

**WOUNDED SUBJECTS:
WHITE SETTLER NATIONALS IN TORONTO G20
RESISTANCE NARRATIVES**

by

Auden Cody Neuman

A thesis submitted to the Department of Gender Studies

in conformity with the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

September, 2012

Copyright ©Auden Cody Neuman, 2012

Abstract

This project engages theories of settler colonialism, biopower, and the state of exception to analyze the operations of rights-based narratives of citizenship in relation to political dissent in Canada. I argue that a normalized state of exception founds the white supremacist, settler colonial state, bringing Canadian citizenship into being as a (white) racialized, (cis)gendered, and (hetero)sexualized construct. By examining “resistance narratives” about the Toronto G20 that emerged in the post-G20 climate, my work argues that, in treating the policing practices employed during the G20 as exceptional and in (re)producing the exaltation of white heterosexual cis-masculine citizens, these narratives normalize and reinforce the daily operations of the exception, which targets Indigenous, racialized, and other “Others” in Canada. Finally, my work critically engages with the space of the Eastern Detention Centre (EDC) as a temporary camp set up to detain G20 arrestees, and with the narrative of “Torontonamo” that emerged to describe and explain the EDC. Reading the EDC in the context of other spatial organizations of the exception in Canada, I argue that the “Torontonamo” narrative reasserts race thinking in relation to the normalized operations of the exception. In so doing, it (re)produces white citizen-subjects as the proper recipients of national and international human rights, while abandoning racialized populations to the space of the camp. Ultimately, my work writes against the hegemonic view of the Toronto G20 as an exceptional event in Canadian history. I contend that G20 policing practices were only a hyper-visible example of the normalized operations of the exception within settler colonialism.

Acknowledgments

My gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Scott Morgensen, for his constant advice and encouragement throughout this project. Thank you also to Dr. Katherine McKittrick for her valuable input, and to Dr. Dana Olwan for inspiration, and for helping me find my “belly fire” again. To the faculty and staff of the Gender Studies Department at Queen’s University, thank you for your support throughout my graduate degree. Special thanks to Terrie Easter Sheen and Kathy Baer, who were always there to answer my questions and keep me pointed in the right direction. Thank you also to my colleagues in the Gender Studies MA program – especially Carla Moore for fuckery and fishbowls, and Ashley Hoskin for protein snacks and office chats. A special thanks to Emily Jane Macgillivray, whose thesis, *Red and Black Blood: Teaching the Logic of the Canadian Settler State*, helped me grapple with the intimate connections between seemingly discreet processes.

My work owes a great debt to the support, throughout my undergraduate degree and beyond, of the Women’s Studies Department at the University of Victoria. Thank you especially to Christine Welsh, Dr. Sikata Banerjee, and Dr. Annalee Lepp – both for their invaluable teachings, and for their ongoing support through the years.

Most importantly, thanks to all those who keep me grounded in struggle. Thanks especially to Gorn, for love and patience, and for saving my noggin that time. To friends behind bars: your bravery inspires me; may you come home soon.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2	
Outsiders Within: Citizenship and the Exception in Canada.....	13
Chapter 3	
Loyal Dissent: The White Settler Citizen-Subject in G20 Resistance Narratives.....	48
Chapter 4	
“Torontonamo” Doesn’t Exist: Interrogating Spaces of Exception.....	79
Epilogue.....	104
References.....	109

Chapter 1

Introduction

In June 2010, Toronto hosted the fourth meeting of the G20 Summit. The G20's arrival was met, as it is wherever it goes in world, by a mass mobilization of protestors in the streets. Its unprecedented security budget (Smith & Cowen 39) led to the mass arrest of over 1,118 people (McNeilly xi). In the early morning of June 27, my friends and I joined a jail solidarity rally outside the Eastern Detention Centre (EDC), a temporary facility established in an industrial neighborhood in Toronto's East End. At around 2 a.m., riot police kettled the demonstration and declared it illegal. We were arrested along with approximately 30 other people. Having arrived to provide support for prisoners inside the EDC, we wound up prisoners ourselves. I was detained, along with 26 others, in a cell built for 10. All of us were identified as female by the state, reflecting the role that spaces of incarceration play in producing gender binaries (Stanley 6). Accurately capturing the identities and embodiments of all 27 individuals is a task I am not fully capable of, yet we might more accurately have been described as a motley crew of mixed-race genderqueers, queer and straight women of colour, white trans and queer folks, white punks and hippies, and at least two Indigenous women who'd already survived histories of incarceration at the hands of the settler colonial state. Our genders appeared similarly to the disciplinary apparatus in which we were caught, yet our differences ensure we are each *differently ensnared* in the normalized operations of the prison industrial complex (PIC), the (in)justice system, and white supremacist settler colonialism in Canada.¹ No

¹ Renaming the land is one of the ways in which settler colonialism attempts to affect the disappearance of Indigenous peoples and histories. As Alan Sears puts it, "Every time we refer to the continent of North America, and call the northern part of that Canada, we are

doubt our bodies moved through the EDC in different ways, exposed differently to criminalization, abuse, harassment, and sexualized violence. My experiences, as a genderqueer transboy, were marked by the insistent production of gender binaries within carceral spaces. From the notes of the arresting officer to the confusion over who should strip-search me, my experiences spoke to the complicated ways that non-cis bodies move through and are disciplined by such spaces.

In the months following the G20, an overwhelming stream of narratives emerged, in both mainstream and independent media, expressing resistance to the brutality of police, the systematic denial of rights, and the conditions in the EDC. Centralized within these narratives were the stories of white, heterosexual, cisgender citizen men. It was as though I was witnessing a different story in the media than the one I'd survived: where, among the homogenously white masculine faces poured across the news, were faces like those of the people I'd shared my cell with? Queered and racialized bodies, so visible in the carceral space of the EDC, vanished in the public production of narratives about the G20. The narratives themselves spoke in complicated ways to my body: as a white, masculine, settler citizen of Canada, I was invited to identify with the wound narratives of white citizen men. Yet as a trans and queer person, I was simultaneously erased, obscured, vanished. My gender and my sexuality were part of what had to be written out of the narrative for the narrative to function.

making certain assumptions about whose land this is and how it got to be this way. The violent subjugation of Aboriginal peoples and their claims to the land simply vanish in the everyday act of referring to the place in terms that are explicitly Europeanized" (Sears 48). The renaming of space has been so complete on this continent that it is often difficult to find ways to refer to spaces without employing their colonial names. After much thought, I have opted to call this landbase "Canada" in this project, both for lack of appropriate options, and because this project is an attempt to call attention to and denaturalize the processes that produce "Canada" as a settler colonial nation-state.

This project examines the narratives produced in mainstream and independent media about the Toronto G20, including the retrospective documentaries *Toronto G20 Exposed* (2010), *Into the Fire* (2011), and *You Should Have Stayed at Home* (2011). The centralization of white, heterosexual, cisgender citizen men within these narratives (re)produces Canadian citizenship as a (white) racialized, (cis)gendered, and (hetero)sexualized construct. The subjects of these narratives are represented as “unlikely troublemakers,” a narrative that both 1) hijacks the discourse about the G20 protests, 2) erases and obscures the organizing efforts, participation, and struggles of marginalized populations in Canada, including Indigenous peoples and peoples of colour, and 3) naturalizes daily state violence against these populations by framing G20 policing as unprecedented and exceptional. In centralizing rights-based narratives of citizenship, these texts position citizens as the deserving recipients of national and international rights, and political dissent as a loyal act of citizenship. All three documentaries construct a 3-day narrative about the protests, which forgets four preceding days of community-based resistance that produced challenges to settler colonialism, the nature of citizenship, borders and immigration control, heterosexism and cissexism, and the intersections of environmental degradation with colonialism, racism, and globalization. The 3-day narrative thus works to evacuate politics from protest, while allowing the raced, classed, gendered, and sexualized institution of citizenship to remain unexamined. Narratives about the EDC focus on comparisons of the EDC to Guantanamo Bay, which I argue is a reassertion of race thinking in relation to the camp.² These narratives naturalize the

² For a different reading of camps, see Gilroy (2000). Gilroy uses the camp in a twofold manner, first as a “*metaphor* for the pathologies of ‘race’ and nation” (Gilroy 85) wherein a biocultural idea of race structures the relationships between the members of a nation-

racialized camp, and its proliferation across national and international space. An intersectional analysis of G20 narratives reveals how social justice movements in Canada operate to reproduce white supremacy and settler colonialism, as well as the gendered, racialized, and sexualized logics of the biopolitical operations of the state of exception.

This project emerges from many places. These places include the places of my childhood, as a white settler of middle-class upbringing: the unceded Stz'uminus, Semiahmoo, and Kwantlen lands where I was raised, and the unceded Lekwungen land where I earned my bachelor's degree. The settlement of these spaces, as territories on the west coast of British Columbia, relied upon the exploitation of the labour of peoples of colour from other spaces, especially China, India, and Japan.³ More directly, this project emerges from spaces in the land now called Ontario. As the location where I undertook this project, Kingston and its colonial history is intimately linked to this work. There is contestation over whether or not the land on which Kingston is built is the traditional territory of the Mohawk or the Algonquin peoples; stolen by colonizers and "worked" by black slaves in the eighteenth century (Walker 20), it became the first capital city of Canada. Finally, this project emerges from the urban spaces of Toronto, a city partially constructed by the labour of black slaves brought to Upper Canada by the Loyalists (Winks 47) on land obtained through the dispossession of the Mississauga people.⁴ The

state (68), and secondly to refer to actual camps as exceptional spaces that these conditions give rise to (86). Concerned with the problem of fascism, Gilroy attempts to rescue the promises of modern democratic nation-states from the racism and race-thinking that plague them. My work examines the state of exception in the context of settler colonialism, an engagement that demands a reading of the camp as an "inclusive exclusion" (Larsen & Piché 216) and the racialized exception as a founding condition of the existence of modern democratic settler states.

³ For more, see Ward (1978).

⁴ For more on Toronto's complicated colonial histories, see Freeman (2010).

curious historical moment of the Toronto G20, in which representatives of the most powerful world economies met in a city built by black slaves on land stolen from Indigenous peoples, represents only one event in the continuous march of colonialism and white supremacy. At first glance, my work is concerned with the events and narratives of the G20 protests; its primary *raison-d'être*, however, is the production of a profound critique of the Canadian state and the institution of citizenship. Methodologically, this project approaches Canada as a white supremacist settler colonial nation, while acknowledging, as internally contradictory, that its roots and mine are inseparable from the processes it critiques.

In calling Canada a “settler colonial” nation, I draw upon Patrick Wolfe’s differentiation of settler colonialism from franchise colonialism. While franchise colonialism is conceived of as a project with a possible end – a possible postcolonial moment – settler colonialism is conceived of as a project without end. There is no postcolonial moment in the settler colonial context, or at least not without the radical dissolution of the settler nation. The logic of elimination, describing the “multifarious procedures whereby settler-colonial societies have sought to eliminate the problem of indigenous heteronomy through the biocultural assimilation of indigenous peoples” (Wolfe 102) is central to the process. Settler colonialism operates as a “territorial project, whose priority is replacing natives on their land rather than extracting an economic surplus from mixing their labor with it” (103). In the Americas, this process is intimately linked to the importation and exploitation of the labour of peoples of colour through the transatlantic slave trade and the use of migrant labour from Asia. We might say that because Canada is a settler colonial nation, there can be no end to colonialism in Canada that does not also entail the end of Canada itself. Envisioning and working toward the end

of the settler nation is exactly the project Andrea Smith challenges activists to take up when she contends that we must “think beyond the nation-state as the appropriate form of governance for the world” (Smith 184). This project, she argues, is particularly vital for colonized peoples; I contend it must also be seen as vital for white settlers striving to act in solidarity with the decolonization struggles of Indigenous peoples and the antiracist struggles of peoples of colour. My work intends to produce a radical critique of the Canadian settler colonial state, while envisioning pathways of resistance that answer Smith’s challenge to think beyond the nation-state.

The project of settlement is a biopolitical process. In examining the biopolitical nature of settlement, my work draws upon Michel Foucault’s theory of biopower as the “administration of bodies and the calculated management of life” (*History of Sexuality* 140). According to Foucault, biopower emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, alongside political and economic transformations in Europe, as the successor of sovereign power. Biopower is power without a center; it is power operating from diverse levels and institutions (141). Instead of taking the will of the sovereign as its starting point, power has turned to the management of populations. The right of the sovereign to defend his own life has become “the right of the social body to ensure, maintain or develop its life” (136). It is now in the name of populations that killing happens (137). Foucault’s words, “Wars are no longer waged in the name of the sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone ... massacres have become vital” (137) calls to mind colonialism and settlement, as much as the post-911 “war on terror” and the subtler, though no less destructive, processes of global capitalism in the neoliberal order.

Giorgio Agamben notes that the classical Greeks distinguished between *zoe*, referring to “the simple fact of living common to all living beings” (*Homo Sacer* 1), and *bios*, “the form or way of living proper to an individual or group” (1). For the Greeks, there was no politics of bare life, only *bios politikos*. Foucault’s theory of biopolitics is thus describable as “the politicization of bare life” (4) or the entry of *zoe* into the political realm. Yet Agamben argues that *zoe* has always been a part of politics, as its “inclusive exclusion” (7). The entry of bare life into politics did not occur in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as Foucault thought,⁵ but rather represents the “original – if concealed – nucleus of sovereign power” (6). *Zoe* was *always* and *already* inside Western politics. Agamben completes Foucault’s theory of biopower so as to preserve – or more accurately to extend – its ability to explain the operations of power. What Foucault misunderstood as a radical political transformation at the turn of the nineteenth century might more accurately be described as the movement of bare life from the political margins to the centre of politics (205). Agamben notes a “curious contiguity between democracy and totalitarianism” (121), which he locates *within* biopolitics. In developing a language of rights, the state increased its control over bare life (121). Writes Agamben,

Every decisive political event was double-sided: the spaces, the liberties, and the rights won by individuals in their conflicts with central powers always simultaneously prepared a tacit but increasing inscription of individuals’ lives

⁵ Foucault likely also became aware of this problem with his theory, as demonstrated by Paul Patton in his analysis of Foucault and Agamben’s work on biopower. Foucault demonstrated a difficulty in locating the historical moment of the political transformation represented by the inclusion of life within the political realm, and ultimately ceased talking about biopolitics in 1976 (Patton 216). In the work of Foucault, the “concept of biopower falls apart, torn between the recognition that the life of subjects had long been included with the scope of the sovereign right and the observation that only from the turn of the nineteenth century onward was state power effectively exercised over the conditions that sustain the lives of its subjects” (216).

within the state order, thus offering a new and more dreadful foundation for the very sovereign power from which they wanted to liberate themselves (121).

The question was never whether or not regimes would exercise control over life; rather, “the only real question ... was which form of organization would be best suited to the task of assuring the care, control, and use of bare life” (122).

The earliest place in which Agamben encounters the law’s “right over life and death” (87) is in the ancient Roman law of the unconditional authority of the father to kill the defiant son (88). In what Agamben refers to as the “genealogical myth of sovereign power” (89), the power of the father over the son becomes the power of the sovereign over his subjects. In a seeming contradiction to Roman law that stipulated that citizens could only be put to death following a trial, every male citizen of Rome was placed within a state of being able to be killed by the father (read: “sovereign”) *as a condition of citizenship* (89). A life that can be extinguished by the sovereign is the foundation of political life (89). Exposure to the exception, a zone in which the law has determined that the law does not apply (*State of Exception* 39), is the bargain of political participation (*Homo Sacer* 90). The figure of *homo sacer* (“sacred man”), who can be killed without the killing constituting sacrifice or homicide, is the original political subject. Agamben’s correction of Foucault is thus capable of explaining why “democracy, at the very moment in which it seemed to have finally triumphed over its adversaries and reached its greatest height, proved itself incapable of saving *zoe*, to whose happiness it had dedicated all its efforts, from unprecedented ruin” (10).

Scholars from Ann Stoler to Achille Mbembe have identified a glaring problem at the heart of Foucault and Agamben’s work: both fail to adequately consider colonialism within their analyses of biopower. Scott Lauria Morgensen resituates Foucault and

Agamben within a “new genealogy of settler colonialism” (“Biopolitics” 53), arguing that the logic of elimination in the settler colonial context exposes Indigenous peoples to a state of exception through assimilation into the settler nation. He derives this argument from Glen Coulthard’s assertion that state “recognition” of Indigeneity presents a route to the elimination of Indigenous peoples and governance. Most attempts to adapt Agamben’s work to the colonial context theorize the state of exception as the externalization of the racialized other, yet centering the *settler* colonial context demands a consideration of how settlement in North America attempts to eliminate Indigenous peoples through *inclusion* within settler nations (60). Such a line of questioning calls to mind a variety of suspect processes in Canada, including the process by which the Vancouver Olympic Committee (VANOC) mobilized the inuksuk as a symbol of Canadian identity while pursuing the violent elimination, through forced removal and incarceration, of Indigenous peoples living in poverty from Vancouver’s Downtown East Side. The father/son relationship captured by the theory of *homo sacer* suggests the means by which Western law incorporates Indigenous peoples within the settler nation precisely by positioning them as “potentially protected children whose racialisation leaves their consanguinity open to elision” (62). In the Canadian context, this process occurs via the Indian Act, which seizes the power to define “Indianness” simultaneous to establishing a patriarchal relationship with Indigenous peoples in order to affect their assimilation (63). Because the son is always potentially *homo sacer*, included in politics only by means of his exclusion, inclusion within the settler nation is precisely the condition that exposes Indigenous peoples to the state of exception (66).

