projects of colonialism, racism and/or genocide, nor how the City is historically and currently implicated in them. Colonialism, racism and/or genocide are fact *denied* in the City, through the discourse of diversity.

“negative stereotyping of the Asian-Canadian community” especially “with Asia being the largest source of immigration to our city” (City of Toronto, 2011, p.1). He asks for this apology on behalf of the City of Toronto, which he writes:

...has taken a leadership role in working towards building a society in which everyone has the right to live in conditions of dignity, respect and peace... as a City which respects and values the diversity among our residents which is reflected in the motto, "Diversity Our Strength"... and a founding member of the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism and Discrimination, and in so doing, has pledged to speak out against incidents of racism and discrimination that can have negative consequences for not only those who are affected but for the community as a whole. (City of Toronto, 2011, p. 1)

It is through the desire to counter negative stereotypes, to provide a “truth” about racialized and immigrant bodies that colonial difference is refashioned; in which the somatic norm in the City of Toronto maintains his civilizing, “saving” role and practices. In City of Toronto texts, the stereotype is taken up as an invitation to re-circulate certain “truths” about the space of the City via the discourse of diversity, in particular its exceptionality and innocence. Any attention to racism and/or racist stereotyping invites an opportunity to re-articulate the “agenda” of diversity, whereby institutional racism is occluded/denied via the co-construction of essentialized inferiority of racialized bodies, the naturalization of the somatic norm (the white, male, upper/middle class body), and the City of Toronto as an exceptional space. At the same time, racialized City staff are *produced* as “insider-Others” to draw on racial stereotypes and/or their “knowledge” of the (other) Other to bolster their belonging in the City, and to define their own exceptionality as being civilized and being like no Other. Drawing on racial stereotypes

and/or knowledge of the other Other has the effects of distancing racialized City staff from lack, bringing racialized City staff closer to the somatic norm *and* re-authorizing the somatic norm's knowledge, power and belonging in the space of the City. Drawing on racial stereotypes thus incites a close(r) proximity to the somatic norm (through a simultaneous refusal and reinscription of racialization) *and* a reconfirmation of the space of the City and those who naturally occupy it as innocent and exceptional, both of which are subjectivated through the discourse of diversity.

Hook (2005) reiterates Bhabha's insistence that the stereotype is not merely a representation or an image of an Other, but a more complex process of identification. As such, there must be an engagement with what kinds of discourses produce and are reproduced by stereotyping. I argue that diversity discourse in the City of Toronto produces and is reproduced by the stereotype which, through encounters and negotiations of belonging of racialized Others, reconstitutes race in the City.

On Being Like No Other – Final Thoughts

In this chapter, I have explained how racial stereotypes and/or “knowledge” of the Other attempts to reinforce separations of “us” and “them” in the City, and produces and determines exceptionality via the proximity to and naturalization of the somatic norm. I have shown how evocations of the stereotype and/or knowledge of the Other simultaneously refuses and reinscribes race and racialization via lack, as a condition of diversity discourse and belonging in the City of Toronto. Separations of “us” and “them” that are (re-)produced in the encounter with racial (other) Others are thus *dependant* on the stereotype (as a reflection of and collusion with the racial norms that are incited into diversity discourse) in order to reproduce the exception(al) space and subject.

In the chapters “Being the Exception(al)” and “Being Like No Other”, I have shown how race is re-grounded and reproduced via the performativity of diversity to define and abject other Others, stranger strangers, those who do not belong in the City, in racial terms. I want to suggest here that the psychic investments in being the exception(al) and being like no Other, for racialized City staff, point to the continuous and arduous negotiations with whiteness and power, as they are discursively reproduced in and co-constructed with spaces of (non-)belonging. Being the exception(al) and being like no Other is both an expression and production of the desires to *become* not-raced, not-strange, which, through the discourse of diversity, reinforces race. In an interesting turn, becoming not-raced in the diverse City thus relies on the reproduction of race.

In the next chapter, “Through Consultation”, I continue to highlight how it is that the reproduction of race and racialization are inextricably linked to the encounter and negotiations of belonging through exploring the invitation to racial (other) Others into public consultations in the diverse City of Toronto.

Chapter 8

Through Consultation

What I resent most, however, is not his inheritance of a power he so often disclaims, disengaging himself from a system he carries with him, but his ear, eye, and pen, which record in his language while pretending to speak through mine, on my behalf.

Trinh T. Minh-ha (1989, p. 48)

That to speak is to exist absolutely for the other.

Franz Fanon (1952, p.1)

Introduction

As I discussed briefly in my introduction to this dissertation, Good (2009) argues that the City of Toronto has a “high” level of responsiveness to immigrant and ethno-cultural minorities living in Toronto, because they have incorporated several policies to “accommodate the diversity of [the city’s] population” (p. 57). In her analyses of the “high” responsiveness of the City of Toronto, Good (2009) includes the many ways in which the City of Toronto’s Diversity Management and Community Engagement office (renamed the Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights Office in 2006, following corporate restructuring) exhibits leadership in ensuring that ethno-cultural minorities have a voice in political decision making. For example, community needs and future challenges are assessed through hosting multiple community engagement forums, such as the multiple “educational events” held in late 2001 to discuss the backlash experienced by Toronto’s Muslim community, post 9/11. Good also suggests that the five access and equity policy advisory committees (including the Race and Ethnic Relations Advisory Committee) and the two working groups (Immigration and Refugee Working Group and the Language Equity and Literacy Working Group) ensure that community engagement goals are

prioritized, and that the community is directly consulted in the development of policies regarding access and equity at the City. Furthermore, the City's programs and policies regarding access, equity and anti-racism reflect the City's "proactive policy style" because of their extensive public consultations with communities on these issues (Good, 2009, p. 63).

In this chapter, I challenge Good's understanding of "responsiveness", as well as her assertion that prioritizing community consultations with immigrant and ethno-cultural groups makes the City is a leader in addressing their needs and, more broadly, issues of access, equity, and anti-racism. Good (2009) also argues that community organization leaders representing immigrant and ethno-cultural minorities would not support the City's increased role in immigration, settlement, access and equity policies *if the City did not have a high level of responsiveness to their needs*. In the following pages, I complicate these ideas by situating the participation of and consultation with racialized Others in the City in the context of diversity discourse, and the racial norms that are incited into and by it. While Good's analyses understands the presence of racialized (what she calls immigrant and ethno-cultural) bodies to signify the City's successful engagement with and responsiveness to them, she neglects to examine the terms under which racial Others are invited and authorized. I draw on interviews with City staff and City texts to complicate the idea of "presence"; specifically by showing how the City's consultations with racial Others reproduce affective variations of the encounter, including subjectivization via the reinscription of racialization, race pleasure, and the commodification of Otherness.

In order to elaborate on how consultations with racial Others reinscribe race pleasure and the commodification of Otherness, I will first turn to the work of Farley (1997) and hooks (1992), who describe how the presence of the Other is taken up in various ways to reconfirm

whiteness and power. I take up their conceptualizations in order to contextualize how consultations with racial Others might be viewed as integral to the reproduction and co-construction of racialization, race, and diversity discourse in the City. Next, I turn to interviews with racialized City staff and to City texts in order to explore how diversity discourse reproduces the desire to encounter/engage *more* racialized bodies, under the guise of challenging racism and/or achieving “full” democratic participation that the City is “known for”. I also discuss how the idea and re-circulation of democratic participation is implicitly tied to the performativity of diversity in the City, and is premised on the reproduction of racialization, race-pleasure and commodification. I then describe how diversity discourse *hails* racial Others into consultations in the City via inciting the desires to be not-raced, not-strange. As such, I suggest that invitations to be consulted in the City via the discourse of diversity reproduce a *call and response* to the encounter, which I argue is integral to the reproduction of racialization, race-pleasure and commodification of racial Others in the City.

I conclude this chapter with a discussion on the relationship(s) between belonging and desire, which offers more insight into the analyses contained in Chapters 6, 7 and 8. Specifically, I contend that the desires to be not-raced, not-strange and to belong are *dependent on and incited by* the reproduction of racialization and race. This contention has significant implications for the discussion in my final chapter, on the topics of agency, desire, and diversity in the City.

Race-Pleasure and the Commodification of Others

According to Farley (1997), race is a form of pleasure. The white subject experiences this pleasure in the body when he humiliates the Other and then denies that race exists in the first place. The pleasure of race is derived from the white subject’s continual gaze on the racialized Other’s inferiority and subordination. Whites are simultaneously “masters and innocents”

(Farley, 1997). Those who are not subordinated, humiliated, and oppressed are white, powerful, and justified. Farley (1997) further argues that the state is especially instrumental in creating spaces for race-pleasure to occur. The somatic norm has an opportunity to objectify the racialized body in the encounter. He wants to produce and elicit experiences of racism because of his passion for race-pleasure. And so, the racialized body complies; and is humiliated when these experiences of pain are consumed, stolen, pacified, and made to fit within a pre-existing agenda which reifies domination. The racialized body sustains the most injury in the moment when the denial of racism is even more humiliating than the act of racism itself (Farley, 1997).

hooks (1992) also explains how the Other can be offered up as a sign that progressive change is happening, as long as the Other is consumed and commodified in a recognizable form. These recognizable forms often rely on stereotypes and associations with images of the “primitive” Other, which are rooted in the idea of “traditional” cultures and lifestyles, untouched by colonial and imperial domination, which also “assuages the guilt of the past” (p. 25). hooks (1992) writes how the encounter with the Other is thus rooted in the desire for pleasure, and is also a form of exploitation in order to reinscribe and maintain colonial thinking and the status quo. Racial Otherness becomes a commodity that is desired only in quantities which do not undermine or threaten white dominance in any way; as a “spice, seasoning, that can liven up the dull dish that is mainstream white culture” (hooks, 1992, p.21). To engage with select racial Others in many cases means to reconfirm “power-over” (hooks, 1992, p. 23). Voices of non-white Others are first enabled, and then “eaten, consumed, and forgotten” (hooks, 1992, p. 26), which relies on depoliticizing and essentializing the presence of the Other in order to reconfirm whiteness and power.

In this chapter, I explore how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto reproduces the pleasure of race and the commodification of racial Otherness via the reinscription of colonial tropes which essentialize racial bodies and reproduce racial thinking. Drawing on Farley's (1997) theorizing of race pleasure and hook's (1992) understanding of the commodification of racial Others, I suggest that diversity discourse sets the stage in which racism is denied as an expression or practice in the City via the processes of evocation, commodification and reframing of bodies in racializing terms. I argue that these racializing terms *form the premise of* and reproduce consultations with racial Others in the City, and are also integral to the reproduction of race in space.

An important intervention what I want to make in this chapter is that although racialized City staff are charged with the task of repeatedly inviting racial Others/outside(r)s into the encounter, I argue that as raced and out of place bodies inside the City who are policed through the threat of abjection, racialized City staff also *rely* on racial other Others/outside(r)s to make claims that they cannot. What I am suggesting here is that although the subjectivities and desires of racialized City staff are (re-)produced through diversity discourse *against* the abjected outsider who makes claims of racism inside the City, racialized City staff also invite and incite claims of racism from the outside(r) in order to expose and challenge race in the City. In an interesting paradox, the invitation to other Others to speak simultaneously *reproduces racialization and race in the City, at the same moment that it seeks to undo them*. Thus, what racialized City staff seek to *do* to and with diversity discourse via their invitation and reliance on racial other Others to speak are inextricably linked with the terms under which other Others are invited, authorized and erased; to reinforce race pleasure and the commodification of Otherness. I now turn to interviews with racialized City staff to elaborate on this paradox, in order to offer

further insights into how diversity discourse both enables and contains the subjectivities and desires of racialized staff in the City.

Consultation, Democracy, and Diversity Discourse

In Butler's (2011) description and analyses of performativity, she writes that "the ideal that is mirrored depends on that very mirroring to be sustained as an ideal" (p. xxiii). In the City of Toronto, consultations with "the community" (i.e. residents of Toronto, community groups and agencies) are prioritized and idealized because they reflect and entrench the idea of democratic political participation; one in which everyone has an equal voice, and the right to speak. Many racialized City staff promote community consultations as a way for the City to achieve its goals of becoming a truly "diverse" City where everyone can participate, even if they acknowledge flaws in the community consultation process. For example, Lauren describes how she chose to work for the City of Toronto because of her particular approach to government, inspired by the idea of decentralizing government:

[taking] decision-making to neighbourhood levels, um, community consultation approach, um, about a particular, sort of, political views at the City Council level, but also at board level, to, um, to enhance certain causes, ensure that residents had the opportunity to participate as much as possible, in the decision-making process, from the very mundane level to the, the larger level.

At the same time that she is an advocate for residents participating as much as possible in decision-making at the City, Lauren is critical of how diversity is interpreted "on a very narrow level", without a deeper analysis of how to further engage communities in the political process. She explains that diversity in the City means fulfilling a set of requirements, a "ticking of boxes...you know, like, at a public meeting you must be accessible, and must, you know, um,

offer translation services and be wheelchair accessible, but that doesn't always happen either". While she is appreciative of these measures in order for the City to become somewhat more accessible, Lauren feels that as a level of government that is committed to being "inclusive and respecting of all the points of view of our residents", a deeper commitment to diversity would "bring a broader range of views and opinions and perspectives and backgrounds to the City" in order to change the way decisions are made.

Echoing Lauren's concerns that typical diversity initiatives with respect to community consultations means "translations, we publish newsletters and make some ac, information accessible in various languages", Salma feels achieving real equity in the City means focusing on increasing "participation...like in terms of consultations, and engagement with the community". Salma feels that her role at the City includes identifying how the City can make specific efforts to determine why certain groups are not present, and what barriers they are experiencing which inhibit them from coming to consultations. Groups that are not present include those from "racialized communities" who Salma explains "offer perspective and experience" that are valuable in the community consultation and decision-making processes. Kevin similarly asks: "how do you reach the hard to reach?" Kevin describes how he feels that as a part of his "end goal of affecting, no, creating influential policy" is to push the City "beyond just translation" to engage a full range of residents in marginalized communities.

Corey also describes how "people with more time to come out, more privileged people" are often the ones who show up at community consultations. Discussing the consultation process to choose the City's motto "Diversity Our Strength", Corey remarks how the motto signifies the "agenda" of particular groups of "privileged" people, who are interested in presenting Toronto to the world in a particular way, and is not necessarily reflective of how some people in Toronto see

themselves. Furthermore, Corey is critical of the way in which communities are invited to contribute their thoughts on particular issues, “but then the decisions made are left to the politicians”. Michelle echoes the concerns of other racialized City staff when she describes how, in her experience with community consultations, “only the white people come out”. She struggles with understanding why this happens, but thinks that perhaps the absence of residents of colour could be “because they’re afraid of their accent, or afraid of...being different, or standing out? Or being looked down upon...” Michelle recalls one community consultation where a Black City staff person lead part of the consultation, which she felt “looked better... it just feels like, you know, more welcoming...like they can talk to us”; but she also acknowledges that this rarely happens.

Nicole feels that the City is “so into that kind of visualizing of access and equity” to prove they are trying to engage communities, but that the impacts of the consultations are not measured in any real way. Nicole feels that the City should drastically change the community consultation process, to move away from “events and proclamations and community groups coming together and giving their feedback to the City, whether the City does something or not”, and into a “permanent, ongoing mechanism for community consultations” whereby feedback from marginalized and racialized communities is incorporated across the board, across City departments. She describes her thinking in more detail:

Well, how can we build a democratic structure of, of, a community input, which is over and beyond town halls, because town halls and official consultations only...this usual suspects show up. So how can we balance, so this is the conversation, how can we have a permanent mechanism or series of mechanisms, and how can we recruit? And how can

we actually have access, or create access for those communities that don't have a sense of entitlement... They don't get to have their voice heard. How can we get to them?

The overwhelming drive for many racialized City staff, especially those who are critical of the way consultations in the City are done presently, is to ensure that more voices are heard in the City via the community consultation process. Staff feel that being a truly diverse and democratic City means incorporating more voices and increasing participation, particularly of those who are marginalized/racialized and not heard in decision-making. Bringing in the perspectives and feedback of racialized/marginalized communities would not only potentially change the direction of the City's current policies and practices to include their needs and experiences, but for some racialized staff, would also *challenge the "traditional" hegemonic practices of the institution* which are entrenched in whiteness. A key insight which I introduced earlier and want to expand on here is that racialized staff also seek out and *rely* on racial outsiders/other Others to make claims in the City that they as "insider-Others" cannot make. For example, Salma discusses how marginalized/racialized members of the public who are "perhaps more aware of the kinds of issues, or more critical around how the City is naming its equity, diversity goals" can help to challenge the City's existing practices. When describing the City's motto "Diversity Our Strength", although Salma thinks the City's practices "could be stronger to support the motto", she also states that "some members of the public, some people in some communities *balk at it*. Like, I think they look at the motto and think... that's not... accurate. Or they don't feel that that's... true".

Nicole additionally describes why she wants to change the community consultation process, to create a permanent mechanism of consultation so that marginalized and racialized communities can continually give their feedback on the question of "what should a strong anti-

discrimination, um, infrastructure out there look like, and how can the City support it?” Nicole feels that “equity-seeking groups, however you define them” are typically invited to consultations to contribute their thoughts “on some items, as if it’s their expertise” when they should be invited to meaningfully contribute their thoughts on all policies and practices in the City. She asks:

What about their feedback into Parks, Forestry and Recreation? What about their feedback into City’s Official Plan? Into the tran, what about their feedback into the budget? What about their feedback into....you know, um, ummm [long pause] I don’t know, social development? Whatever the case may be, right?

While many racialized staff in the City seek to broaden community consultation processes to address issues of race and to create meaningful change, in the rest of this chapter I introduce a series of critical interventions in order to contextualize and trace how the desires to incorporate more racialized/marginalized voices in the City in order to challenge the existing policies and practices of the institution are an *effect and affect of diversity discourse* in the City. Therefore, what I am arguing is that through the discourse of diversity, the mechanisms by which racialized City staff seek to challenge diversity and race in the City are the very mechanisms in which diversity and race is reproduced. Sherene for example describes how doing diversity “properly” in the City means making a concerted effort so that “everyone has an opportunity to participate”. One of the ways that Sherene feels diversity can be done badly is by “not consulting...with your population, with your people”. While she believes that “doing diversity properly” in the City can mean simple things like “making sure your brochures are in all the languages that the...um...the large number of language speakers”, Sherene feels that these diversity initiatives do not capture Aboriginal populations in the city, largely because the

Aboriginal population are often not seen as being part of diversity. For Sherene, one of the positive effects of “being *purposefully separate* from the others...being different, not the same as the diversity you’re talking about” is that the distinct needs and desires of the Aboriginal community are made a priority in the City, which in part lead to the establishment of the Aboriginal Affairs Advisory Committee. The committee, comprised of 13 members of the Aboriginal community, uses their knowledge and expertise to initiate key Aboriginal-focused policies, such as the Statement of Commitment to the Aboriginal communities and the Aboriginal Employment Strategy, which Sherene sees as responses from the City to address “what the [specific] needs of the Aboriginal community are”. As such, Sherene feels that consulting with the Aboriginal community in particular, to determine what their specific situations and needs are, is vital to increasing access for *everyone* in the City.

What becomes interesting in my interview with Sherene is her understanding of how consulting with members of the Aboriginal community and producing policies to address their specific needs is *separate* from what she describes as “typical diversity policies” in the City; yet when I ask her what the committee’s focus is, she describes their “game plan” as “what do we need to do, to increase the um, the Aboriginal reputat, *representation* in our workforce, here in the City of Toronto”. Furthermore, when I ask Sherene if she thinks the prioritization of hiring that the Committee has been focused on over past few years will actually change hiring practices in the City, she responds:

Ah...gosh. [laughs] No. [laughs] Um...a lot has to happen, in terms of hiring...and that that would be, um, if the City of Toronto said, well, we’re gunna be doing a targeted, we’re, um, hiring and so we’re only going to hire, target this to the Aboriginal

community, and this is, you know, what, what we're looking for. Um, but...that won't ever happen, I don't think. I can't see that happening.

Despite her feelings that the City's prioritization of Aboriginal representation will not actually change hiring practices in the City, Sherene also feels that the establishment of the Aboriginal Affairs Advisory Committee contributes to the City's leadership in the areas of access and equity, "that kind of leadership, and showing leadership not only for the people who live here, but for the broader, for the broader, um...you know".

I want to use Sherene's interview, in particular her conceptualization of how the Aboriginal community and their needs are incorporated via the consultation process "*outside*" of the typical diversity interventions, as a starting point into a critical interrogation of how consultations with "the community" and/or members of the public, particularly racialized and Aboriginal members, reconstitute racialization and racializing practices. I also want to draw on Sherene's interview to demonstrate how the performativity of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto produces and renders the subjectivities of racial "insider-Others" intelligible via diversity discourse and racial thinking. Although Sherene advocates for more Aboriginal voices to be incorporated into decision-making at the City and is supportive of establishment of the Aboriginal Affairs Advisory Committee as a way for certain members of the Aboriginal community to advocate on behalf of the community's needs, the recommendations of the Committee often follow the same as those initiated by diversity policies in the City (i.e. representation, training, mentoring, skills development, and/or "*cultural competency training* for

existing staff” to better understand the Aboriginal community).²⁷ Sherene additionally makes it clear that although initiatives such as the Statement of Commitment and Aboriginal Employment Strategy are vital to the City’s incorporation and inclusion of the Aboriginal community in decision-making at the City, *she has no expectations that anything will really change at the City*, particularly with respect to representation/hiring. At the same time, Sherene feels that the establishment of and consultation with the Committee helps to convey the idea of the City as a leader in the area of access and equity, despite her feelings that nothing will really change.

I argue that this complex and at times contradictory positioning with respect to consultation and “democratic participation” of Others in the City elevates and is reflective of the performativity and *productivity* of diversity discourse, whereby the racial norms that are incited into the discourse of diversity become repeated and occluded in consultation processes, at the same time that they co-produce subjectification and intelligibility in the City. In other words, community consultations incite and occlude the repetition of racial norms of diversity discourse which simultaneously reproduce the subjectivities and belonging of racialized staff in the City. The desires to consult with more racialized/marginalized voices as a way to challenge diversity discourse, race and racism in the City thus becomes the site of a series of paradoxes: while opportunities for consultation with more racial (other) Others encourages the race-claims which staff are bound by diversity discourse not to make, consultations also reproduce the encounter and abjection of other Others which are incited by and reproduces *the very discourse which many*

²⁷ See for example the Toronto Police Services Board Aboriginal Policing – Statement of Commitment and Guiding Principles (City of Toronto, 2009b) which contains strong language i.e. Aboriginals “being the original inhabitants of this land” (p. 5) and that “Members of the Aboriginal community are over-represented in the criminal justice system” (p.6); but then recommends that more employment opportunities be extended to the Aboriginal community, and that *cultural competency training* be provided to all service members: “Cultural competency means the ability to interact skillfully with people of *different cultures*...knowledge of different cultural practices and world views, the possession of cross-cultural skills” (City of Toronto, 2009b, p.7). The Board also recommends increasing the levels of community consultations with Aboriginal peoples, in order to promote “meaningful and inclusive dialogue” in community policing, and to ensure “accessibility, accountability, and transparency in decision-making processes” (City of Toronto, 2009b, p.8).

staff seek to challenge. While the desires to incorporate more voices in order to challenge race and racism in the City might reflect the desires of racialized City staff to be not-raced, these desires are contained and produced by diversity discourse which reproduces race. I want to argue that what becomes occluded by the discourse of diversity is that Sherene and other racialized staff who invite and promote consultation with racial and Aboriginal (other) Others in the City are doing exactly what they have been *produced to do*.

Ahmed (2002) draws on Fanon to argue that “it is in such face-to-face encounters that bodies become racialized” (p. 56). In the pages that follow, I turn to City of Toronto texts that point to and/or rely on the consultation process as a way to generate feedback from members of the public regarding issues of diversity and/or race/racism. I use City texts to demonstrate the complex ways in which the City draws (hails) racialized Others into the encounter via the discourse of diversity to negotiate their belonging and desires to be not-raced, not-strange, and to show how this hailing reifies racialization, race pleasure and the commodification of racial Others. I also show how and under what conditions racialization abjects “other Others”/stranger strangers/”them” who stand outside the bounds of diversity, in order to maintain the space of the City as an exceptional, innocent space. Finally, I draw together interview transcripts and City texts to invite and ground critical interrogations into the power of diversity discourse, specifically the power to erase experiences of racism in the City while simultaneously reinforcing subjectification, intelligibility and desires of racial “insider-Others” in spite of, or, as I will argue, *because of*, these erasures. It is to these texts to which I now turn.

At the March 1998 meeting of Toronto City Council, the Task Force on Community Access and Equity was created to ensure that post amalgamation of the six former municipalities, access and equity issues would continue to be addressed in the mega-City. In its creation by

Council, the Task Force was charged with the tasks of “strengthen[ing] community involvement and public participation in the decision-making processes of the municipality, particularly for equity seeking communities” (women, people of colour, Aboriginal people, people with disabilities, lesbians, gays, bi-sexual and transgendered, immigrants/refugees, different religious/faith communities), and “ensur[ing] that the contributions, interests and needs of all sectors of Toronto's diverse population are reflected in the City's mission, operation and service delivery” (City of Toronto, 1998b, p. 1). The Task Force held several City-wide consultation meetings, where they reported that they heard community members’ concerns about increases in hate-motivated crimes against human rights protected groups, difficulties in gaining Canadian work experience, and barriers to access transportation and childcare, to name a few. In the final report (January 1999) Chair and City Councillor Joe Mihevc lists the Task Force’s most significant accomplishments, which include the establishment of “Community Advisory Committees on Access, Equity and Human Rights to address: Aboriginal Affairs, Race and Ethnic Relations, Disability Issues, Status of Women, and Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender Issues”, and “Working Groups on Language Equity and Literacy, Immigration and Refugee issues, Elimination of Hate Activity, Employment Equity” (City of Toronto, 1999c, p. 2). These advisory committees and working groups, comprised of 2/3 community members/“experts”, were established by the Task Force in order for City Council to receive advice on issues relating to the City’s marginalized/racialized communities.