This project engages theories of settler colonialism, biopower, and the state of exception to analyze the operations of rights-based narratives of citizenship in relation to

political dissent in Canada. Chapter Two, Outsiders Within: Citizenship and the Exception in Canada, argues that a normalized state of exception founds the white supremacist, settler colonial state, bringing Canadian citizenship into being as a (white) racialized, (cis)gendered, and (hetero)sexualized construct. In Chapter Three, Loyal Dissent: The White Settler Citizen-Subject in G20 Resistance Narratives, my analysis turns toward the narratives about the Toronto G20 that emerged in the post-G20 climate. I argue that, in treating the policing practices employed during the G20 as exceptional and in (re)producing the exaltation of white heterosexual cis-masculine citizens, these narratives normalize and reinforce the daily operations of the exception, which targets Indigenous, racialized, and other “Others” in Canada. My final chapter, “Torontonamo” Doesn’t Exist: Interrogating Spaces of Exception, critically engages with the space of the EDC as a temporary camp set up to detain G20 arrestees, and with the narrative of “Torontonamo” that emerged to describe and explain the EDC. Reading the EDC in the context of other spatial organizations of the exception in Canada, including the Kingston Immigration Holding Centre (KIHC), I argue that the “Torontonamo” narrative reasserts race thinking in relation to the normalized operations of the exception. In so doing, it (re)produces white citizen-subjects as the proper recipients of national and international human rights, while abandoning racialized populations to the space of the camp. Ultimately, my work writes against the hegemonic view of the Toronto G20 as an exceptional event in Canadian history. I contend that G20 policing practices were only a hyper-visible example of the normalized operations of the exception within settler colonialism.

It may not be immediately apparent why this work belongs in gender studies, yet I argue this project could only have emerged from this field. My work operates as an

intervention into the gender analyses employed in two bodies of scholarship to which I owe great debts. The first is the field of trans studies. In its current historical phase, trans theory, with few notable exceptions, produces trans identity politics in such a way that other imperative axes of analysis disappear. The gender analysis at the heart of trans studies is incomplete; it works to obscure whiteness and white supremacy, as well as the embodied realities of non-white trans and genderqueer peoples. The second field of scholarship, around which this project is centrally focused, is anti-racist feminism. This invaluable work demonstrates how centralizing a gender analysis necessitates an intersectional engagement with other axes of power. This is not because gender is a primary category of analysis, but because systems of gender are inseparable from and mutually constitute systems of race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality, and colonialism. Yet most anti-racist feminism refuses engagement with non-cisgenders, (re)producing the erasure of trans and genderqueer peoples while limiting its ability to comprehend how gender produces and is productive of power. My work thus seeks to intervene into multiple discourses in gender studies. I argue that a centralization of settler colonialism *necessitates* an antiracist, intersectional gender analysis that thinks beyond Western binary genders. I contend that we cannot understand white supremacy, settler colonialism, biopower, citizenship, the nation-state, or the PIC unless we employ an analysis of gender that moves beyond cissexist binaries. In being about white supremacist settler colonialism, this work is centrally about gender.

In an essay in *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*, Tom Malleon argues that protests provide useful sites of analysis for social justice activists. They operate as “mirrors by which we can judge our strength, see how far we have come, and see how much work still needs to be done to ... deepen our

analysis” (Malleon 17). The narratives that emerged about the G20 after the fact offer a unique window into the operations of social justice movements, rights-based frameworks, political dissent, and citizenship in the context of Canadian settler colonialism. I believe that by examining and critiquing these narratives, my work has the power to intervene into existing conversations within social movements, or to create new ones. The majority of my academic studies have been focused on engaging with the works of Indigenous and women of colour feminists, many of whom root their scholarship in the anti-racist and anti-colonial movements of which they are a part. Their tireless work has taught me, among other things, that academic feminism is useful only insofar as it is capable of contributing to social justice movements for change. Often, being a queer trans-anarchist doing prison abolition work and a graduate student doing a gender studies thesis feels like living a double life. But once in awhile, activism and the academy align in my life in such a way that important exchanges happen to remind me that scholarship can have a purpose in struggle. My goal with this work is to engage critical academic theory in the fields of anti-racist and anti-colonial feminism to raise difficult questions about contemporary social justice movements in Canada, in hopes of sparking fresh conversations and contributing to crucial dialogues within the North American activist communities to which I belong.

Chapter 2

Outsiders Within: Citizenship and the Exception in Canada

Canada is a white supremacist, settler colonial nation, in which white, heterosexual, cisgender men occupy a space of privileged belonging. Settlement is a biopolitical project, which takes the management of race, sexuality and gender as privileged sites of its operation. In the Americas, the logic of elimination functions by attempting to replace Indigenous populations with white settler populations, while simultaneously enslaving and exploiting the labour of peoples of colour (Wolfe 105). As Canadian antiracist scholarship demonstrates, racist immigration practices, the language of preferred vs. non-preferred races, and policies of multiculturalism operate to ensure Canada remains imagined as a specifically *white* settler nation despite the seemingly contradictory presence of peoples of colour. Given that the logic of attempted elimination in the settler colonial context exposes Indigenous peoples to a state of exception through assimilation into the settler nation, my work will argue that the ongoing exposure of certain “non-preferred” peoples to a normalized state of exception is a necessary condition of the production of the Canadian nation and of Canadian citizenship. This chapter will engage theories of settler colonialism, biopower, and the state of exception, along with anti-racist and anti-colonial feminist writings on the histories of the building of Canada as a settler nation that imagines itself to be white, ultimately demonstrating how the logic of elimination characterizing settler colonialism is a biopolitical process that not only affects the dispossession, assimilation, and attempted elimination of Indigenous peoples, and the exploitation, erasure, exclusion, and conditional inclusion of peoples of colour, but also *produces* Canadian citizenship as a (white) racialized, (cis)gendered, (hetero)sexualized construct built upon a normalized state of exception.

The logic of elimination describes the diverse strategies through which settler colonialism attempts to affect the removal of Indigenous peoples from the land, through their replacement by a settler population and the exploitation of racialized labour. Removing Indigenous peoples from the land is a process involving diverse strategies, from the “crudely homicidal eliminationism of the frontier” (103) to the quiet work of policies that function to “efface the distinguishing criteria – biology, culture, mode of production, religion, etc. – whereby native difference is constructed in settler discourse” (103). At its core, it is a genocidal project (116).⁶ The “doctrine of discovery” (105), supported by the discourses of *terra nullius* (“no man’s land”) and *terra incognita* (“unknown land”) (Thobani 43), is foundational to the logic of elimination. In Canada, sovereignty over the land was claimed ideologically through racialized appeals to “Christian and European civilizational superiority” (41); legally, it was claimed through the simple assertion of sovereignty by European powers, deemed sufficient to eliminate Indigenous claims to land (41). A declaration of European dominion did not automatically negate Indigenous occupancy of the land, but rather conferred full and exclusive rights upon the “discovering” nation to buy land from Indigenous peoples (Wolfe 106). It thus operated as a stopgap between discovery and conquest (108). The declaration of dominion acted as an assertion of European authority, or what Sunera Thobani identifies as the process by which Europeans “claimed sovereignty over the Americas through the power of *their* law” (Thobani 39). This process pronounced Indigenous peoples as lawless and as subject to colonial law (39). A declaration of dominion thus operated in powerful and consequential ways as a performative speech

⁶ See also Lawrence (2004).

act,⁷ extending European law over the land and its peoples, and discursively paving the way for conquest.

Conquest of the land itself was affected through various means, both official and unofficial. Wolfe notes that the right of Indigenous occupancy, recognized by the “discovering” powers, did not translate to Indigenous rights. Rather it represented, particularly in the US context, only “a pragmatic acknowledgement of the lethal interlude that would intervene between the conceit of discovery ... and the practical realization of the conceit in the final securing of European settlement, formally consummated in the extinguishing of native title” (Wolfe 108). The process of transferring land from Indigenous to European hands was often done using force or coercion, including the unofficial violence of settlers rather than states (107). Wolfe argues that these unsanctioned acts of white violence, spurred on by a lust for land among settlers taken from the dispossessed and landless in Europe (107), were in fact central to the process of conquest in the US (108). As ongoing struggles over Indigenous land in Canada, lusted after as the sites for mines, tar sands, pipelines, developments, Olympic villages, and golf courses, brutally demonstrate, the process of conquest is ongoing. The environmental racism that Indigenous communities are regularly exposed to through this process demonstrates how the “interlude” between discovery and conquest remains lethal.⁸ Now, perhaps even more than in the past, conquest in Canada continues to be carried out legally, with the lawful force of the military and the police ever ready to enforce the decisions of courts, governments, and corporations.

⁷ J. L. Austin defines a performative speech act as an utterance of speech whereby “the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action” (Austin 6). A performative brings the circumstances it describes into being.

⁸ See Rape of the Land in Smith (2005).

Though Canada exalts its colonization process as peaceful in contrast to the US, Canadian law is a violent, colonizing force. The narrative of the “founding of a lawful nation” (Thobani 35), in which settlers are said to have acted lawfully and colonialism is said to have been a lawful process, is a national myth which conceals the reality that the law is upheld by the violence of conquest (35). “Violence was the law,” writes Thobani, “and with the cannons in the hands of the whites, the law was white” (57). The colonization of Canada must be understood in relation to US violence against Indigenous peoples, as the threat of similar violence and starvation was regularly used to pacify Indigenous populations in Canada, “all the while maintaining the posture of innocence and denial about the fundamental violent nature of the colonial process” (Lawrence 30). The myth of the lawful nation constructs the forces of colonialism as benevolent figures responsible for bringing peace and order to the land (Furniss 63), and all those who resist as criminal. Master narratives of nationhood forget Canada’s bloody history by intentionally confusing “lawful” with “peaceful,” while concealing the reality that the law being appealed to is settler colonial law violently imposed upon the land and its peoples.

White supremacy in Canada is built not only upon the subjugation and dispossession of Indigenous peoples, but also upon the enslavement and exploitation of peoples of colour. Emily Jane Macgillivray powerfully theorizes the interlocking relationships between “the dispossession of indigenous peoples and the transatlantic slave trade [as] *both integral to the project of Canadian settler colonialism*” (Macgillivray 2). The transatlantic slave trade was an “essential element of the foundation of Canada” (Mensah 44), with slavery existing as part of the colonial project for almost two centuries (Das Gupta 169) in the Maritimes, Lower Canada, and Upper Canada, including in Kingston (Walker 20). For the most part, these histories have been effaced; in the words

of Rinaldo Walcott, slavery becomes an “absented presence ... in official national discourses ... which argue that Canada’s only relation to slavery was as a sanctuary for escaping African-Americans” (Walcott 22). These erasures manufacture the myth that Canadian blackness is new and urban (36), despite nearly 500 years of black history on these lands (22).⁹ Canadian settler colonialism is further inextricable from the exploitation of migrant labor from Asia. The labour of men who arrived from China, India, and Japan was indispensable to the project of building the infrastructure necessary for settlement in the west, including the transcontinental Canadian Pacific Railway (Ward 27). These men were conceived of as temporary workers (Dua, “Beyond Diversity” 244), rather than as enduring members of the emerging Canadian nation, and paid low wages to do dangerous work. Nonetheless many remained, where their histories are bound up with the history of western Canada despite racist immigration policies organizing access to citizenship along racial lines (Thobani 74). Despite national mythologies of Canada as an originally white nation, the histories of non-Indigenous peoples of colour on this land are as long as those of white people. Canada emerged as a white supremacist settler nation only through complicated histories of mixing the labour of peoples of colour with the stolen land of Indigenous nations for the benefit of white settlers.

Settlement is a biopolitical process, taking the management of sexuality, through family, marriage, reproduction, heterosexuality, and sexualized violence, as its privileged site of operation. The biopolitical process of managing a population is primarily a productive process. It must therefore be understood not only in terms of what it excludes or denies, but also in terms of what it produces. The biopolitics of settlement in Canada,

⁹ See also Nothing’s Shocking: Black Canada in McKittrick (2006).

as the following sections will explore, affected the erasure, denial, exclusion, and conditional inclusion of peoples of colour; it affected the attempted elimination, assimilation, and genocide of Indigenous peoples; it affected the enforcement of European gender, sexual, and familial norms; it affected the enshrinement of the white, heterosexual, nuclear family as the privileged site of the (re)production of the nation; it affected the exclusion and oppression of peoples of colour, of Indigenous peoples, of queer and trans peoples, and of all those deemed outsiders or non-preferred peoples; and, in addition to all of these exclusions, erasures, and denials, it affected the *production* of the white, heterosexual, cisgender man as the ideal and proper Canadian citizen-subject.¹⁰ I will argue that Canadian citizenship is built upon the biopolitical management of sexuality and upon the state of exception, to which all citizens are *potentially* exposed, but to which Indigenous peoples, peoples of colour, trans and queer peoples – especially trans and queer peoples of colour – and other non-preferred peoples must *necessarily* be exposed as a condition of the production of citizenship itself.

Citizenship operates as the “signifier par excellence of membership in the nation-state” (Thobani 69). Through it, nationals assume legitimate and unassailable claims to membership’s privileges. Understanding the process through which membership in the modern nation is produced and maintained is central to understanding the operations of white supremacist settler colonialism in Canada. Thobani’s theory of exaltation as a “technique of power [that is] central to the processes of modern national formation” (5) explains the process by which particular subjects become venerated as the “embodiment

¹⁰ I use the phrase “citizen-subject” to resist the naturalization of citizenship and nation-state by calling attention to the processes that produce subjects who understand themselves to belong to a particular geographically bounded “imagined community.” For more on imagined communities, see B. Anderson (1991).

of the quintessential characteristics of the nation and the personification of its values, ethics, and civilizational mores” (4). In the context of Canadian settler colonialism, the subject who is exalted is the (white) Canadian national. Empowered through citizenship by the state (28), nationals gain access to the benefits and privileges offered by the nation (20), including access to land (21). The process of exaltation creates the appearance that these privileges are gained through individual worthiness, rather than the violence of colonialism (11), concealing the reality that the very subject this process exalts was birthed through violent histories of colonization (10) and the exploitation and enslavement of racialized labour. If this violence is recalled at all in the “master narrative of nationhood,” it is remembered only as lawful and justified by national interests (13).

Membership in the Canadian nation cannot be understood outside of an analysis of race. Dominant theories of citizenship fail to account for the racialization of both citizenship and its attendant rights (70), yet both Canadian citizenship and the Canadian nation are racialized as white. This is not to say that Canadian citizenship is only available to white people; rather, it is to say that whiteness is central to how Canadian citizenship is imagined and produced, and white people hold historic and epistemic priority as citizens. “The shape that this nation has assumed,” Thobani writes, “was the outcome of the intense race battles waged – and the race compromises forged – by the state and nation(als) against those whom they sought to eliminate and exclude” (22). Feminist political theorists, meanwhile, have argued that citizenship is a gendered construct.¹¹ The “battles waged” and the “compromises forged” might therefore be more accurately described as racialized, gendered and sexualized battles, in which differently

¹¹ For example, see Pateman (1988).

positioned subjects experience inclusion, exclusion, assimilation, erasure, elimination, and exaltation in relation to Canadian citizenship and the settler nation. Building upon Thobani's work, this chapter will demonstrate that membership in the Canadian nation cannot be understood outside of an interlocking¹² analysis of race, gender and sexuality that interrogates the biopolitical processes through which Canadian citizenship is produced as a category of belonging to which white, heterosexual, cisgender men have privileged access.

In the settler colonial context, the white heterosexual nuclear family emerged out of racialized imperatives of nation-building (238) as the privileged site of the (re)production of settlement, settler entitlement to Indigenous land, and white supremacy. Enakshi Dua demonstrates how the role of the family changed alongside the “consolidation of the capitalist mode of production” and the “development of the nation-state” in the nineteenth century (Dua, “Beyond Diversity” 248). Nation-building projects in both metropolitan and settler contexts drew extensively on scientific racism (249), constructing an idea of the nation as a “natural” racial kin group to which the politics of racial purity are central (249). The nation became imagined as a racial family, to which individuals were connected through a “national genealogy” (249). The project of nation-building thus depends upon interlocking biopolitical regulations of race, gender and sexuality.

¹² Sherene H. Razack writes, “Intersecting remains a word that describes discrete systems whose paths cross. I suggest that the systems *are* each other and that they give content to each other ... An interlocking approach requires that we keep several balls in the air at once, striving to overcome the successive process forced upon us by language and focusing on the ways in which bodies express social hierarchies of power” (62-63).

The sexual colonization of the land now called Canada speaks to the complicated ways in which the white heterosexual family emerged as a keystone of settlement. Colonizers arriving in the Americas encountered traditions of marriage and family life vastly different from those in Europe. Interdependence, resource sharing, non-interference, sexual autonomy, and community responsibility characterized Indigenous family relations,¹³ with homosexual partnerships and gender fluidity often recognized and valued (K. Anderson 89). During the fur trade, white men and Indigenous women often entered into marriage together (Van Kirk 27). Their unions derived from Indigenous customs (28), though may also have included the enforcement of certain European sexual norms (K. Anderson 81). At times, these marriages operated to undermine traditional Indigenous family forms by diverting the labour of both Indigenous men and women from their communities and extended families (Das Gupta 151). The appropriation of Indigenous women's labour for the fur trade project was sexualized, as these women were taken as wives (151). The sexual and familial relations between white men and Indigenous women in the fur trade were thus complicated: the unions both subverted European patriarchal norms by drawing from Indigenous traditions, while undermining values of interdependence and community upon which those traditions relied. To colonial administrators, marriages between white men and Indigenous women represented a crisis of whiteness that threatened the emergence of Canada as a white nation with ties predominantly to British cultural traditions (Smith 18; Das Gupta 150). As the colonial project progressed, there emerged a push to bring white women to the colony as wives (Van Kirk 47). This pressure operated to disrupt the development of non-hierarchical

¹³ For more see Marriage, Family and Divorce in K. Anderson (2000).

family relations, and to enforce European patriarchal family norms (Dua, “Beyond Diversity” 243), while racializing the emerging nation as white. As a result of the arrival of white women in the colonies, fur traders increasingly abandoned their Indigenous wives and mixed-race children (Van Kirk 48). The early role of the sexualized appropriations of Indigenous women’s labour was replaced by the participation of white women in settlement, seen as “rescuing” the emerging nation (48). White women were written into the colonial project through racialized, gendered, and sexualized roles as wives of white men, mothers of white children, and (re)producers of a white nation.

In order to produce Canada as a white nation, the nuclear family had to be conceived of as a heteropatriarchal racial kin group managing gender and sexuality. Patricia Hill Collins identifies the nuclear family as a “fundamental principle of social organization” in the US (Hill Collins 157). “Organized not around a biological core, but [around] a state-sanctioned, heterosexual marriage that confers legitimacy not only on the family structure itself but on children born into it” (157), the nuclear family signifies belonging in ways that uphold the racial logics of the nation (157). Birth on a particular territory or to particular parents (Agamben, *Homo Sacer* 129), through the biopolitical management of bare life, becomes national belonging (128). To belong to one’s family *is* to belong one’s nation. The nuclear family further operates as a site in which hierarchies of gender, race, class, sexuality, and age are learned, (re)produced, and naturalized (Hill Collins 158), and as a site for the regulation of gender and sexuality (158) and the erasure of queerness (159). Involving strict delineations between those imagined as “insiders” and “outsiders,” the nuclear family further operates as a site for the discursive (re)production of racialized borders and national security (162). Racism, patriarchy, and heterosexism operate as mutually constructing and reinforcing systems, enabling the (re)production of

the white nation through the heterosexual nuclear family model. While Hill Collins specifically focuses on the US context, her work informs an understanding of the role of the nuclear family in the production of Canada as a white settler nation.

The operations of the nuclear family as the site of the (re)production of the nation target women's bodies as part of a gendered and sexualized biopolitics of settlement. The white family had to be organized into the nuclear, patriarchal model, with the goal that the gendered and sexualized labour of white women would become defined as the labour of (re)producing the nation (Dua, "Beyond Diversity" 251). The preoccupation with the idea of "blood" central to both family and nation results in the control of women's sexuality, particularly as it intersects with race (Hill Collins 163). Women of colour become "racially gendered as dangerous to the nation-state" (Dua, "Beyond Diversity" 254), while white women are "racially gendered as mothers of the nation" (254). Nuclear family conventions of marriage and child-rearing enforced by the control of women's sexuality allow the family to operate as the site of inheritance, reproducing not only the racial nation but also racialized class differences through the intergenerational transmission of wealth (Hill Collins 167). The white nuclear family is thus intimately linked to the (re)production of settler control of Indigenous land and of interlocking systems of white supremacy and class reproduction.

In order for the nuclear family to be conceived of as white in the settler colonial context, people of colour necessarily had to be either denied the ability to have a family life, or prevented from having the family life of their choosing (Dua, "Beyond Diversity" 247). The presence of racialized migrant laborers in the colonies necessitated a biopolitical response, capable of managing race, gender, and sexuality to ensure the emergence of Canada as a white supremacist nation. In contrast to white men, who were

encouraged to sponsor the entrance of their white wives and children into Canada, the Canadian state ensured men of Asian descent experienced barriers in their ability to have a heterosexual family life (245). From the 1880s, Canada unofficially barred Asian women from entering the country (Dua, “Racializing Imperial Canada” 74) by employing a series of restrictive measures that operated at the intersection of race and gender.¹⁴ As a result, bachelor communities of single men of colour, exploited for their labour, formed in Canada (Das Gupta 159), raising fears among a racist white public about interracial sexuality and miscegenation (Dua, “Racializing Imperial Canada” 77). This concern hinged on “the trope of the vulnerable white [woman]” (77) in need of protection from Asian men, as well as racist constructions of Asian men as sexually dangerous and depraved (Ward 9). White Canada imagined Asian women to be “producers of an essentially different culture” (Dua, “Racializing Imperial Canada” 76), raising fears that their presence might produce Canada as a different kind of nation. These racist counterpressures, combined with political agitation from Asian men organizing against white supremacy, created complicated questions for white supremacist nation-building projects.¹⁵ Ultimately, bringing Asian women to Canada became seen as an efficient way to prevent interracial sexuality through social regulation (78). Bans on the entry of Asian women were lifted, though gendered immigration restrictions (Das Gupta 161) ensured that Asian women entered Canada pre-written into racialized heteropatriarchy in the roles of wives and mothers in ethnic communities (Dua, “Racializing Imperial Canada” 81).

¹⁴ For example, immigration restrictions and head taxes on Chinese migrants ensured that a limited number of Chinese men were allowed into Canada as laborers, while Chinese women, neither conceived of as laborers nor generally capable of accessing the funds for the head tax, were excluded (Das Gupta 159).

¹⁵ See especially Dua (2004) on the “Hindu Woman’s Question.”

The experiences of men and women of Japanese descent in Canada were somewhat different, marked by changing policies of inclusion and exclusion, shaped in part by the political relationship between Britain and Japan.¹⁶ The eventual internment of Japanese-Canadians living on the west coast during World War II serves as a brutal demonstration of what Agamben identifies as the fiction underlying citizenship (Agamben, *Homo Sacer* 128) operating through racialized logics to expose particular populations to the state of exception. The consequences of the internment for many Japanese-Canadian families were devastating (Das Gupta 163). The experiences of Japanese-Canadian families were thus marked not only by the biopolitical managements of race, gender, and sexuality at the level of immigration policy, but also by racialized ejection from citizenship rights and direct exposure to the state of exception in the unmediated form of the internment camp.

For black people in Canada, early experiences of family were over-determined by the sexualized violence central to the operations of slavery. As in the United States, the experiences of both black women and black men were marked by sexualized violence and coerced reproduction (Das Gupta 169, McKittrick 113). Smith links the sexualized violence experienced by black women in the transatlantic slave trade to the sexual colonization of Indigenous peoples: both populations were constructed as inherently rapeable, while, paradoxically, their status as property meant that their rapes did not count as rapes (Smith 16). The biopolitical managements of race, gender, and sexuality for peoples of colour thus reveal how the nuclear family emerged as a site for the erasure of

¹⁶ See Das Gupta 161-162.

the long histories of peoples of colour in Canada and the production of whiteness and the white family as central to the Canadian nation.

Overt restrictions on the entry of racialized women into Canada were lifted after the First World War, yet gendered immigration policies continue the biopolitical management of family life for many peoples of colour (Das Gupta 161, Dua “Beyond Diversity” 235, 245, Thobani 134-135). Perhaps no case better illustrates how whiteness remains central to the nation’s conception of the family than the racialized gendering of migrant domestic labour in Canada. In the early 1900s, it was common for single, white, working class women to arrive in Canada as domestic workers. Rather than being conceived of as temporary sojourners, these women were encouraged to marry and settle in Canada (Das Gupta 164); their work as domestics acted only as a stepping-stone for their entry into the Canadian national family. Since the 1960s, the racialized character of domestic work in Canada has shifted. Women of colour, particularly from the Caribbean and the Philippines, are now predominantly targeted to fulfill the demand for domestic labour in privileged Canadian households. Similar to how Asian male laborers were treated in the early phases of nation-building, these women are conceived of as temporary sojourners (164), demonstrating how Canadian settler colonialism continues to be produced by mixing the labour of peoples of colour with Indigenous land for the economic benefit of white settler populations. Denied the right to have their own families by restrictions upon their conditions of employment, migrant domestic workers are expected to aid in the reproduction of white Canadian families (167). Their own family concerns are treated as irrelevant or undesirable (Dua, “Beyond Diversity 246), indicating the ongoing racialization of the Canadian family as white.

In addition to exploiting the labour of peoples of colour while exerting biopolitical control over their sexualities and family lives, settler colonialism functioned to break up Indigenous communities and families to ensure settler access to the land (Thobani 118). Morgensen employs the phrase “settler sexuality” to describe how the biopolitics of settlement produced a “white national heteronormativity that regulates Indigenous sexuality and gender by supplanting them with the sexual modernity of settler subjects” (“Settler Homonationalism” 106). Colonial interests sought ways to enforce patriarchal European norms while disrupting traditional Indigenous family forms (Dua, “Beyond Diversity” 243). Early on, missionaries were sent to Indigenous communities to impose Western norms of family and marriage (K. Anderson 83), while white “field matrons” targeted Indigenous women for reeducation into gendered and sexualized roles as subservient wives in heteropatriarchy (83). The introduction and enforcement of patriarchal norms in Indigenous communities helped disrupt community stewardship of land by imposing individual, male-dominated ideas of property (84). Following Confederation, the biopolitical management of Indigenous family life became a normalized function of the Canadian government, targeting Indigenous women through the Indian Act and children through the residential school system (Thobani 119) and the child welfare system (Thobani 119, Dua, “Beyond Diversity” 244).

Enforced by Indian Act legislation (Lawrence 106), the residential school system in Canada played a central role in a genocidal logic of attempted elimination from the 1890s to the 1980s. The system operated to break up Indigenous families and impose European cultural norms (Lawrence 106, Das Gupta 152). Systemic corporeal and sexualized violence marked the residential school experience (K. Anderson 93, Das Gupta 152), playing biopolitical and disciplinary functions for the advancement of

settlement. The widespread loss of language, culture and oral tradition in Indigenous communities is a direct result of the residential school system (Lawrence 106), as was the widespread and genocidal loss of life (Lawrence 106, Smith 40). Physical and sexual abuse prolonged the genocidal impact of the schools, creating generational echoes of its effects in Indigenous communities in the forms of alcoholism, addiction, abuse, depression, suicide, and violence (Das Gupta 154, Lawrence 106). Girls were specifically targeted for sexual humiliation and shaming (92), ensuring that sexualized violence operated in gendered ways to disrupt women's traditional power and sexual agency as part of a process of enforcing patriarchal norms.

In 1951, a change to the Indian Act granted child protective services jurisdiction over reserves, making possible a shift in the biopolitical management of Indigenous families (Lawrence 37). As residential schools were phased out in the 1960s and 70s, child protective services stepped in (Thobani 122, Das Gupta 155), continuing the project of seizing children from their families in what came to be known as the "sixties scoop" (Lawrence 37).¹⁷ Despite national mythologies of child welfare reflecting a "child's best interests," decisions made about the "welfare" of Indigenous children reflected racist, colonial attitudes (Lawrence 113; Thobani 109, 122; Das Gupta 156). Thobani emphasizes how this process was gendered as well as racialized:

Colonial stereotypes about [Indigenous] women, ubiquitous in a society which had for generations already depicted them as sexually promiscuous and morally deficient, lent support to the apprehension of their children. Native communal living and extended family structures within Native communities were defined as promoting immorality and primitivity, and their child-rearing practices were condemned in the exaltation of the middle-class, nuclear Canadian family as the national norm (Thobani 123).

¹⁷ For more on the impacts of the "sixties scoop," see Lawrence 113 and Das Gupta 155.

The child welfare system exposed Indigenous children to sexual abuse, racism within white families, exploitation as labour, loss of language, loss of Indian status (Lawrence 114), and disconnection from community (105), effects shockingly similar to the impacts of the residential school system. Ultimately, the child welfare system helped track many Indigenous people toward the prison industrial complex (PIC), contributing to the overrepresentation of Indigenous peoples in the prison system (Monture-Angus 193). Concealed behind a discourse of protection and aid, child welfare has operated to continue the genocidal impacts of colonialism, a process aptly described by Thobani as the “warlike impulse of the nation’s compassion” (Thobani 129).

The beginnings of the Indian Act, as a feature of colonial law, first appeared as part of the gendered crisis of whiteness in the fur trade (Lawrence 49). In 1850, the colonial government passed a law giving itself the authority to define who was and was not “Indian” (27). The establishment of legislation to name and categorize “Indianness” was a crucial moment in the assertion of colonial authority over Indigenous populations (27). The category “Indian” was brought into being through the violence of colonial law, effacing hundreds of distinct nations that pre-existed colonialism while replacing them with the constructed category of the “Indian” (Thobani 38). Bonita Lawrence refers to this process as the “colonial dismembering and reordering of Indigenous peoples’ identities” (27). The Indian Act must therefore be understood as a biopolitical tool of settlement, managing and manufacturing identity in order to disrupt Indigenous peoples’ ties to traditional community and nation, dismantle their connections to traditional land bases, and divide them along state-drawn lines of identities and rights.

The Indian Act is a deeply gendered and sexualized piece of legislation, operating to politically disempower Indigenous women in order to facilitate the process of

dispossession and land takeover (49).¹⁸ Indigenous women are targeted for loss of status through the Act's various incarnations.¹⁹ Changes to the Indian Act contained in Bill C-31 in 1985 were touted as removing gender-based discrimination, yet these changes operate in complicated ways to maintain the project of genocide by attempted elimination.²⁰ One of the primary effects of the biopolitical management of Indigenous populations through the Indian Act is elimination through assimilation, or what Lawrence calls the "bleeding off" of people from Indigenous communities. The effects of the Indian Act's gendered policies of elimination have been devastating for Indigenous communities (56), particularly through a "bleeding off" that occurred for 116 years (55). The second-generation cut-off rule contained within Bill C-31 ensures the continuation of this process (64). In addition to the people who lost Indian status due to gendered discriminations in the Indian Act, there are entire groups of Indigenous peoples in Canada who were never recognized under the Indian Act to begin with.²¹ Meanwhile, Indian Act policies have forced communities to adopt government forms based on Western, rather than Indigenous, values of leadership (33), while subdividing reserve land into private lots in what Lawrence describes as a "central attack on the collective nature of landholding" (33). Indigenous communities are fractured; the current situation is marked by

the presence, across Canada, of over six hundred tiny, almost landless entities known as the First Nations, the only Native communities recognized as legally existing according to the Indian Act. These scattered communities, occupying only fragments of their original land base, exist alongside an ever-growing body

¹⁸ The tactic of politically disempowering Indigenous women to facilitate colonialism traces its history to the treaty process, in which Britain only negotiated with Indigenous men as a means to negate women's traditional responsibility for the land (Lawrence 46).

¹⁹ See Regulating Native Identity by Gender in Lawrence (2004).

²⁰ See Lawrence 64-67.

²¹ See Lawrence, 82-97.

of urban, dispossessed individuals with no land base at all, whose ties to their communities of origin have been weakened and in some cases obscured (239).

It is clear that, through the Indian Act, the biopolitics of settlement continues, unabated, to carry out of a genocidal logic of attempted elimination,²² which operates hand-in-hand with the erasure of the histories of peoples of colour in Canada and the continued exploitation of racialized labor in order to maintain the centrality of white heterosexuality to Canadian national belonging.

Queer Collusions, Settler Homonationalisms, and Trans-Anarchisms

To say that the white, heterosexual family is centralized as the privileged site of belonging to the Canadian nation is to flag not only the interlocking biopolitical processes of white supremacy and settler colonialism, but also the ways in which Canadian citizenship is (hetero)sexualized. The white heterosexual family (re)produces the nation, which is to say that white heterosexuality is national sexuality. The position of queer subjects within the Canadian nation is complicated. To extrapolate from the heterosexualization of the nation to say that queers are excluded from national belonging would be inaccurate, as queer subjects regularly ply ties to the nation through adherence to norms of class, race, and gender. Thobani notes that gendered and classed stratification has always existed among nationals, yet participation in the settler project brings tangible rewards that unite white nationals across gender and class lines in shared racial and national interests (Thobani 83). The rewards of participation in the white supremacist,

²² Despite these challenges, Indigenous peoples continue to resist the ongoing project of settler colonialism in Canada. Reviving pre-colonial confederacies and creating new confederacies “as a response to specific conditions created *by* colonization” (Lawrence 240) may represent an effective avenue for overcoming the damages wrought by the Indian Act. See also Alfred (1999).

settler colonial Canadian nation are increasingly available to queers, particularly white, middle-class, cisgender queers. Today, certain queers in Canada get married, create queer versions of nuclear families, join the military and the police force, and participate in the ongoing violence of the nation-state. As Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile put it:

Some queers – but only some – are now being included in the fabric of the “nation” and the “national security” mobilized in its defense. In the context of the national security state and the war on terror, some queers (usually white, middle-class men) are now defending national security against a series of “others” (including people of Arab descent and Muslims in Canada), against global justice and anti-capitalist protestors, against people living in poverty, against prostitutes and hustlers, and against groups of queer people such as queers of colour, queers living in poverty, and young queers (xvii).

Participation in the violence of the white supremacist, settler colonial nation allows certain queers to claim full national belonging, along with its associated rewards.

Contemporary queer participation in the Canadian nation is marked by a complicated history of exclusion and exposure to the exception. Kinsman and Gentile examine the Canadian national security campaign against homosexuals in the 1950s and 60s, noting that the Cold War era was as much about “pushing back and weakening the struggles of working-class and oppressed peoples” (22) as it was about Western capitalism and US Empire. Sexual and gender regulation were central to this project, which sought to reestablish heteropatriarchal relations after WWII (23). In this context, queers became constructed as threats to national security akin to communists, as both “transgressed sexual, class, social, and political boundaries” (8). Rather than representing an isolated period of oppression, the “Canadian Cold War on queers” (1) was organized through laws criminalizing homosexuality, including a 1953 amendment to the Criminal Code section on criminal sexual psychopaths (CSPs) that allowed the state to designate queer men convicted of “buggery” and “gross indecency” as CSPs (73) and subject them

to indefinite detention (72). The criminalization of homosexuality allowed the national security campaign against queers to be organized through police coercion and violence (2), criminal charges, interrogation and surveillance (8), immigration exclusions (74), and the compilation of lists of confirmed and suspected homosexuals by the RCMP that reached 9000 names by 1967-68 (3). By the 1970s, the campaign had extended to the surveillance of gay and lesbian organizations (245). The particular attention paid to groups working in solidarity with anti-racist and anti-colonial struggles (251) demonstrates how queers of colour appear particularly threatening to the nation-state. As an ideological “practice of knowledge production” (4), the Canadian national security campaign against queers constructed queerness as a threat to the nation (42) while (re)constructing heterosexuality as loyal, safe, and in the nation’s interests (24).