Of particular interest in the Final Report is Councillor Mihevc’s summarization of the committee and working groups’ thoughts on their roles and contributions in the City:

Members of the groups have very positive feelings about the past and ongoing efforts of the City to be an advocate to other levels of government and to respond to the diverse

service needs of its population. Community members also stressed that the assembly of people from all corners of the world living and working in the City has created a social fabric that is the envy of many. (City of Toronto, 1999c, p.3)

This was followed by his summarization of how “consulted” community members and/or groups felt about the presence of the City advisory committees and working groups in the City:

The Task Force also found that the feelings of “ownership” and “belonging” were fostered by the presence of the community advisory committees established by the former municipalities, both at the City wide and departmental levels. Through these committees, groups who face barriers were able to give advice on policy issues to their Councils and to provide input to Departments about specific service needs. (City of Toronto, 1999c, p.3, emphases added)

As Campbell and Gregor (2004) suggest, people’s experiences, claims and needs disappear through text. A “master plan” is already created elsewhere and local experiences are made to fit within that master plan (p. 38). For example, Ng’s (1995) textual analysis of the Prime Minister’s policy pronouncement on multiculturalism uncovers how texts facilitate the circulation of discourse, not only to other texts but in institutions and in broader Canadian society, through those who take it up and re-distribute it in their everyday activities. I want to extend the notion of the “master plan” in this section of the chapter to suggest that the ideas of the City being a place of “envy” (and/or *leadership*), alongside the apparent “feelings of ‘ownership’ and ‘belonging’” that racialized community members and groups experience via the establishment of these community advisory committees and working groups, and of community consultations more broadly, directly inspire and are reflective of the discourse of diversity in the City which erases experiences of race/racism *as an effect of racialization*. Furthermore, I suggest

that erasure as an effect of racialization also reproduces the space of the City as exceptional and innocent. The establishment of these groups/consultations, particularly what they come to represent in terms of “democratic participation” and commitments to address marginalization/racism in the City, are *repetitive and idealized performances of diversity*; a set of practices that reproduce the encounter/negotiations of belonging of racialized (other) Others in order to reproduce race/racialization via commodification in the City, while *disguising what can never finally or fully be achieved*. Take for example the following text excerpts:

The City of Toronto is a leader in developing innovative policies dealing with the issues of ethno-racial diversity and equity... The Task Force Report sets out major principles of access, transparency, participation and inclusive decision-making processes... The City of Toronto strives to actively engage its citizenry, especially marginalized groups, in the policy development process. (“International Policy Framework for the City of Toronto”, City of Toronto, 2002d, p. 12)

In Toronto, Toronto City Council has undertaken the following as part of its commitment to the elimination of racism and discrimination in this City:

Established Community Advisory Committees on Access, Equity and Human Rights to address: Aboriginal Affairs, Race and Ethnic Relations, Disability Issues, Status of

Women, and Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender Issues;

Established Working Groups on Language Equity and Literacy, Immigration and

Refugee issues, Elimination of Hate Activity, Employment Equity. (“Development of a City of Toronto Declaration and Plan of Action Regarding the Elimination of Racism in

Relation to the United Nations - World Conference Against Racism, Racial

Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (UN-WCAR), City of Toronto, 2001b, p. 7)

Active involvement by Toronto's diverse communities is in line with the trend for enhanced local democracy and public accountability and opening up the process of local government so that residents can influence decision-making in the City. This participation has occurred through the advisory bodies established by Council, as well as processes and committees established by Divisions. ("Status Report - Implementation of 2004-2006 Access, Equity and Human Rights Action Plans", City of Toronto, 2006b, p.3)

The establishment of the five advisory committees and two working groups *travels* (through repetition) across texts, to reproduce claims of City's leadership/exceptionality and in order to occlude the commodification of Others and the writing out of experiences of race/racism in the diverse City. What is revealed in City texts is that these claims (of democratic participation, leadership) need to be repeated because *they are never fully achieved and/or actualized*, as long as the City is haunted by the presence of race/racism/racial Others that must be excluded/abjected in order for the City to reproduce itself as an exceptional space. In other words, the re-circulation of consultation, leadership and democracy in the City of Toronto is both premised on and inspires the abjection(s) of racial other Others.

Dhaliwal (1996), critiquing the idea of radical democracy in the West, argues that exclusions are implicated not as mere absences but rather as constitutive of, perhaps even necessary for, the formation of liberal democracies. Democracy and inclusion discourses often miss (or, as I would argue, *occlude*) how Others can be selectively included to reproduce a hegemonic Self, to "reaffirm a hegemonic core to which the margins are added without any

significant destabilization of the core *or continue to valorize the very center that is problematic to begin with*” (Dhaliwal, 1996, p. 44; my emphasis). For Dhaliwal, the motivation to invite and/or enhance democratic participation and inclusion of marginalized/racialized Others thus needs to be questioned, in the context of reproducing Western superiority and colonial relationships. I take up Dhaliwal’s desire to question the motivation for democratic inclusion politics, as well as Butler’s (2011) theorization of the constitutive outside, to suggest that enhancing the democratic participation of racialized Others in the diverse City is premised on the writing out of racism and of bodies who discuss racism in space, and is co-constructed with race-pleasure and the commodification of racial Others in the City. In several City texts, the presence of racial Others on various committees, advisory bodies, and/or in consultation meetings are commodified and reframed as “proof” of the City’s leadership in enhancing democratic participation and engaging racialized communities in decision-making, regardless of what contributions and/or statements might actually be made by racial Others. Consultations with racial Others in the City, invited and reproduced by the discourse of diversity, thus reconfirms whiteness and power via the denial of racism and a depoliticization and reframing of Others’ presence *as a desired commodity of democratic participation and diversity in the City*. I contend that the commodification of Otherness is precisely how and why Good (2009) arrives at her articulation of the City of Toronto as being “highly responsive” to the issues of immigrant, ethno-racial and/or “diverse” communities, simply by acknowledging their presence in the City.

hooks (1992) also suggests that Others “can be seduced by the emphasis on Otherness, by its commodification, because it offers the promise of recognition and reconciliation” (p. 26). I want to complicate hooks’ idea of the seduction of commodification of Otherness by revisiting how diversity discourse in the City is incited by and reproduces desires, intelligibility,

articulation and abjection in racializing terms. I offer that racial Others who participate in consultations are silenced on issues and discussions of racism in the City as a condition of their (continued) participation, intelligibility, belonging, and of becoming not-raced, not-strange in the diverse City. What I am suggesting here is that through the discourse of diversity, the re-circulation and co-construction of consultation, leadership, and democratic participation in the City is mediated by the denial of racism *and subjectivization of silence*, as co-constituted with the threat of abjection. The desires of racial Others to become not-raced, not-strange, and to belong in the City of Toronto are not only invited (and perhaps to a certain degree, met) by participation in consultations in the diverse City, they become co-constructed with commodification, race-pleasure, the denial of race/racism and thus on the reproduction of race and power.

Following Ahmed (2004) and building upon my analyses in Chapter 6, I again want to make the argument that affect intensifies through the recirculation of discourses. Specifically, I want to suggest that the more diversity discourse re-circulates and repeats claims of leadership and enhancing democratic participation, the more it contains and reproduces the affective and emotional desires of racial Others be not-raced, not-strange, and to belong in the City. What remains concealed in the repetition and re-circulation of the claims of leadership and enhancing democratic participation, and I would argue remains concealed *because of* this repetition and re-circulation, is the racial histories and norms that are incited into and incited by diversity discourse, which both inspire and reproduce these claims in the City. It is my contention that diversity discourse enables a repeated hailing of racial Others into consultations in the City and concurrently reproduces and conceals racialization, commodification, and race-pleasure precisely because diversity discourse operates both as a performative and as an *affective technology*. The

performativity of diversity discourse is thus inextricably linked with the desires of racial Others to be not-raced, not-strange, and to belong in the City *and* the discursive and material reproduction of racialization and race.

The confluence of racialization, race-pleasure, and the commodification of Others which animates and is materialized through diversity discourse is re-circulated in and across several texts that recommend and/or summarize consultations on issues of diversity or racism. For example, the Framework for Citizen Participation in the City of Toronto report (City of Toronto, 1999d) proposes a forum to consult with members of the community and experts to highlight best practices for civic engagement. In an effort to broaden the scope of people who attend consultations, to increase the presence of marginalized communities, and “to build community capacity” more generally, the City offers that “information pamphlets and brochures are usually translated into *different languages* in order to facilitate their accessibility to different language groups” (City of Toronto, 1999d, p.3; my emphases). Here again, the emphasis is on the *lack* of language skills which inhibit racialized groups from participating in the life of the City. To prepare for the City of Toronto Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination (City of Toronto, 2003), approximately 50 community consultation sessions were held, where over 1,000 people participated and contributed their thoughts on how the City could combat increasing experiences racism and discrimination in Toronto. In the summary notes of the consultations were several statements about experiences of racism in the city, and of the City’s accountability in addressing racism:

Since 9/11, Muslim is a euphemism for walking bomb.

Racism is a growing problem in Toronto. How do I know? I know because the number of attacks on me keeps increasing.

There is no safe place. (City of Toronto, 2003, p. 29)

Participants expressed frustration that they were being consulted again. Individuals and community groups asked why they were being consulted when the City and other governments had a catalogue of actions that could be taken. (City of Toronto, 2003, p. 27)

However, in the body of the Plan, the City is again reproduced as a leader/exceptional space via the *commodification and re-framing* of the above-noted comments from racialized (other) Others who participated in consultations. Included the Plan of Action report are the following statements:

The Council Reference Group invited residents, community groups and organizations to offer help and input to build the Plan of Action for the Elimination of Racism and Discrimination. The Reference Group proposed that the Plan of Action *build on the legacy and leadership for which the City is known*. (City of Toronto, 2003, p. 25; my emphasis)

Diversity is a fundamental characteristic of our city. It gives Toronto strength through an ability to value, celebrate and respect differences. It is this recognition of diversity, which makes *Toronto one of the most creative, caring and successful cities in the world*. (City of Toronto, 2003, p. 20; my emphasis)

They welcomed the opportunity to participate in these consultations with one of the few orders of government where discussion on issues of diversity is taking place. Participants expressed hope that the City of Toronto would continue to act as an advocate on behalf of its residents despite the current political climate, and that the *City would continue to lead the country in addressing issues of diversity*. (City of Toronto, 2003, p. 28; my emphasis)

There is a certain irony attached to the statement that diversity makes Toronto one of the most caring cities in the world in a report which seeks to eliminate racism and discrimination. Those who feel that being Muslim is equated with a walking bomb, those who experience increasing racial attacks, and those who never feel safe, would hardly call Toronto “caring.” Furthermore, frustrations at being consulted again become re-framed in the Plan of Action to demonstrate the City’s proactive stance in *inviting and leading* discussions of “diversity”.

What is behind this rhetoric of success, security, and celebration of diversity in Toronto? Ahmed (2012) explains that in institutions which embrace diversity, moments of complaint (i.e. discussions of race/racism) become opportunities to promote the values of diversity and the commitments of the organization. Trinh (1989) also aptly writes that the invitation to sit at the table with “us” appropriates and reduces “them” to a detached “us” discourse. The invitation evokes a grateful witness who mimics and legalizes the discourse. A “them” among “us” is thus “a hoax; a false incorporation that leaves “them” barer than ever, if ‘them’ allows itself to nibble at the bait of Lies” (Trinh, 1989, p. 67). In this section of the chapter, I want to draw on both Trinh and Ahmed, and expand their conceptualization of occlusion/erasure and invitation into mimicry to include an understanding of diversity discourse as a hailing, where racial Others come to know themselves and be known collectively through the discourse of diversity, thus reproducing *a call and response to the encounter* via invitations to consult in the City. I argue that the invitation to consult (re-)produces and co-constructs the “grateful (racial) witness” and the caring City, committed to addressing issues of diversity and racism. As I have argued, diversity discourse simultaneously invites racialized Others into imagining themselves as becoming not-strange, not-raced in the City. I want to suggest here that this imagining is invited and reinforced via consultation with and participation of racial Others in the City *as a gateway to*

belonging. As such, diversity discourse draws the racial insider and the racial outsider in the repeated practices of consultation to negotiate and to imagine new forms of be-longing; however what becomes occluded is how the various subjectivities that are caught up in the processes of yearning are both regulated and reproduced through diversity discourse, *as racialized subjects*. As Cheng (2001) brilliantly writes of the role of ambivalence in the formation of national identities and systems of consumption, “while racism is mostly thought of as a kind of violent rejection, racist institutions in fact often do not want to fully expel the racial other; instead, they wish to maintain that other within existing structures...they need the very thing they hate or fear” (p. 12). I want to extend Cheng’s analyses here to suggest that the reproduction of the racial subject/Other through consultation is necessary and *constitutive* of the City’s care and commitments to address issues of race.

City texts also advise repeat consultations with certain racial Others in order to address ongoing issues related to diversity and/or racism. These repeat consultations are again premised on the reproduction of racialization, race-pleasure and the commodification of racial others via the encounter. For example, the meeting of the Black Business Professionals Roundtable meeting, discussed at the outset of Chapter 5, resulted in the recommendations of training, skills development and mentoring of Black business professionals in order for them to succeed, but also additionally recommends a “Black Business Professionals Program Advisory Committee comprised of members of the Black business professional community and key stakeholders” to provide advice on ongoing issues related to the lack of success of Black business owners and operators in Toronto (City of Toronto, 2014a, p.4). In 1991, the Toronto Mayor’s Committee on Community and Race Relations held a public meeting, given the poor relations between the Black community and Toronto Police, “to hear from all spectrums of the Black Community

about those relations and to avail the Black Community of an opportunity to express those concerns and give the Committee input on changes to the Police Act” (City of Toronto, 1991b, p. 204). The meeting, which in the end recommended further “private meetings between the Mayor, some members of the Committee, and the Black Community, to restore mutual respect and trust between the Black Community and the police” (p. 204) was included in a report for the 1991 program and budget of the Committee, to demonstrate the importance of Black History Month and to request additional funds to celebrate Black History Month in the City. In response to the Council Motion on Racial Profiling in Toronto (City of Toronto, 2002c), which references several reports over three decades on racial profiling of the Black community in Toronto, Police Chief Julian Fantino “met with members of the Black community” and made commitments, following these consultations, to “enhance the TPS recruit orientation and training programs by *arranging face to face meetings with police recruits and members of the Black community prior to their graduation*”, “to increase the recruitment and staff development of Black officers at all levels within the Service”, and coordinate a “Race Relations Conference” in Toronto where the TPS, the Black community and all levels of civil society/government focus on problem solving” (City of Toronto, 2003b, p.7; my emphases).

What becomes important here is that certain racial Others become invited *back*, in many cases to provide ongoing advice/support on established recommendations related to issues of diversity or racism. I want to suggest that being invited back is again premised on certain level of civility, trust and proximity to the somatic norm, established through the encounter, whereby a racialized Other becomes a (partial) insider via “sponsorship of those closer to the center” (Puwar, 2004, p.121). Proximity is determined by those inside the City (the somatic norm and/or “insider-Others” who are already close(r)) *against* the figure of the abjected (other) Other, who

makes claims of racism and who imposes a threat to the diverse City which is spatially configured in racial terms. Being “welcomed” in the City is dependent on modes of civility, self-presentation, hyper-surveillance and disavowals of racialization, which are policed by the threat of abjection from the space of the City, as I discussed in Chapter 7. However, I also want to add to this argument by drawing on Ahmed’s (2012) idea that of institutional passing, that is, the pressure to pass in institutions as the “right kind” of minority, one who avoids asserting their difference in order to escape hyper-visibility, perceptions of illegitimacy, and the tensions that are produced by the very presence of racialized bodies (p. 158). I contend that the democratic participation of certain racial Others both emphasizes and *obscures* the power of diversity discourse to reproduce subjectivities, intelligibility and articulation against the “angry person of colour” figure, whose anger is assumed upon her/his entry into spaces of non-belonging, and whose abjection in space is predetermined and justified *on defensive grounds*. The lack of participation of racial Others in the City thus becomes about “their” anger, “their” lack of civility or “their” inability to let go of difference, and by implication, *their refusal to participate*.