The organization of national security campaigns demonstrates how discourses of national security make citizenship tenuous (44). National security is seen as overriding rights to privacy, while citizens who are deemed to be security risks may be subjected to interrogation or surveillance (44). Kinsman and Gentile suggest that access to full citizenship rights in the Canadian nation depends not only upon birth to the nation or upon legal citizenship itself, but also upon perceived loyalty to the state (44). Loyalty, as national security campaigns attest, is defined according to whether one’s race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, or culture are constructed as within the national interests at any given historical moment. The surveillance techniques of the “war on queers” extend and continue in the “war on terror,” (431), in which certain queers now demonstrate their loyalty to the Canadian nation by colluding in a national security campaign targeting Muslim and Arab peoples (433), among others. In the war on queers, a discourse of national security produced heterosexuality as the centre of a Canadian nation that needed

defending from a homosexual “other;” current campaigns produce whiteness, capitalist interests and Christianity as the centre, and peoples of colour, Muslims and Arabs, and even protestors, as those who must be defended against (432). It is accurate to say that national security campaigns, in (re)producing the logic of insiders and outsiders and aggressively defending the former against the latter, are intimately wrapped up in the process of (re)producing citizenship as a racialized, gendered, and (hetero)sexualized construct. As the 2002 rendition of Canadian citizen Maher Arar to Syria brutally demonstrates, citizenship rights, for some more than others, can easily be stripped away.

In the context of the US “war on terror,” Jasbir K. Puar develops her theory of homonationalism as “collusion between homosexuality and American nationalism” (*Terrorist Assemblages* 39). She notes an historic transition in terms of the relationship between nation-states and queer subjects. In ways intimately bound to the Canadian national security campaign against queers, queers in the US were previously seen as “traitors to the nation, figures of espionage and double agents, associated with communists during the McCarthy era” (xxiii) and as “figures of death” (xii) in the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Yet queers, or at least those queers capable of fulfilling “homonormative ideologies that replicate narrow racial, class, and gender national ideals” (xxv), are now finding inclusion in nationalist projects. White queers become sanctioned figures of the nation only insofar as they are demarcated from other subjects exposed to death; non-white queers become increasingly marked for death, as the (white) homonational is juxtaposed to the figure of the terrorist as a “queer, nonnational, perversely racialized other” (37). In other words, homonationalism describes how certain queer subjects come to be included in nationalist projects and to ply ties of national

belonging precisely through (re)producing racialized, gendered, and sexualized Others as national threats worthy of exposure to violence, death, and the exception.

Morgensen extends Puar's notion of homonationalism to a consideration of settler colonialism, interpreting homonationalism in the United States as "an effect of U.S. queer modernities forming amid the conquest of Native peoples and the settling of Native land" ("Settler Homonationalism" 105). Settlement and its naturalization paved the way for the emergence of modern queer sexualities (110), making settler queers, and in particular white settler queers, the modern inheritors of the sexual colonization of Indigenous peoples (111). While the gendered discipline in residential schools operated as a terrorizing violence that made traditional Indigenous non-binary gender identities unthinkable (116), certain modern queer subjects appropriate two-spirit identity as a means of proving settler citizenship by indigenizing the self through an incorporation of an identity imagined as primitive and lost (119). Settler homonationalism thus describes how "queer movements ... naturalize settlement and assume a homonormative and national form" (106). Concerned with settler homonationalism and the incorporation of non-Indigenous queers within settler colonial projects, Morgensen calls queers to "denaturalize settler colonialism in all its forms" (121) and align their politics with all who have stakes in "theorizing life beyond settler colonialism" (123). While Morgensen is primarily concerned with settler homonationalism in the US, his work easily applies to the Canadian context.

Current theories of homonationalism rarely include trans struggles as anything more than a tokenized and silenced "T" within an LGBTQ acronym that more accurately represents cisgender queer experience. Nonetheless, trans movements have recently begun to assume a stance reminiscent of settler homonationalism. Mainstream trans

activism follows a legacy of gay and lesbian and civil rights activism, framing trans liberation within state-defined frameworks (Spade 79).²³ This move attempts to convince trans and gender non-conforming peoples that an end to oppression can be found through an intensified relationship with the state. Hate crime legislation is centralized in this discourse, despite the fact that “hate crime enhancements ignore the roots of harm, do not act as deterrents, and reproduce the force of the PIC, which produces more, not less harm” (Stanley 3). Following anti-racist critiques of antidiscrimination legislation in the US, Dean Spade argues that struggles that focus on antidiscrimination laws and hate crime legislation individualize the problem of oppression while failing to address the systemic and administrative organization of violence (Spade 29). Meanwhile, “all the daily disparities in life chances that shape our world along lines of race, class, indigeneity, disability, national origin, sex and gender remain untouchable and affirmed as non-discriminatory or even as fair” (85). Agamben warns that it is through the language of rights that the modern nation-state gains ever more control over bare life (*Homo Sacer* 121). The push for trans liberation through legislation frames trans struggles within state forms that serve to increase, rather than reduce, the state’s biopolitical hold on our genders, while feeding a “criminal justice system [that] was founded on and constantly reproduces ... racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, ableism, [and] xenophobia” (Spade 87-88). Not only does this move fail to challenge the power of white

²³ For example, in 2010, trans activism in Canada turned toward advocacy for Bill C-389, which sought to “include gender identity and gender expression as prohibited grounds of discrimination” (Bill C-389) in the Canadian Human Rights Act and amend the Canadian Criminal Code to secure hate crime enhancements for assaults predicated on gender identity or expression. Bill C-389 died in March 2011 as a result of an election call, only to be reintroduced as Bill C-279 in September 2012. At the time of this writing, the bill remains to be decided upon.

supremacist settler colonialism by naturalizing the settler state as a central feature of trans liberation, it also fails to attack the roots of trans oppression itself.

When trans and gender non-conforming peoples ally themselves with the PIC, they implicitly ally themselves with one of the key institutions that manages and organizes violence against transpeople. In relation to cispeople, transpeople are disproportionately incarcerated (Stanley 5). Meanwhile, trans lives are criminalized (Namaste, *Sex Change* 13, 15, 38; *Invisible Lives* 248) through laws that interlock with systems of racism, classism and misogyny, exposing some transpeople to greater risk of incarceration and state violence than others. Incarcerated according to “biological” sex (155), trans prisoners are regularly subjected to gendered and sexualized violence (Spade 89) and denied access to trans-specific healthcare (Namaste, *Sex Change* 39). As Spade points out, the PIC “uses gender-based sexual violence as one of its daily tools of discipline against people of all genders” (Spade 90), a system to which trans prisoners are especially vulnerable. Violence against trans, queer and gender non-conforming prisoners is a normalized aspect of incarceration within an institution that is not merely a product of, but also “produces the gender binary and heteronormativity itself” (Stanley 6). Violence against queer and trans bodies is a normalized part of the PIC’s disciplinary operations. Recognizing this, some trans and queer scholars increasingly argue that “prison abolition must be one of the centers of trans and queer liberation struggles” (3).

Though few theories exist that examine the *cisgendering* of the nation, I argue that national belonging is conditioned as cisgender in Canada. In the fields of feminist and trans studies, much attention has focused on the gendering declarations of doctors in prenatal ultrasound chambers and maternity wards. Speech acts like “It’s a girl!” or “It’s a boy!” have been theorized as the moments in which binary gender and compulsory

cisgendering first seize control over bodies and subjectivities. For Eric A. Stanley, this moment of gendering is intimately tied to the state's violent management of queer and trans bodies. We are "born into a web of surveillance" (Stanley 7), with the initial act of gendering announcing the commencement of a disciplinary system of binary gender that tracks many trans and gender non-conforming individuals toward the PIC (Stanley 7; Spade 89). While trans studies tends to view this moment of gendering as the entry of individuals into *social* systems of gender, Stanley's analysis underscores the *institutional* and *biopolitical* nature of the "It's a boy/girl" declaration. Swiftly following a birth, this gendering declaration is entered into a registry and becomes a political fact of the individual – a "fact" that is virtually inescapable and unalterable, to which the experiences of transpeople trying to change "legal" sex attest.²⁴ Agamben points out that birth in biopolitics, on a particular territory or to particular parents (*Homo Sacer* 129), immediately becomes national belonging (128); a trans analysis of citizenship reveals how birth to the nation is always and immediately *cisgendered*. To be born into the nation is to be (cis)gendered by the nation, to the degree that recognition of a subject *as a subject* by the nation is predicated upon recognition of the subject as cisgender. To put it plainly, trans oppression begins with the state and continues to be carried out by the state as a normalized function of its biopolitical organization.

While mainstream LGBTQ movements attempt to convince trans and gender non-conforming peoples that liberation lies within state forms, I contend that it is state forms themselves that organize trans oppression. In 2010, Transgender Day of Remembrance

²⁴ See The Administration of Erasure: The Bureaucracy of Legal Sex, a Vicious Cycle of Administration, and HIV/AIDS in Quebec in Namaste (2000).

(TDOR) organizers in Ottawa planned a kick-off ceremony and Canadian flag raising at the headquarters of the Ottawa Police Service. According to organizer Amanda Ryan, “This is history in the making because [transpeople] have never had that kind of recognition the police are giving us” (Ryan, qtd. in Fagan). While Ryan and other TDOR organizers in Ottawa attempted to sell police “recognition” as a victory, the police served up a brutal reminder that the criminal (in)justice system has long “recognized” trans and gender non-conforming peoples as appropriate targets for state violence. They brutally arrested two activists for hanging a banner reading “Remember Stonewall?” over a freeway overpass during the march, subjecting one of the activists to a strip search “in a room with 5 or 6 cops, who were both male- and female-bodied” (Fierce and Fabulous Krew). In other words, the Ottawa police used gendered and sexualized violence to punish trans activists for daring to remind the Ottawa trans community of ongoing histories of state violence directed at trans and queer peoples.

State-sanctioned, legislation-based strategies for trans liberation fail to protect trans people from state violence. I am therefore writing against state-assimilationist strategies for trans liberation, and toward a theory of trans liberation as *trans-anarchism*, or as a specifically trans rejection of the white supremacist, settler colonial state. An effective and accountable trans-anarchist movement in Canada must work to oppose and dismantle the Canadian settler colonial state, denaturalize settlement within trans and queer communities, resist homonationalism(s), abolish prisons and the PIC, fight for gender justice, and articulate its demands as deeply intertwined with struggles against racism, colonialism, neoliberalism, capitalism, imperialism, borders, national security campaigns, and the “war on terror.” As queers and trans peoples, we must see our liberation as tied up with the liberation of all peoples subjected to violence as a condition

of the existence of the Canadian nation, and answer Smith's call to "think beyond the nation-state as the appropriate form of governance for the world" (Smith 184).

Exalted Insiders, Exceptional Outsiders, and the Outsider Within

The theory of the state of exception refers to the use of law to suspend law, appearing as the "legal form of what cannot have legal form" (Agamben, *State of Exception* 1). Linked to notions of martial law, state of emergency, or state of siege (4), the state of exception is commonly theorized as coming into being as "state power's immediate response to the most extreme internal conflicts" (2) and involves "a suspension of the juridical order itself, [defining] law's threshold or limit concept" (4). The suspension of law does not imply its abolition, however. The normal order still exists; in fact, the state of exception relies upon its existence to function (33). Mike Larsen & Justin Piché employ Richard V. Ericson's concept of counter-law to demonstrate how the exception exists as a normalized operation of law in which the use of law, rather than its absence, suspends law (Larsen & Piché 205). Counter-law refers to "laws against law" (Ericson 24) that find their official expression in the state of exception (26). Contrary to what its name suggests, the state of exception is not exceptional. Many contemporary democratic states employ permanent states of exception as central components of their operations (Agamben, *State of Exception* 2), including the production of indefinite detentions through the USA Patriot Act in the United States (3) and security certificates in Canada. Judith Butler demonstrates how indefinite detentions in the context of the US "war on terror" construct the state of emergency as indefinite (Butler 63), and therefore serve to normalize and naturalize the exception. This normalization extends beyond national borders, as the Geneva Convention provides protections only to combatants of

recognized nation-states (86). The political violence of colonized peoples becomes politically illegible in this formulation; discourses of terrorism are deployed to define it, thus setting out a normalized state of exception in which landless peoples have no rights (88). A normalized logic of exception increasingly governs the world (Razack 6).

As justification for its existence, the state of exception employs the concept of “necessity,” often framed in terms of national security or defense of the nation-state. “Necessity,” of course, is far from objective; it “clearly entails a subjective judgment, [so] that obviously the only circumstances that are necessary and objective are those that are declared to be so” (Agamben, *State of Exception* 30). We might say that the declaration of the state of exception operates as a performative: in declaring the necessity of the suspension of the juridical order or in enacting counter-law measures that suspend the law, states bring about a space of law outside law in which people are stripped of rights and become *homo sacer*. If a discourse of necessity justifies the state of exception, we might ask what the relationship is between necessity and the state of exception in the white supremacist, settler colonial context? Thobani argues that, in the “war on terror,” Muslim and Arab peoples are exposed to a state of exception in Canada through erosions and suspensions of citizenship rights (Thobani 242), thus “reshaping the meaning of Canadian nationality and citizenship” (221). I contend that what Thobani reads as a reshaping of Canadian citizenship represents only an extension of its normalized operations. As the remainder of this chapter will demonstrate, the state of exception functions as a normalized and foundational element of settler colonialism, so that exceptionality is *always* and *already* necessary to settler colonial projects. Understandings of belonging in the settler nation need to take into account the intimate

and interlocking relationships between citizenship and exception. The former, I contend, cannot come into being without employing the latter as its foundation.

Canadian citizenship is produced not only through the process of exaltation, but also, and necessarily, through a process of abjection that exposes “Othered” populations to a normalized state of exception as outsiders. Outsiders are constructed as devoid of the national qualities said to characterize insiders, and thus become positioned as threats to the nation (4). Defining who the nation’s outsiders are is a slippery project, as the lines between insider and outsider shift temporally and contextually. Nonetheless, one thing is clear: in the Canadian context of ongoing settlement, outsiders are all those who appear as threats to the project of white supremacist, settler colonialism. For insiders, inclusion in the nation carries profound rewards, including inheritance of the settler colonial project and access to rights that elevate citizens above all others. For outsiders, abjection has profound consequences: they are exposed daily to the “sophisticated surveillance techniques, the pervasive border control technologies, and the exclusionary mechanisms deployed against them” (5-6). If citizens, as Hannah Arendt puts it, are subjects imbued with the “right to have rights” (Arendt 296), then the production of citizenship requires a mirrored production of subjects who *do not* have the right to have rights.

The irony of the construction of insiders and outsiders in the production of Canadian citizenship is that the subjects constructed as outsiders are always outsiders *within*, while the subjects constructed as insiders might more accurately be described as outsiders. A long history of restrictive acts mediating the entry of peoples of colour into Canada (Thobani 90), along with the erasure of Canada’s role in the transatlantic slave trade and of black Canadian histories (what Katherine McKittrick refers to as the “careful landscaping of blackness out of the nation” (McKittrick 96)), helps manufacture the

abiding myth that peoples of colour are newcomers to the nation (Thobani 91). The introduction of state policies of multiculturalism in the 1960s allowed designations of “visible minority” and “immigrant,” or hyphenated designations of national belonging, to construct peoples of colour as perpetual outsiders (76). Multiculturalism operates to manage the tensions between the presence of peoples of colour in Canada, the ongoing need for exploitable racialized labour in settler colonialism, and the centrality of whiteness to conceptions of the Canadian nation, keeping the categories of insider and outsider in place while offering tenuous national belonging to certain peoples of colour.²⁵

According to Thobani, “the racialized category of immigrant ... paradoxically helps sustain the myth of the nation as homogenous, by constructing as perpetual strangers those to whom the category is assigned” (76). The contemporary crisis of immigration in the West is a racial crisis (72). The “persons-on-the-move” (72) that appear so frighteningly at the borders of the white supremacist, settler colonial nation are racialized subjects; white subjects, with a few historic exceptions, have long enjoyed freedom of movement on a global scale (72). Manufactured through white supremacist histories of colonization and capitalism, this “crisis” raises provocative questions about the relationships between insiders and outsiders. As Thobani’s writes:

Relations between citizens and their Others ... were forged in the labyrinth of the global market economy, binding slave and master, colonizer and colonized, developed and underdeveloped, North and South together in a vice that has not loosened much in the current phase of globalization ... It might well be asked, then, what makes a Chinese woman, who sews a shirt in a Chinese factory that sells for three dollars on the streets of Vancouver, a stranger when she presents herself at the Canadian border as a migrant? Is not the relationship between the nation of consuming citizens and this woman ... an intimate one? (71-72).

²⁵ See also Thobani 143-175; Srivastava (2007); Henry and Tator (1999).

Strangers who present at Canada's borders, as well as the "absented presence" (Walcott xiii) of black peoples and the "visible minority" citizens who find tenuous inclusion within the nation, are not outsiders at all. Rather, non-Indigenous peoples of colour must be understood as outsiders within – constructed as outside or only tenuously inside the nation, yet intimately and historically bound to it through ongoing histories of settlement, slavery, colonization, globalization, capitalism, neoliberalism, and empire.

Indigenous peoples constitute the original "outsiders within" in the settler colonial nation. They are centrally featured in the process of abjection that produces Canadian citizenship, as their exposure to a normalized state of exception through the logic of attempted elimination founds the Canadian nation. The production of Canadian citizenship constructs the Indigenous subject as outsider, yet the Indigenous subject is the original occupant of the land, or the original "insider" (Thobani 74). There is a curious flop that takes place here, in which those who might best be read as insiders become outsiders and vice versa. The white stranger, who arrives at the shores of the land, constructs himself as the land's only legitimate insider, first as colonizer and then as citizen. Meanwhile, the Indigenous person – she who is literally indigenous to the land – becomes strange; she becomes a stranger in her own "Native land." The process of transforming white outsiders into exalted insiders operates through the category of racialized immigrant as much as through the construction of Indigenous peoples as outsiders; in calling non-white subjects immigrants, the fact that white subjects arrived as part of European migration and settlement is effaced (Thobani 184). The erasure of the transatlantic slave trade and of almost 500 years of black history (Walcott 22) from national mythologies demonstrates how the process further operates through the invisibility/hyper-visibility of blackness in Canada (36). The Canadian citizen, the

Canadian nation, and settler colonialism itself become naturalized, as though all three belong to and arise out of the land they violently occupy. This flop is made possible by racialized discourses of colonialism, including discourses of “civilization” and “culture clash” that repeat in the “war on terror” (Razack 10), and through racial hierarchies naturalized in legal discourse as far back as *The Code Noir* in New France (McKittrick 112). Canadian whiteness only comes to know itself (and to know itself as belonging to the nation) by constructing itself through and against its racialized, abjected Others.

Citizenship in Canada has a “triangulated formation” (Thobani 75) that marks the relationships between exalted white citizen-nationals, peoples of colour, and Indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples in the settler nation, as we have seen, are marked for cultural, physical, and spiritual genocide (75) through the logic of elimination that attempts to vanish them from the land through extermination and assimilation. Non-Indigenous peoples of colour have an ambiguous relationship to Canadian citizenship, at times tenuously included within the nation as citizens, and at other times excluded, erased, or cast from it. “Visible minority” citizens float ambiguously in this formation, officially granted the rights of citizens, yet disproportionately subject to criminalization, incarceration, and surveillance, and perpetually at risk of abjection from the nation as the WWII internment of citizens of Japanese descent brutally demonstrates. White citizen-nationals hold privileged access to citizenship as the intended subjects of national belonging. Class, gender, and sexuality cut across these categories; individuals become differentially distributed in relation to Canadian citizenship and the normalized state of exception according to their racialized, gendered, classed, and sexualized position within a system that produces white, heterosexual, middle-class, cisgender masculinity as central to national belonging.

To call the state of exception a normalized and necessary aspect of the production of Canadian citizenship is to call attention to two complementary processes. Firstly, it is to call attention to the fact that the production of citizenship *requires* the production of insiders and outsiders, and thus requires the production of populations with the “right to have rights” (Arendt 296) constructed against populations *without* the right to have rights. It is precisely *through* the production of Indigenous peoples and peoples of colour as populations that are variously excluded, erased, eliminated, assimilated, tenuously included, or exposed to the state of exception that white subjects are *produced* as the ideal citizens of Canada, and thus how citizenship itself is produced. Secondly, it is to call attention to the fact that the state of exception operates as a *condition* of settler colonialism, and thus as a condition of the existence of Canadian citizenship. As a settler colonial nation, Canada assumes, as a condition of its existence, the presence of outsiders (colonized Indigenous peoples) *within* the nation. The outsider is *already* and *always* inside the settler colonial nation. It is thus accurate to say that in the settler colonial context, the “stranger” is not only, and not originally, she who arrives at the borders of the nation seeking entrance or she who is enslaved to build the nation. The stranger is also, and more importantly, she who preexists the nation’s borders, *preexists the nation itself*, and does so on the lands claimed as (stolen by) the nation. The stranger, or outsider, thus exists both as a condition of the nation (as she who must be colonized and exposed to the exception in order to found the nation) and she whose enduring presence requires a perpetual redrawing of the boundaries between insider and outsider that keep citizenship, and thus nation, intact. Regardless of where these lines lie at any given moment, what is clear is that the state of exception functions as the dark underside of Canadian citizenship. Canadian citizenship cannot exist without the exception; it produces it even as it is

produced by it. In the production of Canadian citizenship, no subject is safe from the exception, yet all subjects are differently located in relation to it based on their gender, race, class, sexuality, and nationality.

Chapter 3

Loyal Dissent: The White Settler Citizen-Subject

in G20 Resistance Narratives

In June 2010, the Group of Twenty Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors (G20) gathered in Toronto for a summit meeting to discuss matters of global economy. While representatives of the most powerful world economies met behind 6.5km of 3-foot-high security fence (Smith & Cowen 30), more than 15,000 demonstrators (30) gathered outside this so-called “Yellow Zone.” The Toronto Police Service (TPS) played a key role in G20 security, yet the operation was overseen by the Integrated Security Unit (ISU), a “shadowy new security umbrella group ... first established to coordinate anti-terrorist [sic] security for the Vancouver Olympics in February 2010” (36). With an unprecedented security budget of \$1 billion (39) and an estimated 19,000 police and security officers present (36), the stage was set for confrontation. The “script was effectively pre-written” (39), as the mainstream media fed sensationalist stories to the public about impending violence. Ultimately, onlookers were not to be disappointed: anti-capitalist direct actions undertaken by a modest-sized black bloc on June 26 produced reams of footage of burning police cars and shattering glass. Immediately following these events, police commenced what Smith & Cowen describe as a scripted and pre-planned “police riot” (40). In the largest mass arrest to have occurred in Canadian history at that time,²⁶ 1,118 people (or more²⁷) were rounded up and imprisoned within a temporary detention centre at 629 Eastern Avenue. Insulated from the brutality playing out on the

²⁶ As of May 25 2012, over 2,500 people had been arrested in the Montreal student strike of 2012 (Banerjee). As of the time of this writing, the strike is ongoing.

²⁷ It is likely that as many as 1,140 people were arrested, but incomplete paperwork makes it difficult to know for sure (McNeilly xi).

streets by the walls of “Fortress Toronto,” G20 delegates decided the fates of the world’s rich and poor while shaking hands for PR photographs.

It is accurate to say that people on the streets of Toronto were exposed to a state of exception during the G20 weekend that was seemingly temporary. Rights guaranteed by national and international law were denied (Des Rosiers 8), while violent, repressive measures were employed to contain and silence dissent against the Summit. This is perhaps best illustrated by an interaction between an animal rights activist and Sgt. Mark Charlebois of the York Regional Police, caught on video on June 27. The activist was stopped on the street by a group of police officers, who demanded to search his bag. In an attempt to exercise the right, protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, to be “secure against unreasonable search or seizure” (art. 1, sec. 8), the young man refused. Charlebois responded, “This ain’t Canada right now ... There is no civil rights here in this area” (Charlebois, qtd. in Baute). As the incredulous laughter of the onlookers in the video attests to, Charlebois’s statement appears nonsensical. Obviously downtown Toronto did not cease to be geographically, legally, and discursively contained within Canada for the duration of the Summit. However, if read as a response to the activist’s assertion that he has rights *because* he’s in Canada, the “sense” of the statement emerges. What Charlebois is saying is that the rights guaranteed by the Canadian constitution have been – temporarily and unofficially – suspended. The activist’s rights are not available for activation. This state of “rightless-ness,” or state of exception, does not exist because Charlebois and the activist are not in Canada; rather, it exists precisely *because* they are in Canada, a nation *founded upon the state of exception*. It is their location within Canada that allows the Ontario government, along with the ISU and the police, to bring into being this particular geographic and temporal organization of the exception. As the exchange

between Charlebois and the activist reveals, the G20 Summit in Toronto brought about the activation of what Agamben identifies as the primary relationship between the nation-state and its citizen: that of the vengeful father to the defiant son (Agamben, *Homo Sacer* 88). The activist finds himself, apparently unexpectedly, to be *homo sacer*, which is precisely who he has potentially been all along (84).

As the Chapter Two demonstrates, a normalized state of exception founds the Canadian settler colonial nation. It marks the ever-shifting divide between insiders and outsiders, between those with the “right to have rights” (Arendt 296) and those without. Razack theorizes the state of exception in the post-9/11 context of security certificates and Islamophobia in Canada, arguing that “because suspensions of the rule of law turn on the logic that normative citizens must be protected from those who threaten the social order, a category to which race gives content, those who consider themselves ‘unmarked’ or original easily find them defensible” (Razack 13). During the Toronto G20, white, heterosexual, cisgender, middle-class Canadian citizens experienced exposure to a state of exception. Thousands of “unmarked” citizens discovered that their rights to free speech and peaceful assembly, and to be safe from unreasonable search and seizure and from arbitrary detention and imprisonment, no longer applied. The unconditional rights of the citizen turn out to be conditional upon the goodwill of the sovereign, precisely in the moment when the citizen attempts to activate rights assumed to already be in operation. This moment might be said to be the same moment in which the citizen becomes the defiant son, raising the question of whether and to what degree rights *ever* truly exist.²⁸ Razack’s assertion that the “unmarked” subject finds the exception defensible raises a

²⁸ Such questions demand further exploration, yet are beyond the scope of this project.

pressing question when read alongside the Toronto G20: what happens when “unmarked” subjects find themselves exposed to an exceptional state that has always existed, yet in relation to which they have previously been benefactors rather than targets?

The “noise” that erupted post-G20 in response to the actions of police and the ISU suggests that the denial of rights came as an unprecedented shock to the “unmarked” subjects among the ranks of protestors, as well as to members of the on-looking public. On June 27, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association released a statement denouncing the widespread arrests at the G20 Summit (CCLA). The following day, thousands of demonstrators gathered outside TPS headquarters to protest the police brutality and repression that occurred. Facebook groups cropped up demanding everything from a public inquiry to the resignation of TPS Chief William Blair. In the months following the Summit, two class action lawsuits were filed on behalf of protestors; one was stayed in August 2011, while the other remains to be decided upon (Small). Ontario Ombudsman André Marin stepped in to investigate the enactment of Ontario Regulation 233/10 under the Public Works Protection Act (PWPA), releasing a scathing report that critiqued the police and the provincial government for the enactment of the PWPA, which “conferred unnecessary and constitutionally suspect police powers in the volatile and confrontational context of inevitable public protest” (Marin 100). In 2011, the CCLA and the National Union of Public and General Employees (NUPGE) released a report based on public hearings held in November 2010, which describes Summit policing as, “a sad and dark moment in Canada’s history” (Clancy 6). This list of events represents only a sampling of the “noise” that followed the G20 in the public domain, which included protests, petitions, public hearings, lawsuits, panel discussions, photographic exhibits,

documentaries, and theatre productions, as well as extensive mainstream and independent media coverage.

This chapter will focus on examining the critiques that emerged in response to the actions of police, the ISU, and the government, which I refer to as “resistance narratives.” I use the phrase resistance narrative not to refer to activist resistance against the G20, but rather to a broad range of narratives produced post-G20, by mainstream, independent and underground media, which express resistance to security measures during the G20. I argue that G20 resistance narratives draw heavily on Canadian nationalism, in the forms of appeals to Canadian citizenship and exaltations of Canada as free and democratic. The nationalist logics embedded within these narratives serve to prop up the white supremacist Canadian settler colonial state, rather than challenge it. I am therefore not primarily interested in what these narratives have to say about resistance to police brutality during the G20. Rather, I suspect that a critical examination and critique of G20 resistance narratives will reveal important insights about the operations of settler colonialism, citizenship, whiteness, white supremacy, and the state of exception in the context of political dissent, ultimately demonstrating severe limitations in the current scope of social justice movements in Canada. G20 resistance narratives provide a site of study for these limitations and failures, which hopefully have the power to open up fresh points of dialogue for activists in North America.

Narrative 1: Patriotic Dissent, or “The Dissent of the Patriot”

On June 26, a group of peaceful protestors was caught behind a line of riot police at the corner of Queen and Spadina in Toronto. Boxed in, they began to sing “Oh Canada.” A white man in a pale t-shirt approached the police and sat down with his back

to them. He sang along, first saluting the anthem and then gesturing to the other protestors to join him. Two other white men and a white woman complied. As the final notes of the anthem rang out, the police charged. The seated individuals struggled to get up, but the man in the pale t-shirt was not fast enough to avoid being struck violently from behind with a riot shield. The police trampled and struck members of the crowd, pursuing them further up the street. Caught on film from numerous angles, the scene swiftly became infamous; within days, the videos went viral on the Internet, earning hundreds of thousands of views.²⁹ The “Oh Canada” moment was cited in dozens of mainstream and independent Canadian news outlets, including [Toronto Star](#), [CTV](#), [The Globe and Mail](#), [Georgia Straight](#), [blogTO](#), [Torontoist](#), [Toronto Media Co-op](#), and [rabble.ca](#).³⁰ A journalist for [The Globe and Mail](#) wrote of the incident:

The defining piece of multimedia from the G20 might just be footage of cops politely waiting for demonstrators to finish singing “O Canada” before charging them. Note to future protestors: singing our national anthem buys you about a minute or so head-start – stretch “We stand on guard for theeeee” as long as you possibly can (El Akkad).

In short, the moment quickly became emblematic of widespread police brutality against demonstrators and repression of lawful dissent during the G20 Summit weekend in Toronto.

It is provocative to note that so many media outlets referenced the “Oh Canada” moment, yet few provided analysis of it. It is as though the video speaks for itself, as though nothing further exists to be said that the footage does not already say. [Rabble.ca](#)

²⁹ One of the first appearances of the incident online was the YouTube video “Peaceful G20 Protest at Queen & Spadina” posted by mkmillard1982 on June 27, 2010. As of May 2012, the video has accumulated nearly 400,000 views.

³⁰ In order, see Rider, CTV News Staff, El Akkad, Hui, Guest Contributor, Topping, Tehowe “Everything is OK,” and Kraus “Police attack crowd.”

journalist Krystalline Kraus provides a single sentence describing the event, and then pens, “I don’t have to say anything more, just watch the video” (Kraus, “Police attack crowd”). David Topping, writing for Torontoist, describes the scene in one sentence and identifies the video’s key moment as, “The whole thing” (Topping). Omar El Akkad’s brief statement in The Globe and Mail, quoted above, may stand as the single most in-depth media analysis of the occurrence. We might therefore ask: why is it that so many journalists, from such a broad range of publications, found the “Oh Canada” moment so noteworthy yet had nothing to say about it? I argue that the reason the media failed to produce a narrative about the “Oh Canada” moment is that the narrative *already exists*: the performance of the Canadian national anthem by a group of (assumedly) Canadian citizens engaged in peaceful civil dissent while trapped by Canadian police, and the subsequent attack of those citizens by the police, *is* the narrative. No explanation is given because, in the eyes of media onlookers, the moment is self-explanatory.

If the “Oh Canada” moment is self-explanatory, what does it explain? The singing of the national anthem by demonstrators, who by all appearances were predominantly white and middle-class, operated as what Thobani refers to as a “rite of nationals” (Thobani 79). The rites of nationals are the means through which “members of the collective perform their own belonging and recognize that of their compatriots” (79). By singing “Oh Canada,” the protestors performed Canadian citizenship. The performance, I argue, operated as an appeal to police to grant Constitutionally protected rights to freedom of speech and peaceful assembly, an appeal that hinged on the logic of citizenship. In evoking citizenship, the protestors evoked the Constitution of Canada, or, more precisely, Section 2 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; they thus further evoked the sworn duty of police officers in Ontario to uphold the Canadian

constitution. Through their performance, the protestors transformed the national anthem into a resistance narrative about policing during the G20 Summit that operated through an exaltation of the Canadian nation as free and democratic and Canadian citizens as politically engaged subjects with the “right to have rights.” The protestors wrote themselves into the narrative as loyal, patriotic subjects exercising their rights to peaceful assembly and free speech precisely *as* acts of patriotic citizenship. In this formulation, the exercise of the *rights* of nationals becomes the performance of the *rites* of nationals. While the dissenting-yet-patriotic citizen appears as the proper inheritor of the right to dissent, repression of all others, in particular outsiders to the nation, is naturalized. The police became constructed as the subjects behaving in a manner unbecoming of Canadians, but only insofar as they behaved vis-à-vis loyal citizen-dissenters.

The decision of the four protestors to sit down with their backs to police further reinforced the nationalist underpinnings of the narrative under construction. They exposed themselves to Canadian police in a display of pacifist vulnerability, which operated as a performance of citizenship through a narrative of peaceful assembly as a right/rite of nationals. They drew upon the logic of Canadian nationalism that literally employs the image of its national police force as a symbol of freedom and democracy. As Elizabeth Furniss points out, Canada’s frontier myth constructs the mounted police as “Canadian heroes [who] do not inflict violence; instead, they impose peace, order, and good government on Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people alike” (Furniss 63), encountering resistance only from criminals. The figure of the benevolent Mountie suggests to Canadians that law-abiding citizens have nothing to fear from the police, and supports the colonial narrative that the violence of the state is right and just. In short, the seated individuals invoked citizenship as a shield against state violence, attempting to

draw on white settler privilege and exaltations of Canada in order to protect themselves from the threatening bristle of batons, shields, and armor-plated riot boots. It was as if the protestors imagined themselves invulnerable, protected and empowered by a citizenship that renders them “beyond the whims and mercies of a tyrannical sovereign, safe from arbitrary infractions” (Thobani 78).

The “Oh Canada” moment appears intriguing to the myriad media outlets that referenced it precisely due to the failure of the nationalist script, and the privileges it attempts to invoke, to protect the protestors. Singing the national anthem failed to protect a group of predominantly white Canadian citizens from the violence of the Canadian state. This failure provides a window into making sense of the public outrage that followed the G20. G20 resistance narratives, including the one contained within the “Oh Canada” moment, centre a particular subject, typically a white, cisgender, middle-class, heterosexual man. This subject is also a Canadian citizen, who, in attending the G20, primarily wanted to exercise his constitutional rights by expressing civil dissent *as an act of loyal citizenship*. What made the G20 shocking to the general public as an event in Canadian history was not actually the violence of police, but rather the target of that violence: this proper Canadian subject. The resistance narratives contained within mainstream and alternative media sought to defend and protect this wounded subject, drawing upon his citizenship and his various raced, classed, and gendered privileges in order to repair a damaged relationship between the Canadian nation-state and its ideal citizen-subject. These observations beg the question of how certain subjects come to feel sufficiently empowered by the state to imagine themselves protected by their citizenship, as well as at whose expense their fantasy of safety is constructed and maintained?