As Ahmed (2012) writes, “the task [then] is to put racism behind you” (Ahmed, 2012, p. 167). I would argue that “putting racism behind you” is intimately connected to the performativity of diversity discourse and *the performance of civility*; specifically through the denial of racism in the space of the City, and by extension the authorization of subjectivities, intelligibility and articulation of those racial Others who are invited (back) into the diverse City to be consulted. Diversity discourse thus again reinforces the separations of “us” (as those who are capable of letting go of racism, those who participate) and “them” (those who are angry, incapable, those who refuse or *lack* the civility to participate) in order to justify the denial of

racism, the abjection of other Others, and the reproduction of racialization, race-pleasure and the commodification of racial Others in the space of the City.

Through Consultation – Final Thoughts

As Swan and Fox (2010) explain, the presence of certain racialized bodies in organizations become “cultural capital”, where bodies are essentialized and tokenized to promote diversity and to challenge claims of inequality or racism (p. 580). In this chapter, I have expanded on Swan and Fox’s notion of cultural capital to offer that the presence of racialized Others in the City is essentialized and *commodified* in order to reproduce claims of the City’s leadership on enhancing democratic participation and inclusion of racial Others. In this chapter, I hope to have made transparent some of the complex ways in which diversity discourse in the City of Toronto reproduces racialization and race via the invitation into consultations, as a reproduction of the encounter. Specifically, I have shown how racialization, race-pleasure and the commodification of racial Others, as well as the denial of racism in the space of the City, is shored up through the very *presence* of racial Others in the space of the City, which is further reinforced by the (threat of) abjection of other Others, those who make claims of racism in the City. I also offered that it is through hailing the desires to be not-strange/not-raced that the racializing terms under which consultations are held and repeated become occluded, in speech acts and through text.

I also want to revisit the idea that racialized City staff, as “insider-Others” who become articulate(d) and intelligible in the City via the discourse of diversity, encourage and re-cite consultations with and democratic participation of racial Others as a way to negotiate and imagine new forms of belonging in the City, and as a way for racial Others (including themselves) to transform policy and practices that impact racialized/marginalized communities.

The impetus of racialized City staff to include racial Others in the City is largely premised on addressing and challenging racial barriers to participation via the inclusion of more voices in decision-making processes, however it also becomes possible to consider that promoting consultation also bolsters the belonging of racial “insider-Others” in the City, *as insiders who have the capacity to bring outsiders in*. What becomes clear in my interviews with racialized City staff is that their desires to incorporate more racialized voices and to incite the race-claims of other Others are set up against what actually happens when certain voices *are* included and under what terms, through the discourse of diversity. As I have argued, racialized City staff, as “insider-Others” in the City, become bound by the performative practices of diversity discourse which repeatedly seek out the race-claims of other Others in order to reproduce racialization and race through their commodification, erasure and/or abjection. I again want to draw on Cheng (2001) here to suggest that dynamic processes of invitation and erasure²⁸ reflect the salience of racial melancholia in the constitution of national and racial identities, which ties “the dominant, white culture’s rejection of yet attachment to the racial other...and the ramifications that such paradox holds for the racial other, who has been placed in a suspended position (p.1). In these entangled relations, the racial (other) Other in the City who desires to be not-raced, not strange and to belong remains bound to the discursive and material relations and spaces which are responsible for the reproduction of (her/his) race, *as a condition of her/his subjectivity and belonging*. Yet, the hegemonic “diversity” ideal is sustained through “exclusion-yet-retention”, “social consumption-and-denial” of racial (other) Others (Cheng, 2001, p. 11). I argue that racialized City staff, as “insider-Others” in the City, are bound by diversity discourse to simultaneously *inhabit and reproduce racial melancholia in the diverse City, as a condition of their belonging*.

²⁸ Cheng calls these processes “grievance and compensation” and “rejection and internalization” -p.1

Through being repeated and re-cited in and across several texts, it also becomes possible to understand how the ideas of consultation and democratic participation increasingly contain the desires to be not-raced/not strange, and to belong in the City. In other words, the more the idea of consultation (vis a vis enhancing the democratic participation of racial Others) circulates, through speech acts and through texts, the more it contains signs of becoming not-raced/not strange, and of belonging in the City. I want to argue again that diversity discourse in the City of Toronto hails and reproduces the desires to be not-raced, not-strange in racial Others, and that this continuous hailing and reproduction of desires is integral to and occludes the racial norms that incite and are incited by diversity discourse in the City. That the City continues to draw out (hail) these desires in order to reproduce the encounter with racialized bodies and to commodify, appropriate, and assimilate them into their own diversity narrative confirms the pleasure of racial violence that diversity discourse continues to engender.

Conclusion – On Belonging and Desire

In Chapters 6, 7 and 8, I have demonstrated how the performativity of diversity discourse in multiple and complex ways incites simultaneous refusals and reinscriptions of racialization, which separates “us” (diverse, not-quite strange) and “them” (other Others, stranger strangers) in negotiations of belonging in the City of Toronto, in racializing terms. I want to suggest here, in my concluding remarks, that diversity discourse in the City of Toronto does not determine who is “outside”. It *makes* outsiders, through the encounter. The question is: if diversity makes outsiders via abjection in order to reconstitute itself, must racial “insider-Others” do the same in order to reconstitute their belonging, via the same racial norms? I argue that if the performativity of diversity discourse in the City of Toronto reconstitutes itself via abjection of racial other Others in negotiations of belonging, the subject positionings that animate and are contained by diversity

discourse in the City of Toronto must and are *produced to* do the same. Positionings that constitute and are constituted by the discourse (and the racial norms that are incited into it) are thus made intelligible (and exceptional) in the City via the re-making of racial outsiders, as a necessary function of their belonging.

In her colonial reading of Foucault's work on European sexuality, Stoler (1995) writes that desire follows from, and is generated out of, discourses of sexuality "where it is both animated and addressed" (p. 165). As such, critical interrogation into the relationships between discourse and desire must not begin with the "true" knowledge of desire itself, but with how desire is both constituted and constituting. I want to suggest that the desire to be not-raced/not strange emerges from *and reproduces* the racializing and racially normative conditions of diversity discourse, and is contained by diversity discourse because the discourse reproduces these desiring effects via the reinscription of race. In short, I argue that diversity discourse reproduces race *and* the desire to be not-raced. At the same time that race is reproduced, the desire to be not-raced is regulated and released through that reproduction. As such, subjects in and of diversity discourse experience desire as an effect *and affect* of diversity. The mutually constitutive and performative relationship between diversity's animation and containment/management of longings to "not-be" in negotiations of belonging highlights how subjectivity and intelligibility along racial and discursive lines is productive, even as it is, *or feels*, restrictive. Finally, I want to suggest that the psychic arrangements and reproductions of race/racism in the City make the desire to belong an after-effect of diversity discourse, and of power. Racial Others and "insider-Others" in the City of Toronto, through the discourse of diversity, are contained to negotiate their belonging through engagements with the confluence of whiteness and power, which reproduces race in order to reproduce itself. Through the discourse

of diversity, the desire to belong is thus inseparable from the reproduction of racialization in the City.

In the next and final chapter (Chapter 9), I continue my examination and discussion of the possibilities of agency that I touch on briefly in Chapter 6. Building on Davies' (2000) conceptualization of agency as an *awareness* of the containment of desire(s) in discourse, in Chapter 9 I discuss how contradictions and erasures, once made visible, become a site of agency via an interruption of the idea of ourselves (and our desires) as continuous, essential, individualized and *autonomous*. In emphasizing a move away from the "rational, autonomous self" (and the binaries/dualisms thus implied), is it possible to embrace these contradictions as part of an understanding of how subjectivity is experienced and not authored by our selves? What happens to discursive constitutions, subjectivities and performativities when they are spoken and written in terms of contradictions, complicities, abjections and erasures? In Chapter 9 I also discuss and complicate Davies' feminist theorizing of agency as speaking authority into existence (i.e. naming the existence of patriarchy as authority and the refusal of that authority through her speaking act). Under what conditions does one have the authority to speak on authority? How do authority, the right to speak and the right to be heard perpetuate the idea of agency along racial, white supremacist, gendered and class lines, and how might authority granted along these lines also be a point of critical interrogation and transformation?

Chapter 9

On Diversity Discourse and the Problem of Agency

...the individual assumes that she is the author of the ideology or discourse which she is speaking. She speaks or thinks as if she were in control of meaning. She imagines that she is indeed the type of subject which humanism proposes – rational, unified, the source rather than the effect of language.

Chris Weedon (1997, p. 31)

Introduction

So what now? It seems that no matter where I go, whether I am discussing my research findings at local or international conferences or at gatherings with colleagues, I am inevitably asked this question. I was warned early in my Ph.D. career that if I chose to draw on a Foucauldian approach in my research, the implication was that I was choosing a “determinist” stance, one that identifies the historicity, productive and administrative effects of power but offers very little by way of the possibilities of the subject as an agent of change – a view that is reflected by a number of scholars as well (Caldwell, 2007; McNay, 2000; Parker, 2012; Prugl, 2011). In this chapter, I pursue a discussion of the possibilities of “agency” within the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto, one which problematizes the idea of the agency as residing within an individual who is rational and who has the freedom and moral sense to desire and to choose differently. Instead, my understanding of agency is one that cannot exist “outside the bounds of power” (Carillo Rowe, 2005, p. 21; Hook, 2007, p. 70). This position can be and is often seen to be quite pessimistic; subjects are interpreted to be no more than passive conduits of power/knowledge (Caldwell, 2007). However, I want to suggest that this project of exposing the performativity and racializing norms of diversity discourse and the various subject-positions that

reproduce and are reproduced by it provides a site of illumination into the diffuse operations of power, particularly of the complicities and contradictions that are contained and occluded by it. Specifically, I propose that agency resides in making visible the multiple modes of complicity with power, as well as the lived (“real”) contradictions that are transformed and/or muted through the production and (re-)making of racial Others into diverse subjects in the City of Toronto.

Before I turn to the matter of agency and diversity discourse, I will first outline a summary of my research which highlights the some key aspects of my approach and findings. I do this in order to ground my discussion on agency, power, subjectivity and desire, particularly in relation to how the desire to belong for racial Others in the City has historical, political and racial implications which further complicate the idea of agency as “choice”. I will then turn to a discussion on the work of a few scholars who take up a Foucauldian approach to agency, and further their conceptualizations in order to situate the idea of agency within power, as well as in a local context. Therefore, I take up an understanding of agency and diversity discourse which has racial *and* spatial implications, so that it becomes possible to articulate the spatial dimensions of complicities and contradictions, or more specifically, their occlusions. Lastly, I draw on the critical work of Denise Ferreira da Silva (2007, 2014) to complicate what these complications and contradictions can actually mean and do, given the bounds of diversity discourse and the diverse City. In this last section, I pose some key questions on the matter of agency and diversity discourse which continue to critically engage with the historical, social and political forces of race, power and diversity discourse in the City of Toronto.

Theorizing the Local – Critical Insights

My research has been guided by the central question of how race is reproduced and organized through diversity discourse in the City of Toronto. The intention of my thesis was to explore how racialized City staff understood and worked with diversity in the City, but to explicitly avoid making generalizations about their identities, “essences” and/or psyches. I sought instead to trace staff’s various positionings of themselves, their work and their belonging in the City as being historically constituted, with re-constituting effects. In order to pursue this work, I drew on Foucault’s genealogical method. In Chapter 3 I describe how this method enabled a reading of the interview transcripts against City of Toronto documents which named and/or offered policy directions on race, racism or diversity, so that I could offer an understanding of the various subject positions taken up by racialized City staff as being *produced and productive*, within the confines of power. Specifically, I wanted to trace how the subjectivities of racial Others in the City might be produced to incite and reproduce the norms of diversity discourse, through speech acts and through texts. In drawing on this method, I sought to investigate how power, knowledge, diversity discourse and subjectivities are co-constructed in the City of Toronto, in order to reproduce race. I also sought to identify any differences, similarities, tensions and/or contradictions between interview transcripts and City texts, and how they might be indicative of both the anxieties and regenerative aspects of diversity discourse in the City.

As Weedon (1997) explains, a genealogical method explores the relationships between power, knowledge and discourse in the constitution of the subject, specifically how subjects’ understandings of themselves and their worlds are historically, politically and socially determined. For Foucault (1990), “power is everywhere...it comes from everywhere” (p. 93).

This method disqualifies the humanist approach whereby one examines how individuals possess/wield power or are repressed by it, and instead focuses on how power incites, reinforces and normalizes various subjectivities via discourse and is performed in everyday practices, including acts of resistance. What is important to note here is that this genealogical method is in line with a Foucault's approach to agency, which Caldwell (2007) argues is a specific move away from a humanistic approach which centres on the "rationality, knowledge/expertise, autonomy and reflexivity" of the subject (p. 770). Both genealogy and agency actively resist interpretations and reductions of the subject to an individual with a certain essence or character, and in the case of agency, to one who actively chooses to fight against power because s/he possesses the political and "right" moral intentions to change the world. The idea of possessing the character to be and do good, and the racist implications thus implied is discussed very briefly by Davies (1991) in her conceptualization of agency. However, as I have made visible in this thesis, commitments to social change based on personal, moral choices to "do and *be* the right thing" are grounded in and reproduce colonial and racial thinking, which often further reinforce individualistic notions of the self as outside/against power, occlude the racial norms which reproduce diversity discourse in the present, and separate those racial Others who conditionally belong (welcomed, "us") from those who do not (stranger strangers, "them").²⁹ As I have shown, even forms of resistance to diversity discourse in the City can be traced to a reproduction and accommodation of its racializing effects.

²⁹ For example, see Chapter Six - "doing the right thing" guides racialized City staff to draw on other discourses (equity, inclusion, intersectionality) in order to move diversity 'beyond race', *and* to deny the existence of race/racism in the City. Both are experienced as being personal commitments towards social change, a move away from the past, and what separates these "exceptional" staff from other Others in the City. What is occluded by the discourse of diversity (and other discourses that circulate with it) is how these subjectivities and separations are reproduced via imputing lack onto other Others in the City, as a negotiation of belonging. Similarly, the push to consult with more racialized bodies (Chapter Eight) is premised on the desire to impact/change social policy at the City, to challenge race, and to better reflect the needs of racialized communities. However, what becomes occluded in this desire for "change" is how racial Others and insider-Others become integral to the reproduction of the encounter, race-pleasure and commodification.

Again, my methodological aim was not to seek out or divulge any “truth” about racialized Others in the City, but to expose how power transforms and/or erases any historical, social, political, racial and/or embodied schisms so that the racial norms of diversity discourse could be regenerated in the present. What I am suggesting here is that morality, specifically the appeal to racial Others to do and to be good, is but one of the ways in which diversity discourse continues to occlude and reproduce racialization, race and power in the City via *a reproduction and re-centering of the idea of the autonomous, free and agentic individual*. Furthermore, I argue that agency/resistance and morality converge with the reproduction of longings to be not-raced, not strange as affective technologies of diversity discourse, which are incited and reproduced through the encounter and through negotiations of belonging for racial Others in the City. It is precisely through the containment and engagement of these technologies by the discourse of diversity that the reproduction of racialization and race is occluded and effected in the City.

The theoretical framework for this dissertation which I describe in Chapter Four pursues an understanding of negotiations of belonging for racial Others in the City of Toronto that is contained and reproduced by diversity discourse via the encounter, hailing, and longings to be not-strange, not-raced. I also discuss how diversity discourse in the City is spatially configured and articulated, which I suggest reproduces encounters, hailings and longings to belong in local, site-specific ways. This approach implies that that encounter(s) with, hailing of, and longings to be/come of racial Others must be historically, racially and spatially configured in order to reproduce the regulatory norms which make diversity discourse possible in the present. Importantly, this framework also begins to theorize how certain bodies, certain subject positions are “welcomed” in the diverse City *against* (other) Others, strangers strangers who are expelled because they get “too close”. The reproduction of diversity discourse in the City thus requires not

only the hailing of, encounter with, and longings of racial (other) Others, but the expulsion of those deemed a threat from the space of the City as well. In this chapter, I also introduce a conceptualization of longing to be/come as an affective technology, whereby diversity discourse contains and reproduces the desires of racial Others to be not-raced, not strange, and to belong in the City.

I complement this theoretical approach with an understanding of diversity discourse as performative via the reinscription of racializing norms (Chapter Five). The intention of this chapter is to supplement and ground my analyses of interview transcripts and City of Toronto texts. It is in Chapter Five that I first discuss how my preliminary analyses of interview transcripts and City texts revealed several contradictory moments which I felt I needed to interrogate further. I became increasingly curious about how and under what conditions racialized City staff articulated these at times glaring contradictions while continuing to maintain and defend their various positionings - as being the exception(al), as not seeing race, as denying the existence of racism, as being like no Other, as advocates for increased participation of racialized groups, and so on. At the same time, I became aware of the remarkable similarities between how diversity was taken up and authorized in City texts and how staff articulated their work with diversity, even as they described how their work differed from and *resisted against* how diversity work was done “in the past” and/or by “others” in the City. In Chapter Five, I brought together Judith Butler’s (2011) conceptualization of performativity and Sara Ahmed’s (2002) understanding of racialization so that it became possible to understand how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto could contain and occlude these contradictions and collusions³⁰ by producing, narrowing and reinforcing intelligibility, articulation, subjectivity and negotiations of belonging of racial Others in racializing terms, in order to reproduce race and power in the

³⁰ I use collusions interchangeably with complicities in this Chapter.

City. An important point to be raised here is that the contradictions which became evident in my analyses, whether through speech acts or in texts, are often not taken up and/or perceived by racialized City staff *as contradictions*. In a similar vein, staff's various positionings rely on interpretations/acts of diversity which they perceive to be *individually authored*, even as these interpretations reflect the historical antecedents associated with diversity, in particular the essence of lack.

Bronwyn Davies (1991) espouses that the humanist approach to agency positions the individual as one "who stands out of the collective, against the pressures of society...heroes who engage in difficult tasks, as people who we might become" (p. 42). I want expand on Davies' point to argue that the containment and occlusion of these contradictions and collusions are additionally reinforced through the *production* of the heroic, agentic racial Other who is permitted, encouraged and *subjectivated* through the discourse of diversity in the City. What I am suggesting here is that diversity discourse incites and *produces* the agentic, exceptional racial "insider-Other" in order to occlude the reproduction of racialization and race. Additionally, I offer that the hailing of racial Others via diversity discourse into negotiations of belonging incites and is incited by the desires of racial Others to be autonomous, moral and agentic individuals, which obscures how the encounter is invited and reproduced within the bounds of race and power. I also want to suggest that by encouraging a humanistic, individual and agentic approach to diversity work, it becomes more difficult to see how contradictions and collusions manifest and are occluded via *subjectivizations* of diversity discourse, race and power in the City. As an affect and effect of diversity discourse, the more autonomous and agentic the racial Other feels and/or claims to be, the more the reproduction of racialization and race becomes obscured in the City.

A critical insight of my research is that the performativity and racializing effects of diversity discourse are also spatialized. In my analyses, it becomes possible to see how diversity discourse hails and reproduces the desires to be not-raced, not strange, as well as intelligibility and articulation in racializing terms. The reproduction of racialization and race is co-constituted with spatially bound denials of racism and claims of leadership, exceptionality, and innocence. The analyses that I present reinforce the insight that space is *productive*; the racialization of other Other bodies, stranger strangers is co-effected with the racialization of space. Equal attention must also be paid to the ways in which the City's claims of leadership, innocence and being not-racist simultaneously invite, police and abject experiences of racism, thus conditioning the intelligibility, participation and belonging of racial Others in the City. Additionally, my research reveals that the various subject-positions that racialized City staff take up are produced, conditioned and contained by diversity discourse to refuse and reinscribe racialization, in order to reinforce and police the boundaries between "us" (diverse, insider-Others) and "them" (stranger strangers, other Others, abjected) as they negotiate their belonging in space. The reproduction of racialization and the separations between "us" and "them" thus implied are performed, in speech acts and in City texts, via an incitement of racial norms in order to erase/abject those who make claims of racism in the space of the City.

The separation between "us" and "them" as negotiation of belonging is first taken up in Chapter Six of this thesis, where I discuss how being the exception(al) in the City is premised on and produced through conferring of lack onto other Others/stranger strangers. In this chapter, several moments of tension are revealed. Although some staff's sense of themselves as exceptional is premised on their particular interpretations of diversity which intend to move diversity 'beyond race' in order to effect social and political change in the City, their interviews

indicate moments of contradiction and “anxiety” which would suggest a break with the coherency of their positionings.³¹ I use the term “anxiety” because some staff do not actually see or take up these moments as contradictions *within themselves* in any real way (i.e. as effects of power/knowledge and the limits of discourse), but instead as momentary slippages as a result of institutional power over them and/or conceptualizations of diversity that they *fight against*. Similar moments occur with staff who explicitly deny the existence of race/racism in the City, as a negotiation of their belonging, and to reinforce the separation between “us” and “them” in the City. Although some racialized City staff are adamant that race does not exist and/or matter in the diverse City, in our interviews they experience what I have described as “affective disjunctures”, where their denials of race/racism collide with their own embodied experiences, their encounters with other Others in the City, and/or their observations that the City is a white space. However, these disjunctures are effaced as staff describe and justify their particular belongings in the City, as exceptional individuals who become trustworthy because they refuse to name and/or *rely on* race/racism, unlike “them” (other Others, stranger strangers).³² As I highlight in Chapters Six, Seven and Eight, claims of racism made by racial other Others/stranger strangers are taken up and re-framed in City texts in order to reproduce statements that the City is an exceptional space where *there is no racism*. In both interviews and in City texts, moments of tension appear to be glossed over, made irrelevant, and/or erased

³¹ Here I am talking about the contradictions that are brought up in interviews with racialized City staff, which very few pause on, and if they do, only very briefly. For example, staff separate themselves from others in and outside of the City (“them”) by indicating that their definitions of diversity include multiple identities and/or intersections of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion etc. However, in our interviews, they discuss how when they use the term in the City, or write it in reports, they generally mean race. Patricia takes a brief moment to reflect on this: “I’ve not thought about that until this second...” Edward thinks about the contradictory positions he takes up with respect to the language of inclusion only when I press him further, and then suggests that I’ve put him “on the spot” by asking him to think this through.

³² See “the denial of race/racism” section in Chapter 6 for further discussion.

through the discourse of diversity and the various forms of exceptionality that it inspires and *produces*.

I again want to suggest here that racial Others' hailed presence and various positionings in the City via the discourse of diversity draw on and are produced through a humanistic approach which is centred on racial Others being autonomous, heroic and moral individuals, outside the bounds of race and power. I also want to suggest that these positionings preclude any further probing or analyses of moments of tension, in speech acts and in texts, because they are inextricably bound with how racial Others negotiate and *justify* their belonging in the City of Toronto, in a space where they are seen not to belong. Although any probing of these tensions might indicate the *failure* of diversity discourse to fully encapsulate the speaking and writing subject, their oclusions and/or reconciliations demonstrate diversity discourse's exceedingly powerful effects *and affects*. Furthermore, I argue that the various positionings associated with being the exception(al) and the separations thus implied ("us" versus "them") not only maintain a coherence and continuity of the Self (as doing and being good), but also *evade and defend against complicity*. The coherency and understandings of the individual Self as one who is "good" therefore cannot be complicit. I offer that the evasion of complicity is in multiple and sometimes *contradictory* ways also co-effected with the desire to be not-raced, not-strange, to be the exception(al) and to belong in the City.

In Chapter Seven, the idea of the heroic and moral individual becomes especially evident in Kevin, Corey and Nicole's narratives, as they draw on their "specialized knowledge" of racialized groups to not only reinforce their exceptionality and belonging in the City, but to articulate their abilities and desires to teach others (and/or other Others) about racialized communities in order to effect social and political change. The racial terms under which this

“specialized knowledge” is articulated and taken up in the City are again obscured from view, as are the collusions with the racial norms that are incited into and reproduced by diversity discourse in the City. As I have argued in Chapter Seven, the possession of specialized knowledge not only brings racial Others in the City in close(r) proximity to the somatic norm, but also justifies the somatic norm’s natural existence and occupation in space, as the true bearer of knowledge and truth. I want to extend my analyses here to argue that solidifying the somatic norm in space also justifies the *moral* grounds to help/save racial (other) Others, which disguises how diversity discourse in the City reproduces racialization and race in order to *reinforce its racist exclusions*. Again, the implication here is that racial Others take up the position of having specialized knowledge in order to effect social and political change for racialized groups in particular. However, I want to suggest that the heroic, moral and autonomous positionings that racial Others are incited and *produced* to take up through the discourse of diversity both constitute and de-historicize the moral, colonial imperatives of diversity discourse and occlude the collusions with its racializing and exclusionary effects.

Chapter Eight of this thesis delves into the racialization of consultations/democratic participation in the City, particularly the race-pleasure and commodification of Otherness which reinforce the racial and spatial dimensions of diversity discourse. Again, the impetus for racialized City staff to increase the participation of racialized bodies via consultation is premised on their positionings as agentic subjects who want to transform the policies and practices that impact racialized communities in the City in order to effect institutional change. In Chapter Eight I also describe how racialized City staff, as “insider-Others” are produced to inhabit a series of paradoxes which are bound by diversity discourse and the melancholy of race. As City texts reveal, the presence and participation of racialized bodies is repeatedly commodified in order to

demonstrate and re-cite the City's leadership on enhancing democratic participation and addressing racism and diversity issues. Although experiences of racism are written in City texts, through the discourse of diversity they are continuously re-framed and/or erased in order to reinforce the claims of achieving democratic participation and progressive change that the City is "known for". My analyses suggest that the idealization of democracy that is incited into and reproduced by diversity discourse is refracted through racial Others' sense of themselves as agentic and their desires to be not-raced, not-strange, and to belong in the City, which precludes the possibilities of exposing the racializing and exclusionary assumptions and practices of consultations (and of democracy more broadly), the erasures that are co-effected through its claims, and the contradictions and collusions that are concealed by it.

As Weedon (1997) offers, accounts of how subjects live their lives and the desires that subjects take up as indicators of their essential selves are reflections of multiple discourses, power, and the subject-positions made available within them. In Chapter Three, I wrote about how I arrived at my central research question through reflection upon my years as a former political staff person in the City of Toronto, as an "insider Other" who drew upon discourses of diversity, agency and resistance in order to *personally* invoke and sustain an anti-racist agenda in the City. In my research process, I began to see how racial Others in the City accessed similar agentic subject positions, whereby their actions, feelings and desires became intimately connected with and reflected individualized, autonomous and essential notions of the Self, rather than constituted by and through diversity discourse.