Narrative 2: Unlikely Troublemakers

In the post-G20 climate, *Toronto G20 Exposed* (2010), *Into the Fire* (2011), and *You Should Have Stayed At Home* (2011) emerged as three retrospective documentaries examining what transpired on Toronto's streets in June 2010. Despite different origins as home-produced, independent, and mainstream productions, *Exposed*, *Fire* and *Home* contain similar narratives. Each film valorizes the wounded white male citizen-subject while ignoring or sidelining all others; each seeks to reprimand a police force that has merely "stepped out of line;" each exalts the Canadian state as free and democratic even in the act of speaking against a Toronto police state (presented as temporary, unprecedented and exceptional); finally, each evacuates politics from its discussion of the G20 protests. Absent – in fact erased – from these narratives are the bodies and voices of Indigenous peoples, peoples of colour, queer and trans peoples, poor peoples, migrants and even, for the most part, white women. Thobani points out that the rites of nationals may include "highly ritualized erasures of the presence of minorities in national historiography" (79). By centering a white heterosexual male citizen-subject as the loyal face of lawful dissent, the resistance narratives represented within these films obscure all others and naturalize state violence against them.

As an episode of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's (CBC) The Fifth Estate, *Home* is the most mainstream of the three films. Practically ignoring the broader context of the G20 protests, *Home* profiles five citizen-subjects who have been wounded by their experiences with police during the G20. In the first few seconds of the film, host Gillian Findlay introduces *Home*'s subjects with the words, "They were the most unlikely of troublemakers." The film cuts to interview footage with a young white man, Tommy Taylor, a self-identified "Canadian dude" from Mississauga. "I was not an activist,"

Taylor confesses, “I had never attended a political rally in my life.” If *Home*’s category of “unlikely troublemakers” signifies subjects undeserving of police repression, then the editing of the film swiftly achieves the collapse of this category with white citizen masculinity. Released in February 2011, *Home* has a simple thesis: in Findlay’s words, “There were thousands of them: *ordinary Canadians* on the streets at Toronto’s G20, protesting peacefully until the police shut them down” (emphasis added). While *Home* claims to represent the “thousands” evoked, it actually tells the story of only five individuals. An examination of the five reveals much about the category of “ordinary Canadian,” which I argue is a construct harnessed to national ideals of gender, race, class, and sexuality. Reflecting the role of the CBC as a state agency mandated to promote national unity and identity (De Sousa 135), I argue that the raced, classed, gendered and sexualized “wounded subjects” in *Home* represent Canada’s ideal citizen-subjects.

Besides “Canadian dude” Taylor, *Home* features four other citizen-subjects of Canada: Dorian Barton, Jason MacDonald, Maryse Poisson and John Pruyn. Barton is a 29-year-old white man who, like Taylor, had never attended a political demonstration prior to the G20. He “wandered over [to Queen’s Park] with a friend to have a look” at the protest. Shortly thereafter, police became violent toward those gathered in Queen’s Park. Barton was beaten, dragged, arrested, and imprisoned within the Eastern Detention Centre (EDC). Having suffered a broken arm and a dislocated shoulder, he launched a lawsuit against the TPS. MacDonald is also suing the TPS. He is a 27-year-old white man who works as a carpenter. On June 27, MacDonald became trapped in a police “kettle” while photographing the protests. He was struck in the face with a riot shield, opening a large gash on his forehead, before being arrested. 21-year-old Poisson is the only woman among *Home*’s five citizen-subjects. In a move that effectively contains all difference

within one subject, she is also the only Québécois(e) person interviewed. She addresses the targeting of francophone activists by security forces, describing how she was ID'd repeatedly by belligerent police who called her a "fucking Frenchy" and told her to return to Québec. Early in the morning on June 27, police conducted a warrantless raid on a University of Toronto gym where Québécois(es) activists were staying. Poisson was arrested and taken to the EDC, where she was strip-searched and denied access to legal counsel. *Home* uses Poisson to both express and *contain* difference: though Poisson is a Québécoise woman, as a white settler and a university student expressing an apparently cisgender identity, she remains harnessed to national raced, classed, and gendered ideals.

The most provocative figure in *Home* is Pruyn. In addition to being profiled in *Home*, Pruyn's story is covered in *Exposed* and *Fire*, and in numerous media outlets including the [National Post](#), [Niagara at Large](#), [CBC News](#), [rabble.ca](#), [Toronto Star](#), and even conservative publication [MacLeans](#).³¹ A 57-year-old, middle-class, heterosexual white man, Pruyn is what Findlay calls "no one's idea of a rebel." A Revenue Canada employee and small businessman, Pruyn lost a leg in an accident on his tree farm; he now wears a prosthetic leg. Pruyn had no personal inclination to attend the protests, but wound up in Queen's Park on June 26 as part of a "family weekend." He and his wife were visiting their daughter in Toronto, and decided to "tag along" to the protest. Pruyn and his daughter were seated in Queen's Park when police demanded they move. He was unable to comply with the order swiftly enough. Police set upon him, tearing off his prosthetic leg and dragging him across the concrete. He was arrested and imprisoned within the EDC, where he was denied access to his prosthetic leg and confined to a wheelchair.

³¹ In order, see Vallis, Draper, CBC News, Kraus "G20 activist claims," Contenta, and macleans.ca.

Pruyn did not receive food for the first 12 hours of detention. He has now launched a human rights complaint against police.

As a narrative about policing during the G20, Pruyn's story is both exemplary of and differentiated from widespread accounts of indiscriminate police brutality and repression of dissent. Findlay's identification of Pruyn as "no one's idea of a rebel" hinges on the portrayal of him as a white, middle-class, entrepreneurial, heterosexual family man with a respectable government job. That a subject like Pruyn – a subject who fulfils national ideals of race, class, gender, and sexuality, and whose political participation fits nicely with the narrative of civil dissent as a performance of loyal citizenship – could be brutalized and arrested by Canadian police illustrates the indiscriminate scope of the state of exception activated in Toronto during the Summit. Yet Pruyn's story is also compelling because of the specifically *discriminate* nature of the ableist violence he suffered at the hands of the state. I am interested not only in how Pruyn's experiences speak to how ableist logics permeate policing practices and underwrite the construction of Canadian citizen, but, more importantly, to how white, middle-class, masculine privilege modifies Pruyn's experience in such a way to make him a compelling focal point for media critiques of ableist violence by police. Whose narratives disappear from view in the overwhelming coverage of Pruyn's story?

In *Home*, Pruyn briefly relates the story of another dis/abled man, arrested while passing police in his wheelchair. *Home* never bothers to name the man, or investigate his story further. The media in general made little mention of Gabriel Jacobs, a poor paraplegic man of colour who works as a panhandler. It wasn't until May 2011, when Jacobs filed a human rights complaint against police (Kennedy, "Disabled man"), that media paid token attention to his story. Jacobs did not attend the protests, but, on the

evening of June 26, he paused to retrieve a cigarette butt from the sidewalk near police. Police dragged Jacobs from his chair, arrested him, and left him lying on the concrete floor in the EDC (Kennedy). Jacobs spent two nights imprisoned in the EDC, where police systematically denied his requests for assistance in using the washroom, and for pain medication and treatment for pressure sores. He eventually defecated on himself, and his sores became infected (Kennedy). In March 2012, Jacobs settled his human rights complaint for an undisclosed amount of money, which one of his advocates referred to as “hush money” because it bought immunity for the officers responsible (Gillis). As a narrative about the ableist violence of police, Jacobs’s story has more to tell than Pruyn’s. I argue that Jacobs’s story indicates how racism, classism, and ableism are systems that operate through and mutually constitute one another within the (in)justice system. As Nirmala Ervelles and Andrea Minear put it, “individuals located at the interstices of race, class, gender *and* disability are constituted as non-citizens and (no)bodies” by legal and social institutions (Ervelles & Minear 129). Both men’s experiences brutally demonstrate the ableism built into the operations of Canadian law enforcement, yet they demonstrate *differently* how race and class constitute these operations.

My initial reading of the experiences of Jacobs is complicated and deepened by comparison to those of Emomotimi Azorbo. Azorbo is a 30-year-old deaf black man arrested during the Justice for Our Communities march on June 25. The date of his arrest is notable, as it occurred before the midnight raids on the night of June 25 when police snatched Toronto Community Mobilization Network (TCMN) organizers out of their beds (Kraus, “Police conduct midnight raids”), before anti-capitalist direct actions on June 26, and before the mass arrests of June 26 and 27. I remember Azorbo’s arrest clearly, though I do not know Azorbo and did not witness his arrest. I was part of a crowd

of thousands of demonstrators moving west on College Street on June 25, and happened to be close enough to where the arrest occurred to hear the thunderous chants of “Let him go” from the crowd.³² The moment was notable precisely because of the timing. Though the police presence on the streets had been steadily increasing all week, and though heavily armed riot cops flanked the march on June 25, protestors were still in a nervous limbo, anticipating the police violence to come. Arrests during demonstrations, as of that moment, were rare. Analysis of Azorbo’s arrest must therefore take into account an understanding not only of the context of the G20, but also of the context of the gendered, ableist racism that allowed a young deaf black man to be singled out and arrested during a demonstration at which police showed no general interest in making arrests.

Azorbo was ordered by police to move, yet unable to understand the order as it was not delivered in ASL. Crown attorney Jason Miller claims Azorbo then behaved aggressively toward police, though Azorbo contends he was merely trying to communicate that he was deaf (Yang, “Deaf man cleared”). Azorbo was arrested and taken to the EDC, where he was denied his right to access adequate interpretation. Interpreters subsequently failed to show up at his first two court dates (Yang). While mainstream media in the weeks following the G20 paid sensitive attention to Pruyn and ignored Jacobs, their coverage of Azorbo was tinged with racist and classist undertones. The Toronto Sun notes Azorbo works as kitchen worker, and claims he “[got] into a shoving match with police” before his arrest (Robertson). The Globe and Mail opens a June 26 piece about Azorbo by describing him standing behind plexi-glass in a prisoner’s box. The article lists bail conditions, police allegations, and charges long before

³² The moment was captured on video and uploaded to YouTube; see ReetReeter.

discussing the conditions of Azorbo's arrest or detention (Boesveld & Paperny). The framing of coverage of Azorbo's story is markedly different from that of Pruyn's. While Pruyn appears only as an undeserving victim of ableist police violence, Azorbo appears primarily as a dangerous black man and only secondarily as a victim of ableism. The fact that his arrest and treatment by police is deeply connected to the gendered, ableist racism that marks the profiling practices of Toronto police³³ is obscured.

When read alongside the lack of coverage of Jacobs and the treatment of Azorbo in the media, the attention given to Pruyn attests to the ways in which raced and classed privilege modify his story in such a way as to make him a compelling focal point for discussions of police brutality and ableism during the G20. In the media, Pruyn, as a middle-class white man, appeared as a loyal citizen unfairly brutalized by ableist police; Azorbo, as a working class black man, appeared as a dangerous criminal to whom police could have been more sensitive; finally, Jacobs, as a street-involved man of colour, nearly disappeared altogether. Though I do not know the details of Jacobs's identity, I suspect that, as a street-involved, racialized man in Canada, he is read by media and law enforcement as an Indigenous man. The logic behind these markedly dissimilar treatments by the media, despite similar treatments by the police, speaks volumes about the operations of white supremacist settler colonialism and Canadian national belonging. Pruyn appears as a subject unfairly and brutally stripped of his rights, Azorbo appears as a

³³ In February 2011, Toronto police arrested 35-year-old Vaughn Nembhard, a dis/abled black man, because they "suspected him of concealing a weapon because he was limping with his right arm tucked inside his coat" (Kennedy, "Toronto police accused"). Nembhard's right arm has been paralyzed since a stroke 13 years ago. Meanwhile, six years of access to information requests filed on Toronto police contact cards demonstrate systematic racial profiling targeting black people in all 74 of Toronto's police patrol zones, as well as similar practices targeting people of South Asian, West Asian and Arab descent (Rankin).

member of a “criminal and suspect category, which belongs elsewhere” (McKittrick 112) – behind plexi-glass, perhaps – and Jacobs appears to vanish, an “absented presence” (Walcott 37) that sustains the settler myth. The outrage expressed in the media in response to Pruyn’s experiences suggests not outrage at ableist violence itself, but rather outrage at ableist violence *targeting white, middle-class, citizen men*. The ways in which ableism interlocks with other systems of oppression, including racism and classism, to produce subjects cast out of the protection of the state and subject to violence by the (in)justice system and the prison industrial complex (PIC) remains naturalized.

The narratives about citizenship contained within *Home* hinge not only upon white masculinity, but also upon national ideals of sexuality. The documentarians took pains to anchor Taylor, Barton, and Pruyn to national sexuality through narratives of fatherhood and heterosexual partnership. Barton’s heterosexuality is foregrounded by the CBC when they introduce him by showing him kissing his wife. His wife neither appears again nor is named in the film. Pruyn’s story hinges on the portrayal of him as a family man and his attendance at the June 26 demonstration as an act of family bonding. Neither Pruyn’s wife nor his daughter are ever named or depicted in *Home*, or in *Fire* or *Exposed*. Taylor relates his experiences of attending a demonstration on June 26 with his girlfriend, which eventually saw them both kettled and arrested on the Esplanade. He even relates stories of his girlfriend’s gendered experiences within the EDC, yet she is never interviewed or even named. The girlfriends, wives and daughters of these three men do not appear as subjects in the narrative; they operate only as nameless anchors that harness Pruyn, Barton and Taylor’s narratives of wounded Canadian masculinity to appropriate national sexuality. Neither Poisson’s nor MacDonald’s sexuality is ever mentioned, yet regardless of their sexual identities it is accurate to say that queerness is evacuated from

Home. The absencing of trans narratives from *Home*, and from G20 resistance narratives more broadly, supports the implicit assumption that all citizen-subjects are stably cisgendered. *Home*'s portrayal of its five subjects as "unlikely troublemakers" hinges on unspoken assumptions that each is not only heterosexual, but also cisgender, and thus that each occupies national ideals of gender and sexuality.

Fire and *Exposed* express similar narratives of wounded white citizen masculinity. *Fire* was produced by Dan Dicks, creator of Toronto-based alternative media group Press for Truth (PFT). Dicks founded PFT as "an organization of dedicated patriots ... committed to covering issues which the mainstream media is not willing to touch" (PFT). *Fire* contains interviews with a long list of white citizen men, as well as the occasional white citizen woman, who suffered violence, detention, or arrest at the hands of police during the G20. Its repertoire of interviewees includes both Taylor and Pruyn. A curiously self-referential film, *Fire* sets up Dicks and British satirist Charlie Veitch as its two main protagonists. The film is framed by Veitch's megaphone antics as the self-proclaimed "Love Police."³⁴ As a non-citizen of Canada, the centralization of Veitch in *Fire* would seem to strain my analysis. Yet I argue that Veitch performs white British citizenship in a manner that renders it collapsible with white Canadian citizenship, drawing deeply upon the two nations' intertwined colonial pasts and presents. Following his arrest under the PWPA, Veitch describes the EDC as "like something out of the X-Files ... like a place in Area 51 where they'd house aliens." In a police booking video

³⁴ In "Lighten Up?!: Humour, Race, and Da off colour joke of *Ali G*," Tara Atluri explores the "work" of comedy and satire, suggesting that "racialized jokes work to produce racialized subjects" (199). A deeper analysis of the racial politics of Veitch's satirical performances, contained within *Fire*, may reveal more about the productive work of joking, yet is beyond the scope of this project.

included in *Fire*, he complains that his detention “just doesn’t feel very becoming of a civilized country like Canada ... you’ve treated me like this is Guantanamo Bay.” It is telling that Veitch first compares the EDC to a place to “house aliens” and later compares it to Guantanamo Bay. While he evokes “alien” in a sci-fi sense, the slippage to detention centers in the “war on terror” is noteworthy. Being treated “like an alien” and “like a terrorist” blend together in Veitch’s description of the EDC, revealing the racialization of both “alien” and “terrorist” and the dehumanization of racialized “terrorists.” As a British citizen visiting Canada, Veitch could be argued to be alien himself, yet in his own formulation he is distinctly *not* the alien evoked (and thus not deserving of the treatment he receives). White British citizenship operates in *Fire* as a stand-in for white Canadian citizenship precisely by naturalizing indefinite detentions targeting peoples of colour who appear as racialized “terrorists” to the white nation.

The most underground of the three films is Derek Soberal and Adam Letalik’s *Toronto G20 Exposed* (2010). *Exposed* is pieced together out of footage gathered from YouTube and from news sources, including PFT and the independent Real News Network. Soberal is a self described “real Canadian”, who identifies the purpose behind the making of *Exposed* as “want[ing] the Canadian public to be informed, and [wanting] police officers to be informed too” (MayorVij). The film centralizes and relies upon a long series of white male commentators as the expert voices making sense of the protests and the actions of police. Among *Exposed*’s key subjects are TVO’s Steve Paikin, Real News’s Paul Jay, US political commentator Alex Jones, and constitutional lawyer Paul Cavalluzzo. Taylor, Veitch and Pruyn also appear, demonstrating how the three films operate in conversation with one another to centralize certain privileged voices drawn from a narrow pool of white male citizen-subjects. *Exposed* differs from *Fire* and *Home*

insofar as it includes a number of testimonials of white women narrating their G20 experiences of gendered and sexualized violence. While remaining harnessed to narratives of white citizenship, these testimonials at times threaten to escape the film's framing. Lacy MacAuley, a white woman, relates how she was seized by a snatch squad during a jail solidarity rally outside the EDC and physically assaulted by plainclothes male officers in the back of a minivan. At the end of the clip, she states, "I consider myself pretty lucky that things weren't actually worse." That MacAuley considers herself *lucky* is noteworthy, as it contrasts sharply with the film's central narrative of G20 policing as exceptional. Earlier in the film, another white woman relates being arrested, beaten, and sexually assaulted by police at Queen's Park. She ends her narrative by saying, "It was very traumatizing and very scary to experience that I have no rights." Her word choice is telling: she does not relate having her rights violated or denied, but rather relates *learning that she has none*. Though neither she, nor *Exposed*, elaborates upon this distinction, her words suggest recognition of the unexceptional nature of the exception. Despite the inclusion of testimonials that strain its arguments, the framing of *Exposed* ensures that the film remains deeply invested in narratives of nationalism. The film opens with a title screen that reads, "Please stand for our national anthem." A montage of Canadian flags, caribou, orcas, mountains, Niagara Falls and the CN tower accompanies the anthem, which eventually fades into the afore-discussed "Oh Canada" moment. Repeated images of the flag and direct quotations from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms structure the film, ensuring it ultimately remains harnessed to narratives of white citizenship.

The centralization of white, middle-class, heterosexual, cisgender citizen men in G20 resistance narratives needs to be read alongside critiques of whiteness in North

American summit protests. In 2000, Elizabeth Betita Martinez famously asked of the mobilization against the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle, “Where was the Color in Seattle?” (Martinez). Martinez raised pressing questions about the underrepresentation of peoples of colour at the protests. In the words of Narina Nagra,

The irony is that communities of colour in Western countries and throughout the world bare the brunt of corporate-led globalization. The struggle against globalization is just an extension of the struggle against colonialism, capitalism and imperialism that people of colour have been fighting for hundreds of years (Nagra 27).

Martinez’s critiques of whiteness in Seattle proved influential for future organizing. The successfully shutdown of the WTO stood not only as an historic victory in the anti-globalization movement in North America, but also as a turning point after which mobilizations against the powers of global capitalism began to take stock of race, gender, and class, and of the connections between global and local struggles (28). Martinez’s question became a challenge to future organizers to root their mobilizations in local contexts, while centralizing struggles against racism and colonialism in their movements.

Partly in response to the difficult questions raised by the critiques of Seattle and the efforts of subsequent movements, the TCMN formed as a coalition with the goal to “build a summit protest for the 2010 Toronto G20 meetings that would prioritize long-term movement building ... [and] use the summit protest opportunity to strengthen local grassroots groups” (Wood & Stalker 179). With central roles in the TCMN played by the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP) and No One Is Illegal Toronto (NOII-Toronto), the G20 protests were organized with anti-colonial and anti-racist politics at their core (Hussan 40). Peoples of colour, migrants, and Indigenous peoples were centralized in decision-making roles within the TCMN (40). Researchers Lesley J. Wood and Glenn J. Stalker adapted a survey used at the 2009 Pittsburgh G20 to explore the

demographics of the Toronto protests, while acknowledging limitations with their method.³⁵ Their findings demonstrate that overall “Toronto’s G20 protestors were more radically diverse, older, a more polarized group of new and experienced activists, and more local than their equivalents in Pittsburgh, New York, Washington and Seattle” (Wood & Stalker 184). 27% of protestors surveyed identified as people of colour (182), a significantly higher proportion than survey data from other North American summits and from Martinez’s findings of 5-7% in Seattle (Martinez). Ultimately, the question “Where was the colour in Toronto?” was answered resoundingly, “On the streets.”

Given the TCMN’s success in centralizing and mobilizing communities of colour, the most pressing question to ask of the Toronto G20 protests might be, “Where was the colour in the coverage?” Why so many white faces in the news, not only in *Home, Fire* and *Exposed*, but overwhelmingly in most media coverage of the protests? Syed Hussan, a NOII-Toronto organizer, notes how the narratives produced in the mainstream media portrayed the protestors as predominantly middle-class white youth (Hussan 42). He refers to the production of these narratives as “white-wash[ing] the anti-G20 convergence” (40), allowing for the delegitimization and silencing of the active participation and organizing efforts of peoples of colour (42). The media rendered invisible the central roles played by Indigenous peoples, peoples of colour, queer and trans peoples, and peoples with dis/abilities in organizing the protests. These erasures contributed not only to the valorization of the white male citizen-subject, but also to the

³⁵ The researchers asked every 7th participant at the protests on June 23-26 to fill out a survey (Wood & Stalker 180). They acknowledge that people most concerned with surveillance may have opted not to participate, thus biasing the results toward more privileged populations (180). Wood & Stalker fail to acknowledge, however, that not collecting data during the June 21 migrant rights demonstration and the June 22 queer resistance demonstration may have further affected their findings.

naturalization of the daily violence the Canadian state directs these populations. Much of the post-G20 agitation for inquiries into the actions of the police failed to employ an anti-racist or anti-colonial analysis, thus “present[ing] police violence as an aberration rather than the norm” (41). For the populations obscured from view in G20 resistance narratives, the violence of police and the denial of rights were hardly remarkable. Though many white, middle-class, heterosexual, cisgender subjects were shocked to discover themselves to be *homo sacer*, the communities erased from G20 resistance narratives know there is nothing exceptional about the exception. Even during and after the G20, the law targeted organizers who were migrants or peoples of colour in especially brutal and repressive ways (Klein xvi, Hussan 35-36).³⁶ This racially inflected state violence is not isolated, but speaks to the daily violence faced by marginalized communities in Canada. As Hussan puts it, “The brutal behavior of police during the G20 was not uncharacteristic – it was just more visible” (36).

The protagonists of G20 resistance narratives are predominantly white, middle-class, heterosexual, cisgender men, and occasionally women. Most importantly, they are citizens who are loyal to the Canadian state. They are never migrants raising pressing questions about the legitimacy of borders and immigration laws established by settler states; they are never Indigenous peoples struggling for decolonization; they are not even white anarchists, seeking pathways of resistance through which to challenge their own implication in white supremacy, colonialism, citizenship, and the perpetuation of the

³⁶ NOII-Toronto organizers faced disproportionate violence and repression, including targeted arrests and beatings (Hussan 35). After being charged with three counts of conspiracy and two counts of counseling to commit an indictable offence (35), Hussan faced surveillance, harassment, (36) and the initiation of deportation proceedings against him (36). Eventually, all charges against Hussan were dropped.

settler state. Dissent, for the wounded subject, is a performance of citizenship, so that resistance takes only the form of seeking the restoration of white settler privileges. The narrative of the “unlikely troublemaker” achieves two things: 1) it hijacks the discourse about the G20 protests by obscuring and erasing not only the organizing efforts and participation of marginalized populations, but also their struggles and political concerns, and 2) it naturalizes the daily state violence directed against these populations by framing the violence of the G20 as isolated, unprecedented, and exceptional. In other words, the figure of the “unlikely troublemaker” operates to uphold white supremacy and settler colonialism by reproducing the insider/outsider logic of citizenship that necessarily exposes abjected populations to a normalized state of exception.

Narrative 3: Iconic Images and the 4-Day Amnesia

Home, Fire and *Exposed* evacuate politics from protest, effectively achieving total disengagement with the reasons why 15,000 protestors took to the streets during the G20. In *Home*, MacDonald and Poisson are the only two subjects who identify with politically-motivated participation in the protests; Barton, Taylor and Pruyn are essentially only sightseers. MacDonald’s reasons to protest are never explored, while Poisson expresses an intention to “protest peacefully” yet gives no information about her beliefs or goals. Protest thus becomes disconnected from politics, so that Poisson’s desire to engage in peaceful protest serves only to differentiate her from those who engage in direct action tactics. By evacuating politics from protest, *Home* effectively creates dichotomies between peaceful and militant, and between invested and not invested, protestors that obscure the possibility of shared goals and affinity while transforming the

violence/nonviolence question from one of tactics to one of culpability.³⁷ State violence against both direct action participants and demonstrators with discernable political goals becomes naturalized in *Home*'s formulation of innocence. In the post-G20 context, the media expressed a sensationalist preoccupation with images that replaced any sustained engagement with politics. Findlay describes how the "iconic images [of the Summit] are still with us," referencing the fetishization of burning police cars, black bloc actions, and the massive security presence. She promises that *Home* will tell the omitted parts of the "whole story" of the G20, yet the interviews within *Home* perpetuate a similar disengagement with the politics of protest. *Fire* and *Exposed* engage in similar tactics of avoidance, though to varying degrees that reflect each film's political investments.

One of the devices that allows for the disappearance of politics from protest is what I refer to as a 3-day narrative supported by a 4-day amnesia. *Home*, *Fire*, and *Exposed* only appear interested in the events that unfolded on Friday June 25, Saturday June 26 and Sunday June 27. In truth, anti-G20 protests commenced in Toronto on June 21, before the Summit began. Following a three-day People's Summit held June 18-20, the TCMN coordinated four community-based days of resistance in the build-up to the G20. In chronological order, the themes for June 21-24 were: 1) Migrant Justice and an End to War and Occupation, Income Equity and Community Control over Resources, 2) Gender Justice, Queer Rights, DisAbility Rights, 3) Environmental and Climate Justice, and 4) Indigenous Sovereignty (TCMN). Each day included a mass mobilization on the streets, and many included film screenings, forums, and community assemblies. Taken together or separately, the themed days of resistance represent profound challenges to the

³⁷ For critiques of moralist pacifism, see Churchill (1998) and Gelderloos (2007).

legitimacy of the Canadian nation-state, the nature of citizenship, borders, and immigration control, settler colonialism, national ideals of gender and sexuality, and the intersections of environmental degradation with colonialism, racism, and globalization. The 4-day amnesia allows the raced, classed, (cis)gendered, and sexualized institution of Canadian citizenship to remain unexamined and uncritiqued.

By employing different organizational devices, each documentary constructs a 3-day narrative about the G20 protests that effaces everything that preceded it. Title screens in *Home* divide the film's narrative into three successive parts, for June 24, 25, and 26. *Fire* opens by contextualizing its discussion of policing during the G20 through black and white footage of old police training videos, and through training exercises undertaken by Toronto security forces in April 2010. The film embarks on a cursory examination of policing practices during past summit meetings in North America, particularly the use of agents provocateurs during the 2007 SPP Summit in Montebello. *Fire* thus quickly establishes itself as a film that is fundamentally disinterested in political reasons for the G20 protests, and primarily concerned with sensationalist images of militant protest and militarized police. It is hardly surprising, then, that *Fire* skips over and forgets four themed days of resistance on June 21-24, jumping ahead to the weekend. *Exposed* is even more blatant in its disinterest toward the politics of the protests: the first protest footage appears seventeen minutes into the film, after a lengthy discussion of the PWPA and of agents provocateurs at Montebello. The footage is introduced by a title reading "Peaceful Parade, Downtown Toronto – Early Saturday Afternoon." *Exposed* thus transports its audience all the way to June 26, with no mention of the days of protest that preceded it.

The only moment when *Home* pays lip service to the politics of the protests is a brief montage of B-roll approximately 6 minutes into the film. Findlay's narration intros

the montage: “Dissent had many faces that day, an abundance of causes, and people marching for all kinds of reasons.” As the only commentary in the entire film that specifically addresses the politics of the protests, this statement says essentially nothing. *Home* never examines the “many faces” or the “abundance of causes,” never explores what “all kinds of reasons” means. In the B-roll clips that were chosen to represent the alluded-to diversity, few political messages are discernable and most of the faces are suspiciously white. If the CBC video editors were seeking to put together a series of B-roll clips to summarize the “abundance of causes” that marked the G20 protests, where in the montage are the true “iconic images” of dissent? Where is the papier-mâché Stephen Harper head worn by a queer activist in pink silk underwear and fishnets, dancing in a circle of pink-clad queers on June 22, or the street theatre performance by the Lesbian Billionaires for the G20? Where are the environmentalists drenched in fake oil carrying signs about the BP oil spills, the tar sands, and migrant labour rights on June 23? Where is the city-block-long banner demanding “Native Land Rights Now” carried by Indigenous activists on June 24? Where are the yellow Disability Action Movement Now t-shirts and the “Disabled People Fight Back” banner that led the charge on June 25? Where is the transwoman standing alone, inches from a row of heavily armed riot police, holding a “Trans Rights” banner aloft in a courageous statement that foregrounds the role of police and state in perpetuating trans oppression? Where are the red No One Is Illegal flags, bristling above the crowd at nearly every rally? Any of these images could operate as powerful visual signifiers for issues brought forward by demonstrators during the G20, yet the only discernable political message in the montage is a vague slogan about world peace on a sign held by a white woman in her 20s.

Exposed is somewhat more interesting to analyze. In its preoccupation with black bloc tactics targeting banks, multinational corporations, and four TPS cruisers on June 26, *Exposed* reveals somewhat more than it intends to about the nature of the protests. After spending barely more than a minute on Saturday's "peaceful protest," the film dedicates 20 minutes to footage of the black bloc. Though *Exposed*'s central, and bizarre, thesis is that the black bloc was comprised of police agents provocateurs,³⁸ the extensive footage of black bloc actions in the film seems to suggest something else entirely. Mainstream media played only snippets of burning police cars and shattering glass, effectively decontextualizing black bloc actions. What emerges in *Exposed*, apparently by accident, is a clearer picture of the role of a black bloc within the context of the anti-G20 protests. Footage shows NOII-Toronto organizers, waving NOII flags and wearing red NOII bandanas, leading the black bloc charge. In one shot, a group of NOII activists link arms to form a defensive chain protecting the front of the bloc, while a woman of colour leads a chant over a megaphone: "No fences, no borders, fuck law and order!" Another clip shows the black bloc chanting, "No G20 on stolen Native land!" This footage suggests that black bloc actions during the G20 arose out of and expressed a radical stance against racist immigration practices, settler colonialism, and the (in)justice system, and for solidarity with struggles against the Vancouver 2010 Olympics on unceded Coast Salish land earlier that year.³⁹ Black bloc demonstrators appear to have been operating alongside and in solidarity with NOII-Toronto and other groups, while expressing similar politics to

³⁸ What is bizarre about this theory is that it confuses agent provocateur with infiltrator, thus profoundly misunderstanding the role of a provocateur (a provoker). These questions deserve further exploration, yet are beyond the scope of this project.

³⁹ "No G20 on stolen Native land!" is a reference to the no2010 movement slogan, "No Olympics on stolen Native land!"

those foregrounded by the TCMN. The pains that *Exposed*, as well as *Fire* and *Home*, take to distance their valorized white male citizen-subjects from the tactics of the black bloc thus operate also as a distancing from anti-racist and anti-colonial struggles.

By employing a 3-day narrative bolstered by a 4-day amnesia, *Home*, *Fire* and *Exposed* effectively evacuate politics from protest. What emerges is the appearance that the only thing agitated for at the G20 was the right for white, middle-class Canadians to engage in peaceful civil dissent. The focus upon nationalism and the Charter in these narratives renders invisible the struggles of Indigenous and migrant peoples by naturalizing settlement and the settler nation-state. Struggles and concerns brought to the table by Indigenous activists, activists of colour, queer and trans activists, dis/abled activists, migrant activists, feminists, and anarchists vanish. When the concerns of these groups are omitted, the appearance that the violence of the police was exceptional is upheld, while state violence against these groups is naturalized. The erasure of the politics of the protests thus contributes to ongoing violence against these groups, by perpetuating the construction of loyal citizens as those with the right to rights in relation to abjected populations exposed to a normalized state of exception.

Exception and the Camp in the Age of Austerity

Earning the nickname the “Austerity Summit,” the G20 in Toronto was the place where “[the G20 leaders] decided to stick the public with the bill for an economic crisis that began with wild speculation on Wall Street” (Klein xiv). Instructions were given for governments to halve their deficits by 2013, resulting in massive and ongoing cuts to social programs (xv). The populations most harmed by the decisions made at G8/G20 meetings are poor peoples, racialized peoples, and peoples in the Global South (Scott 29;

McNally 202-206), not the white citizen-subjects centralized in resistance narratives. In Canada, cuts to social programs have been accompanied by increases in government spending on prison expansion and law enforcement (xv), and by the introduction of “new” and “special” counter-law measures.⁴⁰ Yet the current situation is remarkable only in its scope, not its character. The exception has always been, and continues to be, a normalized aspect of the operations of white supremacist settler colonialism. Though the wounded subjects of G20 resistance narratives hijacked the discourse by expressing outrage at their exposure to the exception, poor, Indigenous, racialized, migrant, queer, trans, and dis/abled subjects continue to be the *primary* and *intended* targets. In the words of Morgensen, “today, we are all exposed to bare life not because we appear *similarly* to Western law, but only to the extent that we are all caught *distinctly* in the hierarchies that structure its persistently colonial formation” (Morgensen, “Biopolitics” 72).

The G20 Summit in Toronto saw an activation of a state of exception, legally constituted through counter-law measures, discursively constituted through the “telling euphemism” (Smith & Cowen 31) of a “free speech zone,” and spatially constituted through the EDC. The exception appeared, to some, to be temporary and unprecedented, yet it represented only an extension of its normalized operations and a fulfillment of the fundamental relationship between citizen and nation-state. Appeals to Canadian citizenship played a key role in the formulation of resistance to widespread suspensions of rights, police brutality, mass arrests, and illegal detentions; in so doing, these narratives drew upon and reinforced settler citizenship as a construct built upon an exception that targets colonized, racialized, queered, trans’ed, and dis/abled populations constructed as

⁴⁰ For example, Act 78, a.k.a. “la Loi Speciale,” introduced in Québec in May 2012, and Bill C-309, a.k.a. “the mask law,” expected to become federal law sometime in 2012.

national outsiders. In the efforts to defend the wounded subject against the spatial organization of the exception, the EDC came to be known as “Torontonamo,” a turn of phrase that flags how the racialized discourse of the exception serves to demarcate white citizen-subjects as the recipients of the protections of the nation-state precisely by exposing racially Othered populations to a normalized state of rightless-ness. It is toward an examination of the spatial organization of the exception in the form of the camp, and the discursive organization of “Torontonamo,” that Chapter Four turns.