So, how can anything ever really change in the City of Toronto, given the omnipresence of power and diversity discourse? As I described earlier in this chapter, a Foucauldian approach which contextualizes agency and resistance within the bounds of discourse and power appears to

leave very little room for “real” agency – that is, agency that is not simply an effect of power. In the next section of this final chapter, I complicate and attempt to reconcile the problem of agency by introducing how making visible the various contradictions and collusions with diversity discourse, race and power might offer the possibilities of agency for racial Others in the City. I offer that by de-centring the free, autonomous, consistent and whole individual in favour of speaking and *revealing* from a place of contradiction, collusion and de-essentialization, it becomes possible to expose the proliferating effects and affects of power, as well as a critical awareness of the subject’s *ongoing relationship(s) with and within it*.

On the Problem of Agency

“The true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situation which we seek to escape, but that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us, and which knows only the oppressor’s tactics, the oppressor’s relationships”

Audre Lorde (1984, p.123)

Parker (2012) writes that some feminist theorists and activists critique Foucault’s understanding of agency because they seek active strategies of resistance against sexist and patriarchal relations, and oppose the idea of resistance as being complicitous with power. However, in emphasizing agency as resistance against patriarchy, Parker argues that what is often obscured in some feminist work is the neo-colonial, western, eurocentric and appropriating terms which undergird and legitimize the universalization of whiteness, alongside and *through* the exoticization and objectification of “Others”. Davies (1991) also asserts that the idea of agency as control *over* reinforces white, masculinized ideals. She instead advocates for liberation from the essentialist and rational notions of the Self, whereby new forms of authorship and speaking can disrupt the bounds of discourse which attach subject positions to genitalia.

Although Davies and Parker both advocate for agency as an awareness and constitution of the Self via contradictions in order to disrupt the “truth” and consolidation of the subject, Parker complicates agency further by situating it within a politics of location, specifically an awareness and refusal of *complicities* with subject/Other relations. As Parker (2012) offers, a politics of location also makes visible the silences, erasures and appropriations which are produced and reinforced via the making of the subject, knowledge and subjection in Western, imperial, raced, classed, gendered, heteronormative and/or nationalist terms. This approach to agency centralizes *complicities* within relations of power and also contextualizes modes of internalized oppression within relations and subjectivizations of power, so that they are no longer conceived of as a “choice” (or inherent *weakness*) of the individual and free subject.

In this section of the chapter, I want to take up Parker’s insights regarding agency in order to suggest that the recognition of contradictions and *complicities* with discourse, race and power makes it possible to expose what effects and affects constitute and are constituted by the discourse of diversity in the City of Toronto. Building on Parker’s politics of location (re: *complicities* with subject/Other relations), I also want to suggest that by understanding subject positions, intelligibility and articulation of racial Others in the City as being authorized *against* the racialization and abjection of other Others/stranger strangers, it becomes possible to see how negotiations of belonging in the City via diversity discourse are effected and reproduced by and through racial and colonial thinking. Attention to *complicities* also brings to the fore that racial Others in the City of Toronto are produced through diversity discourse, race and power to invite individuality and completeness. My analyses show how the separations of “us” and “them” which undergird and reproduce the various positionings of racial Others in negotiations of belonging in the City are an effect of diversity discourse, race and power *and* the desires to be

not-raced, not-strange, to be the exception(al) and to belong in the City of Toronto. The point that I have hopefully made in this thesis is that these binaries are less rigid and totalizing than they appear. By illuminating the fractures of the coherent individual subject, it becomes possible to understand the racial and colonial anxieties of diversity discourse, as well as how and under what conditions they are simultaneously *repeated and subverted* in the present.

An approach to agency and diversity discourse which makes visible the complicities and contradictions is not without its concerns, however. The acknowledgement of complicities and contradictions with diversity discourse, race and power could very well become wielded as an *apparatus* of power, simply by way of taking up and reproducing the positioning of the “truly ethical” insider-Other. I would argue that this critique could similarly be leveraged against the establishment of critical Whiteness studies in academic institutions. White feminist scholars who conceive of themselves as being ethically aware of their racial privilege and identify collusions with whiteness might actually reinforce and reproduce their own whiteness and innocence, as well as the whiteness and innocence of the institution. This paradox also resonates with Ahmed’s (2006) observations on the politics of admission, specifically that institutional and individual admissions to being racist are in themselves seen as acts of doing good, and as antiracist action. In the case of the City of Toronto, it is indeed possible that racial “insider-Others” who speak and work from a place of contradictions and complicities could take up and reinforce their positionings as *ethically responsible* diverse subjects. Their presence in the City could also be taken up by the institution to demonstrate and reinforce the City’s *increased* commitment to and leadership on addressing race and diversity issues. However, I also want to suggest the task of articulating agency in terms of “good” versus “bad”, complicity versus resistance again sets up the binaries which reinforce the idea of the agentic, free and rational individual outside of

relations of diversity discourse, race and power. Furthermore, I argue that by diligently making visible the various complicities with power as well as the possible *contradictions* that are effaced in the process of recognizing these complicities,³³ it becomes possible to increasingly interrogate and destabilize a totalized subjectivity, and to work towards a greater accountability to act(ion).

In short, the recognition of complicities and contradictions is to “engage with the unnatural” (Butler, 2011, p. 190); a complex, constantly evolving, intensely reflective and uncomfortable process. As Caldwell (2007) also explains, a Foucauldian interpretation of agency shifts the focus from moral or political tasks to make a difference, to an ability “to *act otherwise*”, within the bounds of power (p. 789). I want to suggest that the confluence of discourse of diversity, race and power and the confrontation of its contradictions and collusions inspires increased accountability and can compel a constant negotiation with the (non-totalized) Self to *act otherwise*, that is, to act from a place of *awareness and subversion of racial norms*.³⁴ I am not suggesting here that to act in greater variation and/or subversion means to eliminate race and diversity discourse in the City. Instead, I propose that variable and subversive acts have, as Butler (2011) also implies, the potential to disrupt conventional repetitions of racializing norms and to *reveal* the failure of diversity discourse, race and power to “ever fully legislate or contain their own ideals” (p. 237). Although this constant process of undoing, acting otherwise and revealing can be very challenging, exhausting, and painful, it can also be potentially liberating.

Here I want to draw on Denise Ferreira da Silva’s (2007) brilliant critique of theories of race that re-constitute self/Other relations and claim “that racial emancipation comes about when

³³ For example, the recognition of complicities effects (and obscures) the desires to become “good”, to race to innocence, might further incite the desire for consolidation of the Self and is therefore complicit with racial thinking.

³⁴ Butler (1990) calls agency “subversive repetition” (p. 188): to intervene, denaturalize, destabilize and contest the repetition of “traditional” gender norms via engaging the “unnatural” (p. 190). I would argue that contesting and subverting gender norms in this way does not necessarily displace gender/heteronormativity, but instead questions its very authority.

the (juridical and economic) inclusion of the racial others and their voices (historical and cultural representations) finally realizes universality” (p. 154). For Silva, focusing on inclusion of Others both pursues and seeks to recuperate the idea of the whole, universal subject (pre-modernity), which continues to rely on and reproduce particular “truths” of the Other cultivated by *racial knowledge*. Furthermore, pursuing logics of inclusion become invested in and focused on narratives of injury and repair, rather than on how and why the state legitimizes and authorizes the reproduction of subjugation and violence.

Silva (2014) revisits the ideas of legitimacy and authority of the state in her analyses of the military police’s occupation and activities in the economically dispossessed neighbourhoods in Rio de Janeiro Black “over the past few years” (p. 141). She describes several events in which black and brown bodies were subjected to massive deployments of law enforcement and army officials, and several black and brown teenagers were killed. As Silva asserts, it was not the conditions of criminality and/or drug crimes in these areas that authorized the interventions of the state, nor the fear of violence *within these communities* that required state intervention and protection. These events were merely opportunities for the state to re-engage with acts of self-preservation and authority. Raciality, as Silva names it, *produces* both the ethical subjects which laws and the state are designed to protect, as well as the racial bodies and territories where the state deploys its forces in the interests and demonstration of self-preservation of the state and ethical subject. In other words, the legitimacy of the self-preservation and violence of the state is “always-already given – in exteriority” (p. 160) and is justified and free from condemnation because zones (and bodies) are “*always-already*” *constructed as violent*. As such, death is always-already justified. This, Silva argues, is what makes racial subaltern subjects no-bodies. As Silva (2014) goes on to say:

Because it functions, *a priori*, immediately in representation, the deployment of architectures and procedures of security – occupations, military interventions, torture, summary executions, and so on – need no further justification. For raciality assures that, everywhere and anywhere, across the surface of the planet, that ever-threatening ‘other’ exists because already named; as such, it is an endless threat because its *necessary* difference *consistently* undermines the subject of ethical life’s arrogation of self-determination. (p. 160).

What I want to argue here is that the notion of “agency” with respect to diversity discourse cannot remain grounded in (and hopeful about) what racial Others can *do* to and with diversity discourse, in order for themselves and racial (other) Others to *be and feel included*. Using Silva’s critical interventions, I want to suggest that we move away from the ideas of agency as a means towards greater inclusion, and instead into agency as a critical interrogation of *legitimacy*; that is, the role of the City in always-already legitimizing exteriority and various forms of violence (via diversity discourse and race) in order to re-inscribe its authority and self-determination. Following Silva, I want to suggest that my investigation into how diversity discourse in the City of Toronto reproduces racialization and race is not about tracing processes of racial inclusions and exclusions in the City so that we can become better at *being* included. Instead, I argue that this project has been one of tracing the legitimacy and authority of the City, its self-preservation tactics, as well as the laws and policies that are always-already designed to protect it and the ethical subject via *raciality*. And so, I ask: what happens when we refuse processes and policies of inclusion, and instead initiate critical interventions in how, why and under what terms racial Others are always-already constituted by the State via exteriority? What

if questions turned to what racial bodies are always-already *doing* for diversity discourse (and for the diverse City) instead of what racial Others and “insider-Others” might *do* to and with it?

My thesis traces and renders visible the racial norms that are incited into and by diversity discourse, which reproduce racialization and race in the City of Toronto. It also begins to expose how diversity discourse produces and narrows subjectivization, intelligibility, articulation and belonging of racial Others in racial terms. As I have shown in this thesis, diversity discourse in the City of Toronto has, for the last three decades, incited and reproduced the conferring of lack onto racial (other) Others in the City via the need for *their* training, civility, knowledge, skills development, education building, language skills, representation, and/or greater participation. The project of making visible the racial norms of diversity discourse at the very least makes it more difficult to re-articulate the same “diversity agenda” that has been re-circulated over the past thirty-six plus years in the City of Toronto. It is imperative now that intelligibility and articulation for racial Others in the City be redefined, given the discursive and material constraints within which this redefinition must take place. However, we cannot redefine without attending to how the City maintains the racial Other as other to the modern subject, thereby keeping race and racial thinking intact. The question of where diversity discourse will take us now must continue to attend to and reveal the racial norms of diversity discourse; particularly how they bend and shift in the current, local context to constitute and be constituted by the subjectivities, encounters, desires and negotiations of belonging of racial Others in the City of Toronto. Most importantly, we must pay close attention to the various tactics of the local state which legitimize and authorize its self-preservation *in the face of diversity*. As racial Others, this also means that we must also begin and continue to fiercely engage and contend with our own contradictions and complicities because, in the discourse of diversity, there is no innocent space.

Final Thoughts – On Complicity and *This Diversity Work*

Nearing the end of my Ph.D. process, I was asked two very poignant questions: How does this research fit within the context of diversity work? Have you thought about how this work will be taken up *as diversity work*? When I was asked these questions, I froze. Even as I advocate for a necessary close reading of contradictions and complicities as a way to discover “agency”, I had neglected to examine how the work that I had pursued over the past seven years would be complicit with diversity discourse and with the racial norms I sought to expose. I could not see, or perhaps refused to engage with, how a “critical” project which sought to make visible the racial norms of diversity discourse could in fact *keep the diversity discourse project going*. As Rose (1996) and others suggest, it is in the space of war that new subjectifications occur. Following these questions, I began the slow process of reflecting on how this project, as a form of “war”, works to reproduce diversity discourse, race, power, and my own subjectivity.

My ongoing reflections compel me to now locate my desire to uncover and make visible the norms of diversity discourse within the context of the autonomous, individual, heroic figure, *and its racial associations*. The positioning I take up, as a researcher who is “outside”, as a *revelatory figure*, encourages an engagement with positioning that stands outside of diversity discourse, race and power. However, it is in this very idea of the “outside”, and as the heroic individual, that I now locate and re-attach my work (and body) within and as contributing to diversity discourse and its racial norms. As I have shown in this thesis, *this is what diversity does*. Diversity discourse compels and produces the exceptional racial subject *because of its anxieties and ruptures*. By engaging in a project which seeks to expose anxieties and ruptures, perhaps in order to facilitate “new” ones, I am certainly not outside of, and am certainly no exception in the reproduction of diversity discourse, race and power in the City of Toronto.

References

- Abu-Laban, Y., and Gabriel, C. (2002). *Selling diversity: Immigration, multiculturalism, employment equity, and globalization*. Toronto, ON: Broadview Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters. Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ahmed, S. (2002). Racialized bodies. In M. Evans & E. Lee (Eds.), *Real bodies: A sociological Introduction* (pp. 46-63). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Ahmed (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text*, 22(2), 117-139.
- Ahmed, S. (2006). The nonperformativity of antiracism. *Meridians*, 7(1), 104-126.
- Ahmed, S. (2007). The language of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(2), 235-256.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and the ideological state apparatuses. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (pp. 153–164). Athens, GA: University of Georgia.
- Altilia, C. (2003). Planning for diversity in the global city: The Toronto case. Retrieved from: http://www.yorku.ca/fes/research/docs/carol_aitilia.pdf
- Anderson, B. (1991a). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Anderson, K. J. (1991b). *Vancouver's Chinatown: Racial discourse in Canada, 1875-1980*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Anderson, K. (2000). Thinking “postnationally”: Dialogue across multicultural, Indigenous , and settler spaces. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(2), 381-391.
- Antonsich, M. (2010). Searching for belonging – An analytical framework. *Geography Compass* 4(6), 644-659.
- Appadurai, A. (1988). Putting hierarchy in its place. *Cultural Anthropology* 3(1), 36-49.
- Archer, L. (2007). Diversity, equality, and higher education: A critical reflection on the ab/uses of equity discourse within widening participation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5-6), 635-653.
- Arrington, C.E., and Francis, J.R. (1989). Letting the chat out of the bag: Deconstruction, privilege and accounting research. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 14(1/2), 1-28.

- Averill, J. (2009). *Diversity matters: Changing the face of public boards*. Retrieved from The Maytree Foundation Website: http://maytree.com/PDF_Files/DiversityMatters.pdf
- Bannerji, H. (1997). Geography lessons: On being and insider/outsider to the Canadian nation. In L. Roman & L. Eyre (Eds.), *Dangerous territories: Struggles for difference and equality* (pp. 23-41). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). The paradox of diversity: The construction of a multicultural Canada and “women of colour”. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 23, (5), 537-560.
- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1984). Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse. *Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*, 28, 125-133.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bird, K. (2005). Guess who’s running for office? Visible minority representation in the Canadian election. *Canadian Issues*, Summer: 80–83.
- Black, J. H., and Lakhani, A. S. (1997). Ethnoracial diversity in the House of Commons: An analysis of numerical representation in the 35th Parliament. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, November: 13-33.
- Brah, A. (2000). Difference, diversity, differentiation. In L. Back and J. Solomos (Eds.), *Theories of race and racism: A reader* (pp. 441-436). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bryman, A. (2001). *Social research methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Caldwell, R. (2007). Agency and change: Re-evaluating Foucault’s legacy. *Organization*, 14(6), 769-791.
- Campbell, M. L., and Gregor, F. (2004). *Mapping social relations: A primer in doing institutional ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Carrillo Rowe, A. (2005). Be-longing: Toward a feminist politics of relation. *NWSA Journal*, 17(2), 15-37.
- Catungal, J. P., and Leslie, D. (2009). Contesting the creative city: Race, nation, multiculturalism. *Geoforum*, 40, 701-704.

- Chatterjee, P. (1993). *Nationalist thought and the colonial world: A derivative discourse?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chen, A. S. (1999). Lives at the center of the periphery, lives at the periphery of the center: Chinese American masculinities and bargaining with hegemony. *Gender & Society*, 13(5), 584-607.
- Cheng, A. A. (2001). *The melancholy of race: Psychoanalysis, assimilation, and hidden grief*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- City of Toronto (1980a). Appendix "A" City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 37 – clause 45. "*Equal Opportunity 1979 Annual Review (report July 23, 1980)*" (p. 8747).
- City of Toronto (1980b). *The Minutes of the Council, October 2, 1980 - Minute no. 1394* (re: increased presence of Ku Klux Klan) (p. 71).
- City of Toronto (1981). Appendix "A" City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 7, Clause 26. "*Committee on Community and Race Relations*" (p. 1054).
- City of Toronto (1990a). 1990 Reports Adopted by Toronto City Council: City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 20, Clause 48. "*Multicultural Access Program: Proposed Consultation and Program Development Committee*" (p. 12.148).
- City of Toronto (1990b). 1990 Reports Adopted by Toronto City Council: City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 20, Appendix 1. "*Summary of Corporate Training on Multicultural and Race Relations (July 3, 1980)*" (p. 12.147).
- City of Toronto (1990c). City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 1, Clause No. 29. "*Scholarships for Aboriginal Students Studying in Health Professions*" (p. 1.139).
- City of Toronto (1991a). City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 9 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 8 on May 6, 1991. Clause 94. "*Multicultural Access Program – Implementation*" (p. 251).
- City of Toronto (1991b). City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 1 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 2 on January 15, 1991, Clause 45. "*Toronto Mayor's Committee on Community and Race Relations – 1991 Program and Budget*" (p. 203-205).
- City of Toronto (1992a). City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 9 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 6 on March 23, 1992, Clause 24. "*Equal Opportunity Corporate Review for the Period 1986-1990*" (p. 69).
- City of Toronto (1992b). City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 14 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 8 on May 4, 1992. Clause 27. "*Response to the Provincial Discussion Paper on Employment Equity*" (p. 35).

- City of Toronto (1992c). City of Toronto Executive Committee Report No. 13 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 7 on April 13, 1992. Clause 60. “*Options for Organizational Structure and Placement of Multicultural Access Program*” (p. 118).
- City of Toronto (1993). City of Toronto Neighbourhoods Committee Report No. 10 for City Council Consideration at Meeting No. 11 on August 30, 1993. Clause 11. “*Anti-Racist Demonstration Held on June 28, 1993*” (p. 10).
- City of Toronto (1998a). *Urban Aboriginal economic development*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/1998/agendas/committees/cs/cs980914/it017.htm>
- City of Toronto (1998b). *Terms of reference for the City of Toronto task force on community access and equity*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/1998/agendas/council/cc/cc980304/tr3rpt/cl006.htm>
- City of Toronto (1999a). Staffing requirements - Toronto fire services. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/1999/agendas/council/cc/cc990727/pof4rpt/cl004.htm>
- City of Toronto (1999b). Toronto police association poster and stereotyping of the Hispanic community. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/1999/agendas/council/cc/cc990706/adm1rpt/cl002.htm>
- City of Toronto (1999c). *Final report – Task force on community access and equity*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/1999/agendas/council/cc/cc990202/sp2rpt/cl006.htm>
- City of Toronto (1999d). *Framework for citizen participation in the City of Toronto*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/1999/agendas/council/cc/cc990302/tr2rpt/cl002.htm>
- City of Toronto (2000a). Allocations: 2000 access and equity grant program. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2000/agendas/council/cc/cc000704/adm14rpt/cl017.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2000b). *Certificate of amendments – Notices of motion appearing under item P* (no. 15 – Establishment of a diversity advocate position). Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2000/agendas/council/cc/cc001205/cofa.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2001a). *Diversity advocate action plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2001/agendas/council/cc010306/pof2rpt/cl004.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2001b). *Development of a City of Toronto declaration and plan of action regarding the elimination of racism in relation to the united nations - World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (UN-WCAR)*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2001/agendas/council/cc010424/pof4rpt/cl009.pdf>

- City of Toronto (2002a). *Re: CAO's status report – Implementation of the recommendations of the final report of the task force on community access and equity*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2012/cd/bgrd/backgroundfile-51832.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2002b). *Notice of motion: Request to federal government to petition the government of Nigeria regarding Amina Lawal law*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2002/agendas/council/cc021001/nomj%289%29.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2002c). *Notice of motion: Principle of zero tolerance of racial profiling for policing in the City of Toronto*. Retrieved from: <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2002/agendas/council/cc021029/nomj%289%29.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2002d). *International policy framework for the City of Toronto*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2002/agendas/council/cc020521/pof8rpt/cl009.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2003a). *City of Toronto plan of action for the elimination of racism and discrimination*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2003/agendas/council/cc030414/pof3rpt/cl003.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2003b). *Update – Council motion on racial profiling in Toronto*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2003/agendas/council/cc030204/pof1rpt/cl016.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2004). “If low income women of colour counted in Toronto” report – Implications for parks and recreation. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2004/agendas/committees/edp/edp041122/it002.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2006a). *Pilot project – Implementation of an equity lens and equity impact statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2006/agendas/council/cc060925/pof7rpt/cl004.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2006b). *Status report - Implementation of 2004-2006 access, equity and human rights action plans*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2006/agendas/council/cc060725/pof6rpt/cl007.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2008). *Appendix A: Reporting to City manager Shirley Hoy*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2008/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-13970.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2009a). *Diversity and positive workplace strategy*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2009/el/bgrd/backgroundfile-25339.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2009b). *Toronto police services board: Aboriginal policing – Statement of commitment and guiding principles*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2009/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-19994.pdf>

- City of Toronto (2011). *Request for an apology for the media article “Too Asian?” – by Councillor Mike Layton, seconded by Councillor Kristyn Wong-Tam*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2011/mm/bgrd/backgroundfile-34300.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2012). *Recreation service plan 2013-2017*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2012/cd/bgrd/backgroundfile-51832.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2014a). *Deputy mayor’s black business professionals roundtable*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/ed/bgrd/backgroundfile-72675.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2014b). *Talent blueprint 2014-2018 (Toronto public service workforce plan)*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-68293.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2014c). *Toronto youth equity strategy*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/cd/bgrd/backgroundfile-65633.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2014d). *Toronto strong neighbourhoods strategy 2020 – Recommended neighbourhood improvement areas*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/cd/bgrd/backgroundfile-67382.pdf>
- City of Toronto (2014e). *Aboriginal employment strategy*. Retrieved from <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2014/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-66236.pdf>
- Clayton, J. (2008). Everyday geographies of marginality and encounter in the multicultural city. In C. Dwyer and C. Bressey (Eds.), *New geographies of race and racism* (pp. 255-268). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Coleman, D. (2006). *White civility: The literary project of english Canada* (pp.3-45). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Coleman, D. (2015). Afterword: A two row ethics of encounter. In C. Janzen, D. Jeffery, and K. Smith (Eds.), *Unravelling encounters: Ethics, knowledge, and resistance under neoliberalism* (Chapter 12). Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Cross, M., and Keith, M. (1993). Racism and the postmodern city. In M. Cross and M. Keith (Eds.), *Racism, the city and the state* (pp. 1-30). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Crabtree, B.F., and Miller, W.L. (2004). Research methods: Qualitative. In R. Jones (Ed.), *Oxford textbook of primary medical care*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Croucher, S. L. (1997). Constructing the image of ethnic harmony in Toronto Canada: The politics of problem definition and nondefinition. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32 (3): 319-347.

- Darder, A., and Torres, R. (2004). *After race: Racism after multiculturalism*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Davies, B. (1991). The concept of agency: A feminist poststructuralist analysis. *Social Analysis*, 30, 42-53.
- Dean, M. (2002). Liberal government and authoritarianism. *Economy and Society*, 31(1), 37-61.
- Delhi, K. (2003). 'Making' the parent and the researcher: Genealogy meets ethnography in research on contemporary school reforms. In M. Tamboukou and S. J. Ball (Eds.), *Dangerous encounters: Genealogy & ethnography* (pp. 133-152). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Desfor, G., Keil, R., Kipfer, S., and Wekerle, G. R. (2006). From surf to turf: No limits to growth in Toronto?" *Studies in Political Economy*, 77, 131-55.
- Dhaliwal, A. (1996). Can the subaltern vote? Radical democracy and questions of race. In D. Trend (Ed.), *Radical democracy: Identity, citizenship, and the state* (pp. 42-61). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dreyfus, H. L., and Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (second edition). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Processing fieldnotes: Coding and memoing. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes* (Chp. 6). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4, (2), 133-168.
- Fanon, F. (1952). *Black skin, white masks*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1965). *A dying colonialism*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Farley, A. (1997). The black body as fetish object. *Oregon Law Review*, 76, 457-535.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (pp. 78-108). New York, NY: Pantheon
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 57-78). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

- Foucault, M. (1984a). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 51-75). New York, NY: Random House Inc.
- Foucault, M. (1984b). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). New York, NY: Random House Inc.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality*, (trans R. Hurley). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of Method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 73–86). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gilroy, P. (1987). *There ain't no black in the union Jack: The cultural politics of race and nation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist culture: Philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2002). *The racial state*. Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Goldberg, D. T. (2009). *The threat of race: Reflections on racial neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Good, K. R. (2009). *Municipalities and multiculturalism - The politics of immigration in Toronto and Vancouver*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Goonewardena, K., and Kipfer, S. (2005). Spaces of difference: Reflections from Toronto on multiculturalism, bourgeois urbanism and the possibility of radical urban politics. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3).
- Goonewardena, K., and Kipfer, S. (2006). Postcolonial urbicide: New imperialism, global cities and the damned of the earth. *New Formations*, 59, 23-33.
- Hage, G. (2000). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (1996). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In P. Mongia (Ed.), *Contemporary postcolonial theory: A reader*. London, UK: Arnold.
- Hall, S. (1997). Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Hall, S. (2000). Who needs 'identity'? In P. du Gay, J. Evans, and P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader* (pp. 15-30). London, UK: Sage Publications Inc.

- Haque, E. (2007). Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework: Language and the racial ordering of difference and belonging in Canada. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 68(1), 54.
- Hartman, S. (1997). *Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in the 19th century*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, D. N. A. (2003). Getting rid of the subject: A technique for understanding how gendered subjectivities form and function in educational discourses. In M. Tamboukou and S. J. Ball (Eds.), *Dangerous encounters: Genealogy & ethnography* (pp. 91-110). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Henry, F. and C. Tator. (1994). The ideology of racism in Canadian society: Democratic racism. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXVI (2).
- Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, knowledge, materiality. Foucault and discourse analysis. *Theory and Psychology*, 11, (4), 521-547.
- Hook, D. (2005). The racial stereotype, colonial discourse, fetishism, and racism. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 92, (5), 701-734.
- Hook, D. (2006). 'Pre-discursive' racism. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 16(3), 207-232.
- Hook, D. (2007). *Foucault, psychology and the analytics of power*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hook, D. (2011). Psychoanalytic contributions to the political analysis of affect and identification. *Ethnicities*, 11(1), 107-115.
- hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks: Race and representation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Iltan, S. (2002). *Longing in belonging: The cultural politics of settlement*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Isin, E., and Siemiatycki, M. (1997). Immigration, Diversity and Urban Citizenship in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, 21, (2): 73-102.
- Isin, E. & Siemiatycki, M. (2002). Making space for mosques: Struggles for urban citizenship in immigrant Toronto. In S. Razack (Ed.) *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp.185-210). Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.
- Jacobs, J. (1996). *The edge of empire: Postcolonialism and the city*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Jackson, P. (2007). Afterword: New geographies of race and racism. In C. Dwyer and C. Bressey (Eds.), *New geographies of race and racism* (pp. 297-304). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Jordan, G., and Weedon, C. (2015). The celebration of difference and the cultural politics of racism. In B. Adam and S. Allan (Eds.), *Theorizing culture: An interdisciplinary critique after postmodernism* (pp. 149-164). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Keith, M. (2002). The mirage at the heart of the myth? Thinking about the white city. In D. T. Goldberg and J. Solomos (Eds.), *A companion to racial and ethnic studies* (pp. 323-339). Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kholsa, P. (2003). If low income women counted in Toronto: Final report of the action-research project 'Breaking isolation, getting involved'. Retrieved from http://www.oaith.ca/assets/files/Publications/Low_Income_Women_of_Colour.pdf
- Kipfer, S. (2007). Fanon and space: Colonization, urbanization, and liberation from the colonial to the global city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25, 701-726.
- Kirby, K. (1996). Re-mapping subjectivity: Cartographic vision and the limits of politics. In N. Duncan (Ed.), *Body space* (pp. 45-55). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kirova, A. (2008). Critical and emerging discourses in multicultural education literature: A review. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40, 1-2, 101-124.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research, Second Edition* (pp. 257-277). California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lee, S. (2008). Recognition as a depleted source in Lynne Tillman's motion sickness. In R. M. Berry, J. R. Di Leo (Eds.), *Fiction's Present: Situating Contemporary Narrative Innovation* (pp. 195-208). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lentin, A. (2005). Replacing 'race', historicizing 'culture in multiculturalism. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 39, (4), 379-396.
- Lentin, A. (2011). *Contemporary issues: Racism and ethnic discrimination*. New York, NY: The Rosen Publishing Group, Inc.
- Lentin, A., and Titley, G. (2011). *The crisis of multiculturalism: Racism in a neoliberal age*. London, UK: Zed Books.

- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Mayo, C. (2002). The binds that tie: Civility and social difference. *Educational Theory*, 52(2), 169-186.
- McNay, L. (2000). *Gender and agency: Reconfiguring the subject in feminist and social theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Mackey, E. (1999). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mackey, E. (2000). Death by landscape: Race, nature and gender in Canadian nationalist mythology. *Canadian Women's Studies*, 20(2), 125-130.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2010). The time and space of race: Reflections on David Theo Goldberg's interrelational and comparative methodology. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 44(1), 77-88.
- Mani, L. (1989). Contentious Traditions: The Debate on *Sati* in Colonial India. In K. Sangari and S. Vaid (Eds.), *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History*. New Delhi: Kali for Women.
- Matus, C., and Infante, M. (2011). Undoing diversity: Knowledge and neoliberal discourses in colleges of education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32 (3), 293-307.
- Mauthner, N., & Doucet, A. (1998). Reflections on a voice-centered relational method. In J. Ribbens & R. Edwards (Eds.), *Feminist dilemmas in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- McDonald, J. (2007). Citizenship, illegality, and sanctuary. In V. Agnew (Ed.), *Interrogating race and racism* (p. 112-134). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent in the new millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Memmi, A. (1991). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press Books.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mills, C. W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mills, C. W. (1998). *Blackness visible: Essays on philosophy and race*. Cornell University Press.

- Mohanram, R. (1999). *Black body: Women, colonialism, and space*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2000). Under western eyes. In L. Back and J. Solomos (Eds.), *Theories of race and racism: A reader* (pp. 71-91). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). Race, multiculturalism, and pedagogies of dissent. In C.T. Mohanty (Ed.), *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity* (pp. 190-217). New York, NY: Duke University Press.
- Nagle, J. (2009). *Multiculturalism's double-bind: Creating inclusivity, cosmopolitanism and Difference*. Burlington, VT: Ashgrave Publishing Company.
- Ng, R. (1995). Multiculturalism as ideology: A textual analysis. In M. L. Campbell and A. Manicom (Eds.), *Knowledge, experience, and ruling relations* (pp. 3-17). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Oksala, J. (2004). Anarchic bodies: Foucault and the feminist question of experience. *Hypatia*, 19, (4), 97-119.
- Okolie, A. C. (2005). Toward an anti-racist research framework: The case for interventive in-depth interviewing. In G. J. S. Dei and G. S. Johal (Eds.), *Critical issues in anti-racist research methodologies* (pp. 242-268). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Padgett, D. K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work research: Challenges and rewards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Parekh, B. (2006). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political Theory* (second edition). London, UK: Palgrave.
- Parker, J. (2012). Questioning appropriation: Agency and complicity in a transnational feminist location politics. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship*, 3, 1-18.
- Prado, C. G. (2000). *Starting with Foucault: An introduction to genealogy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Probyn, E. (1996). *Outside belonging*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Prügl, E. (2011). Diversity management and gender mainstreaming as technologies of government. *Politics & Gender*, 7, 71-89.
- Puwar, N. (2001). The racialised somatic norm and the senior civil service. *Sociology*, 35(3), 651-670.

- Puwar, N. (2004). *Space invaders: Race, gender and bodies out of place*. Oxford and New York: Berg Publishers.
- Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press Inc.
- Razack, S. (2002). Introduction: When place becomes race. In S. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp.1-20). Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.
- Rose, N. (1996). Identity, genealogy, history. In S. Hall and P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 128-150). London: SAGE publications.
- Ross, K. (1996). *Fast cars, clean bodies: Decolonization and the reordering of French culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Saloojee, A., and Siemiatycki, M. (2002). Ethnoracial political representation in Toronto: Patterns and problems. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3(2), 241-273.
- Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: New Press.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (2003). *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Shachar, A. (2000). On Citizenship and Multicultural Vulnerability. *Political Theory*, 28(1), 64-89.
- Shaw, W. S. (2007). *Cities of whiteness*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Silva, D. F. (2007). *Toward a global idea of race*. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Silva, D. F. (2014). No-bodies: Law, raciality and violence. *Meritum – Belo Horizonte*, 9(1), 119-162.
- Skrbiš, Z., Baldassar, L., and Poynting, S. (2008). Introduction – Negotiating belonging: Migration and generations. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 28(3), 261-269.
- Smith, D. E. (1999). *Writing the social: Critique, theory, and investigations*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, M. (2010). Gender, whiteness and “other Others” in the academy. In S. Razack, S. Thobani, and M. Smith (Eds.), *States of race: Critical race feminism for the 21st century* (Chp. 2). Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.

- Solomos, J. and Back, L. (1996). *Racism and Society*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Spivak, G. C. (2003). *Death of a discipline*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Swan, E., and Fox, S. (2010). Playing the game: Strategies of resistance and co-optation in diversity work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 17(5), 567-589.
- Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing genealogies: An exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 20, (2): 201-217.
- Tamboukou, M. (2008). Re-imagining the narratable subject. *Qualitative Research*, 8, (3), 283-292.
- Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Guttman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp.25-74). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Trinh, M. (1989). *Woman, native, other*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.
- Valverde, M. (2007). Genealogies of European states: Foucauldian reflections. *Economy and Society*, 36(1), 159-178.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Discourse and racism. In D. T. Goldberg and J. Solomos (Eds.), *A companion to racial and ethnic studies* (pp. 145-159). Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (second edition). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Weedon (2004). *Identity and culture: Narratives of difference and belonging*. London, UK: Open University Press.
- Wetherall, M. (2013). Affect and discourse – What's the problem? From affect as excess to affective /discursive practice. *Subjectivity*, 6(4), 349-368.
- Yan, M. C. (2003). Antiracism discourse: The ideological circle in a child world. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 1, 127-144.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2007). Intersectionality, citizenship, and contemporary politics of belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 561-574.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Information and recruitment letter

Appendix B: Consent Form

Appendix C: Interview guide for in-depth interviews

Appendix A: Invitation to Participate in a Study

An Exploration of Diversity in the City of Toronto

You are being invited to participate in a study conducted by Shana Almeida, a PhD Candidate in the School of Social Work, York University.

What is the purpose of this study? In this study I would like to understand how self-identified ethno-racial staff in the City of Toronto use and make sense of the term ‘diversity’ in their work lives. In particular, I would like to explore the multiple ways that ethno-racial staff talk about, reference and work with the term ‘diversity’, in order to better understand what diversity does for staff and for the City itself. Participants’ responses will inform analyses of the role of diversity in the policies and practices in the City of Toronto, and offer a better understanding of how diversity is applied and understood in a local context.

I believe your participation in the study can have several benefits. Your contributions may lead to a better understanding of how the City incorporates the term diversity, and in what context(s). The study results may also shed light on the multiple and divergent ways that diversity is understood and experienced by ethno-racial staff in the City of Toronto, and how this is reflected in and affects the City’s reports, policies and practices.

If You:

- Self-identify as part of an ethno-racial group, a “visible minority”, or as a “person of colour”
- Are currently employed by the City of Toronto, and have been for at least one year

Please consider participating in this study! This research involves one, semi-structured individual interview. The interview will be between one and one-and-a-half hours and can be done at a time and place of your choice. The interview will have some guiding questions that will allow you to give information that you feel is relevant to the topic being studied and/or to the interview discussion. With your permission, the interview will be taped and transcribed by myself. Any information you give me will be treated as confidential. The tapes will be locked in a filing cabinet in my office until the end of the research, at which time the tape(s) will be destroyed. Anonymity will be maintained, and you can choose to end the interview at any time, without consequence.

If you have any further questions or are interested in participating in this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at [phone], or email me at cheenaDR@yorku.ca (with subject heading “research participant” so that I may identify you properly). For considerations of time and planning, **please respond before [date]**.

Thank you for your time, and for your interest!
Shana Almeida M.S.W/ PhD Candidate
York University School of Social Work
[contact information]

Appendix B:

Theorizing the Local: An Exploration of Diversity in the City of Toronto

Consent Form

You are being asked to participate in a study conducted by Shana Almeida, PhD Candidate from the Department of Social Work, York University. If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact Shana Almeida at: (phone number) or (email address). You may also contact the faculty supervisor for the study, Professor Barbara Heron, at (416)736-2100 Ext: 20521, or by email at bheron@yorku.ca

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to understand how ethno-racial staff in the City of Toronto use and make sense of the term ‘diversity’ in their work lives and in relation to their responsibilities. Participants’ responses will inform analyses of the role of diversity in the policies and practices in the City of Toronto, and offer a better understanding of how diversity is applied and understood in a local context.

PROCEDURES

If you choose to participate in this study, I will ask you to take part in one individual interview (lasting approximately 90 minutes). Interviews will take place at the location of your choosing and, with your permission will be audio-taped and transcribed. You can choose to stop the interview or withdraw at any time, without consequence or judgment. You may also refuse to answer any question that you are not comfortable with. As part of the interview process, I will share copies of your transcripts with you, for your feedback. When the study is complete, I will offer you a summary of the results.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information obtained from you in connection with this study will remain strictly confidential. I will retain any collected information and data in a locked cabinet in my office for the duration of the study, and no names will be used in the study or ensuing reports and publications. I will ensure that all data is properly and thoroughly deleted 24 months after the study is complete. Pseudonyms will be used to protect participants’ anonymity for the purposes of transcription and the publication of findings.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

If you volunteer to be part of this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. If you do choose to withdraw, none of the information generated by you will be used in the study. You may also choose to decline to answer any question you do not wish to answer and still remain in the study.

RISKS / BENEFITS TO PARTICIPATION

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts related to this research, however if you do experience feeling uncomfortable by some of the questions that I might ask, you will be encouraged to share only information that is comfortable for you. You will be encouraged to contact the researcher or faculty supervisor at any point during the study to discuss your experiences or any concerns related to participation in the study.

You may benefit from the reflections and discussions about the relationship between diversity and the work that you do at the City of Toronto. Additionally, your contributions may lead to a better understanding of how policies and practices in the City are shaped by diversity, by how City staff use diversity, and in what context(s).

COMMITMENT TO ETHICAL RESEARCH PRACTICES

This research has been reviewed and approved for compliance to research ethics protocols by the Human Participants Review Subcommittee (HPRC) of York University.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Graduate Program Office, School of Social Work, York University, S880 Ross Building, phone 416-736-5226

or

Manager, Office of Research Ethics, York University, 309 York Lanes, phone 416-736-5914.

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANT AND INVESTIGATOR

I understand the information provided to me about the study on the uses and effects of diversity in the workplace. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Name of Participant/ Date

Signature of Participant/ Date

Signature of Investigator/ Date

Appendix C:

Interview Guide

The questions below will serve as a guide to explore how ethno-racial City of Toronto staff use and make sense of diversity in the City of Toronto. Probe and follow-up questions will be initiated in each interview, if necessary, and as each discussion unfolds.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this interview. As I mentioned to you earlier, the purpose of conducting these interviews is to gather information on how you use and make sense of the term ‘diversity’ in your work. I am looking for insight into what diversity means to you, how you conceptualize it, and how it relates to the work that you do in the City of Toronto. If it is alright with you, I would like to start off with some questions to initiate our conversation about your work.

1. Why have you chosen to work for the City of Toronto?
2. How would you describe the work that you do?

Diversity

3. What does the term diversity mean to you?

Probe: When you think of the term ‘diversity’, what do you think of?

Follow up: Can you talk about how you arrived at this definition?

4. When you hear the City of Toronto’s motto “Diversity Our Strength”, what do you think this means?

5. In what contexts have you seen the term diversity used in the City?

Probe: Are there specific policies, or specific places, where you see ‘diversity’ appears more than in others?

6. Has the term diversity ever been used by you in the work that you do for the City? If so, when have you used it? You can use specific examples if this helps.

Follow up: did you receive any guidance on how to use it in your work, or did you initiate using the term on your own?

7. Do you remember when you first started hearing of the term diversity? Or, do you remember when you first started using it?

8. Has how you conceptualize diversity changed over time? If so, what are the reasons for these changes?

Probe: Do you feel that the meaning of the term has changed over time in your work, and in the City?

Text (if texts arise in the conversation)

8. What is this text you are referring to? What does this text contain?

9. What is the purpose of this text?

10. How does this text come to exist within the organization? Can you please describe, to your knowledge, how this text was created?

11. Do you work with this text in any way? If so, how?

Conclusion

12. Is there anything else that you would like to say on the topic of diversity, how you make sense of it, and how you use it?