Chapter 4

“Torontonamo” Doesn’t Exist: Interrogating Spaces of Exception

In April 2010, the Toronto Police Service (TPS) leased a 240,000 square foot property, formerly owned by Toronto Film Studios, and constructed a temporary detention facility for the purpose of “detain[ing] and process[ing] a large number of people” (TPS 36) during the G20 Summit. The property was located at 629 Eastern Avenue; the detention centre became known as the Eastern Detention Centre (EDC). At 2:25am on June 27, I was arrested along with 30 other people at the corner of Eastern and Carlaw, one block from the EDC.⁴¹ Handcuffed, searched, and loaded into police wagons, we arrived inside the EDC a short while later. A friend, peering through the wagon’s breathing holes, described how she could see rows of wire cages full of people. As we sat in the overcrowded wagon, we could hear them yelling and rattling their cages. Eventually, we were removed from the wagon and escorted to cages of our own. The main holding area of the EDC was constructed within one of the studio’s soundstages, an enormous, temperature-controlled, soundproof space in which film sets are built. Inside the EDC, we could hear nothing going on outside: neither the boom of guns firing “less-lethal” rounds at demonstrators on the afternoon of June 27, nor the rainstorm on the night of June 27, nor the music and chanting of ongoing jail solidarity rallies. We were literally insulated from the Summit protests beyond the walls. Nothing could get in, except more arrestees and more cops, and very little could get out, including phone calls and detainees. The feeling was one of having been disappeared behind a state-constructed wall of silence in a detention centre that took on the character of a temporary camp.

⁴¹ Descriptions of the events leading up to the arrest can be found in Kellar 71-72, MDC 91, Wachsmuch 103-104, and Sekhar 127.

In the days following the G20, the EDC earned the nickname “Torontonamo.” The turn of phrase, which references the US-run detention centre in Guantanamo Bay (formerly Camp X-Ray, now Camp Delta), appeared in articles on numerous independent news sites, including [Toronto Media Co-op](#), [Press for Truth](#), and [rabble.ca](#).⁴² The underground documentary *Toronto G20 Exposed* (2010) organizes its discussion of the EDC around the phrase. Tracks from Ontario hip hop artists Lyracist and Test Their Logik⁴³ reference it, with the Test Their Logik song containing the lyrics, “Welcome to Torontonamo Bay, where your rights and dignity are stripped away.” A website titled [Torontonamo.com](#) cropped up to collect links and stories to “put faces to those swept up in the largest mass arrests in Canadian history” (Torontonamo).⁴⁴ It was accompanied by a corresponding francophone version, [Torontonamo.net](#), and an anglophone twitter account, [@Torontonamo](#). Uncritical mentions of the phrase appear in an article by Smith & Cowen published in *Human Geography* (Smith & Cowen 33), and one by Barbara Legault and Jodi Proctor of the Rebelles published in *Canadian Dimension* (Legault & Proctor 11). Mainstream news outlets, including [CTV](#) and [Maclean’s](#), referenced the name,⁴⁵ while British satirist Charlie Veitch vlogged on his website about his experiences in “Torontonamo” (Charlie). As many of the examples in this list attest to, the nickname largely arose out of activist circles. This chapter will engage theories of the camp in order to examine “Torontonamo” as a truth-producing narrative that reinforces white

⁴² See, in order, Tehowe, “The Criminalization of Dissent,” PFT, “Police CCTV Footage,” and Kraus, “303 people head.”

⁴³ See Lyracist and Test Their Logik.

⁴⁴ Until the Montreal student strike of 2012. See Banerjee.

⁴⁵ See [ctvtoronto.ca](#), and Intini, Belluz, Dehaas & Findlay.

supremacist settler colonialism, from within leftish social movements, by reasserting race thinking in relation to the operations of a normalized state of exception.

Camps are spaces that come into being wherever law spatially organizes the abandonment of populations. For instance, the Geneva convention allows Camp Delta to come into being by defining the combatants indefinitely detained in Guantanamo Bay as illegal, and thus not subject to prisoner of war status. As the space wherein power seizes unmediated control over bare life, the camp is the “pure, absolute, and impassable biopolitical sphere (insofar as it is founded solely on the state of exception)” (Agamben, *Homo Sacer* 123). The camp operates as a “place where, paradoxically, the law has determined that the rule of law does not apply” (Razack 6), a contradiction given character by race thinking. Race thinking refers to the “denial of a common bond of humanity between people of European descent and those who are not, [which] remains a defining feature of the world order” (6) and “matures into racism through its use as a political weapon” (8). Camps tend to operate through race thinking to target racialized populations for eviction from rights, thus designating them as belonging to a “different order of humanity altogether” (7) and defining the line between who is and is not considered human (13).⁴⁶ In all its manifestations, the camp – from the prison to the war prison, the detention center to the internment camp, the mental hospital to the residential school – operates as the spatial organization of the exception within modern nation-states.

In white supremacist, settler colonial Canada, the state of exception finds spatial constitution in a long list of spaces that operate as camps, and legal constitution in a long list of acts and counter-law measures. The Indian Act, as legislation, creates legal zones

⁴⁶ See also Butler, 72-79, 90-91.

of exception that allow for the spatial organization of residential schools and reserves, the latter being referred to by Thobani as “zones of exception” (Thobani 50) and Lawrence as “zones of fundamental illegality” (Lawrence 8). The steamship *Komagata Maru* became constituted as a floating camp in 1914, when, carrying 376 immigrants from India, it was forced to remain anchored in the Vancouver harbor for two months before being turned away (Ward 88). In 2010, 492 Tamil refugees from Sri Lanka faced indefinite detention upon arrival on the *MV Sun Sea* near Victoria (NOII-Van). Both the case of the *Komagata Maru* and the *MV Sun Sea*, as well as all other cases of refugee and migrant camps in Canadian history, must be understood as legally organized through racialized and gendered immigration restrictions, which reinforce the settler colonial project by instilling the settler government with the right to decide who accesses the land (Smith 179).

The Kingston Immigration Holding Centre (KIHC) stood as one of the more blatant examples of how race thinking constructs the camp in Canada. KIHC was legally organized through security certificate legislation contained within the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, which targets Arab and Muslim men for abandonment from the law through the racialized and gendered construct of the terrorist (Razack 38).⁴⁷ The bureaucratic organization of KIHC reveals much about the nature of camps in contemporary Canada. Agamben contends Foucault’s privileging of the prison as the site for the examination of theories of sovereignty, arguing that the prison exists inside penal law, while the camp, as “the absolute space of exception ... is topologically different from a simple space of confinement” (*Homo Sacer* 20). Mike Larsen & Justin Piché’s analysis of the operational structure and spatial organization of KIHC invites us to rethink

⁴⁷ For more on security certificate legislation, see ‘Your client has a profile’: Race in the Security Hearing in Razack (2008).

the dichotomy Agamben sets up between camp and “simple space of confinement.” Housed on the grounds of Millhaven Institution, a maximum security federal prison in Ontario, KIHC operated as an “ambiguous and hybrid space” (Larsen & Piché 205) and as a “spatial demonstration of the operation of the state of exception as an inclusive exclusion – a camp located within a correctional institution but simultaneously differentiated from it by an internal layer of fences, security cameras, and policy” (216). Correctional Services Canada (CSC) managed KIHC, though its existence, as a space in which people neither charged nor convicted were detained indefinitely, contradicted CSC’s correctional mandate (216). KIHC came into being through a “bureaucratic pragmatism” (205) that produced it as a “product of the [Canadian Border Services Agency’s] *authority to detain indefinitely* meeting [CSC’s] *capacity to confine pragmatically*” (205). KIHC not only blurred, but collapsed the distinction that Agamben attempts to draw between the space of the prison and the camp. Though KIHC ceased to be operational in December 2011, its closure neither signals the abolition of security certificate legislation nor forecloses the construction of new camps to take its place. As Larsen puts it, “the KIHC project is a testament to the viability of a Canadian ‘special prison’ model that normalizes an exceptional form of detention” (Larsen).

I argue that all prisons in Canada must be read as camps. Just as the presence of former US prison guards as torturers at Abu Ghraib brutally demonstrates the linkages between the new war prison and the American PIC (Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages* 79), so too does the management of KIHC by CSC demonstrate the slippage between the camp and the prison in Canada. As Canada gears up for massive prison expansion following the March 2012 passage of the omnibus crime bill C-10, blueprints for new units already in construction at Collins Bay Institution in Kingston show built in wall-brackets to facilitate

double-bunking (CBC News).⁴⁸ The practice of double-bunking goes against United Nations standards for inmates, yet is increasingly becoming a normalized and *built in* aspect of incarceration in Canada. Sexualized assault (Spade 90; Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages* 113) and stealth torture (104), among other violations of human rights, function as normalized disciplinary methods within prisons. Disproportionately, the criminal (in)justice system and the PIC target Indigenous peoples, peoples of colour, poor peoples, and trans and queer peoples for incarceration and state violence. If we follow Agamben's logic, these spaces constitute something different from the camp because they are contained within normal penal law (*Homo Sacer* 20), yet I argue that such a reductive analysis of prisons fails to account for how they *operate* as camps through gendered and sexualized race thinking and through the normalized suspension of rights. As we brace for prison expansion and an anticipated boom in the Canadian prison population, we must understand the PIC in Canada as a proliferation of camps across this stolen land.

The title of this chapter, "Torontonamo" Doesn't Exist, should neither suggest that spaces did not form during the Toronto G20 Summit to enact the state of exception, nor that one of those spaces, the EDC, did not share qualities with the camp. I argue that the EDC was constituted as a temporary camp through a complex set of relations that governed its formation and operations. While the EDC no longer exists, having been dismantled following the G20 Summit, for a truncated period of time it *did* exist. The EDC became operational as a temporary detention facility on June 18, 2010 and ceased operations on June 29 (TPS 44). My statement that "Torontonamo" doesn't exist should not be read as a denial of the existence of the EDC, but as an attempt to disentangle the

⁴⁸ Leaked blueprints, designed by architects at the Kingston office of Norr Ltd., can be viewed online at <http://cryptome.org/2012/03/csc/csc-const-docs.htm>.

EDC as a space of detention from “Torontonamo” as a *narrative about that space*. This disentanglement can only ever be partial, as spaces and their narratives constitute one another. It is narratives that allow for the production of knowledge about space, and space that gives rise to narrative. Foucault argues that power needs to be described not in negative terms, but in terms of what it produces (*Discipline and Punish* 194); it must therefore be asked what rituals of truth “Torontonamo” produces, as well as what the relationship is between these “truths” and the powers that produce them.

As a narrative about the EDC, “Torontontamo” produces a variety of results. First, it produces a comparison between the space of the EDC and the space of Camp Delta. In so doing, it compares the detentions in the EDC to the detentions in Guantanamo Bay. As a well-known space of exception, Camp Delta has been internationally critiqued for the inhumane treatment of detainees and the denial of procedural and human rights guaranteed by national and international law. In creating “Torontonamo” as a narrative of comparison, activists in Canada call attention to conditions of detention in the EDC described as “unlawful and inadequate” by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA, “Canadian Civil Liberties Association files complaints”). These conditions included wire-mesh cages akin to “animal pens,” overcrowding, extreme cold, inadequate food and water, inadequate medical care, lack of sanitation, lack of space to sleep or sit, bright lights, exposed washrooms, handcuffs left on during detention, sexualized violence, threats of violence and rape, and verbal abuse targeting peoples of colour, Indigenous peoples, queer peoples, women, trans, and genderqueer peoples, and peoples with dis/abilities. The comparison further seeks to call attention to denials of civil liberties in many of the arrests, and to denials of procedural rights within the EDC, including access to legal counsel, access to telephones, access to medical treatment and

prescribed medication, access to assistance for persons with dis/abilities, knowledge of charges or reasons for arrest, and prompt processing and release for those not held for court hearings. “Torontonamo” thus strategically evokes Guantanamo Bay to make an argument about the EDC. Calling attention to poor conditions and denials of rights, however, is neither the only nor the most pressing productive element of the “Torontonamo” narrative that this chapter will attend to.

KIHC has earned the nickname “Guantanamo North,” an act of naming that operates as a political move to denounce the space while calling attention to similarities between the logics of exception that constitute KIHC and Camp Delta.⁴⁹ Yet Larsen and Piché contend that “all contemporary spaces of exception are not simply variations on the theme of Guantanamo” (203). While local spaces must be read in the context of global relations of power, in so doing we must be mindful not to “displace the complexity of national institutions” (204). Doing so not only collapses differences between spaces and logics of exception, but also prevents an understanding of how the logic of exception can be mobilized through different means in different contexts. In comparing the EDC to Camp Delta, “Torontonamo” collapses vast differences between the two spaces, including differences in conditions, operations, and logics of exception, as well as differences between camps constituted as indefinite and as temporary. The collapse treats similarity (for example, denial of due process) as sameness, and in so doing effaces difference (indefinite denial vs. temporary denial, indefinite detention vs. temporary detention). Consequently, by comparing them to the incredibly brief experiences of white Canadian nationals temporarily denied access to citizenship rights during the G20 Summit, this

⁴⁹ For more on the operations of KIHC, see Larsen & Piché. For a critical examination of the operations of Camp Delta, see Indefinite Detention in Butler (2004).

conflation minimizes the experiences of Muslim and Arab men indefinitely cast out of national and international law in the “war on terror.” In so doing, “Torontonamo” denies the role of race thinking in constituting the camp, while, paradoxically, *reproducing* the dehumanizing race thinking that serves to justify spaces like Camp Delta and KIHIC. The “Torontonamo” narrative (re)produces a set of racialized and gendered logics that determine how different people are positioned differentially in relation to the logic of exception. This is achieved through the production of two complimentary logics: first, that particular raced and gendered subjects (in this case, Arab and Muslim men) are the appropriate targets for spaces of exception, and second, that white, cisgender, heterosexual citizen men are the appropriate recipients of “universal” rights guaranteed by national and international law, as well as the rights and entitlements of citizenship in a settler state. Other subjects, including women of colour, Indigenous peoples, and queer and trans peoples, slip into the gaps left by the silences of this narrative. These silences normalize the ways in which these groups are targeted by the PIC and by the operations of the exception in Canada.

The final point that must be made about “Torontonamo” attends to what it *prevents* rather than what it produces: “Torontonamo” prevents an accurate understanding of the ways in which the EDC operated as a temporary camp. By collapsing the EDC with Camp Delta, “Torontonamo” fails to account for how different logics of exception produce different spatial and temporal organizations of the exception. From a social justice movement perspective, “Torontonamo” prevents activists from comprehending how bureaucratic measures can mobilize the logic of exception to produce temporary camps within Western nations in response to political dissent. It further prevents us from understanding how the logic of exception can, albeit temporarily, become disconnected

from race thinking in order to produce exceptional spaces that act upon bodies normally protected through the raced, classed and gendered privileges of white settler citizenship. How did white citizen-subjects come to be targeted by a space of exception in Toronto during the G20 Summit? What logics of exception were necessary to achieve such a move? And further, how does the narrative of “Torontonamo” prevent activists from speaking in solidarity with those detained in Guantanamo Bay, KIHC, and other spatial organizations of the exception in the “war on terror” and in white supremacist settler colonialism? It is toward an understanding of the unique ways in which the EDC operated as a temporary camp that this chapter now turns.

Counter-Law, Rhetorical-Law and the Construction of a (Temporary) Camp

The logic of exception that produced the EDC is different from the logics that produce either Camp Delta or KIHC. KIHC and Camp Delta are constituted as spatial organizations of the exception through race thinking and East-West culture clash narratives, which manufacture a triangulated relationship between the figures of the “imperiled Muslim woman,” the “dangerous Muslim man” and the “civilized European” (Razack 5). This narrative serves to justify erosions of rights that target specific racialized populations (4) for “stigmatization, surveillance, incarceration, abandonment, torture and bombs” (5) in the “war on terror.” KIHC is further constituted through legal measures that Richard V. Ericson calls counter-law, or “laws against law” (Ericson 156), and, as previously discussed, through “bureaucratic pragmatism” (Larsen & Piché 205). Guantanamo Bay, on the other hand, is constituted as a limitless space of exception through extra-legal measures that suspend both national and international law (Butler 63), representing a reemergence of sovereignty within governmentality (55). Mostly notably,

the EDC is different from Camp Delta or KIHC in that its exceptional logics did not specifically target racialized populations. Rather, it targeted all subjects within downtown Toronto during the G20 Summit who were not security personnel or summit delegates, including journalists, legal observers, and public transit employees.

The EDC operated as a spatial organization of the exception through a complex set of relations that constituted it as a temporary, indiscriminate camp. On the streets, a series of counter-law measures went into place, including the Public Works Protection Act⁵⁰ (PWPA) and strategic uses of Breach of Peace legislation and the Trespass to Property Act (TPA).⁵¹ In the case of the PWPA, police went beyond the powers provided by the Act by claiming that the counter-law measures of the Act existed within a 5-metre radius outside of the area designated as the public work (TPS 41). Having established a fictitious “5-metre rule” (which became known among activists as the “5-metre backtrack” when police retracted their claims about its existence following the G20 (Smith & Cowen 30)), police at street level proceeded to go beyond even these powers by claiming the “5-metre rule” extended all over downtown Toronto. In calling the “5-metre rule” and its extensions fictitious, I mean to imply that they were a fiction only insofar as police claimed they were powers provided by law. Despite not being provided by law, police nonetheless utilized these powers to enact illegal searches, seizures, detentions, and arrests throughout downtown Toronto (MDC 89). The “5-metre rule” and its extensions operated as performative speech acts: in claiming these powers existed, and backing their claims with real or threatened force, police *brought the powers into being* on the streets of Toronto during the G20. I refer to these discursive extensions of counter-law as

⁵⁰ See Public Work Protections Act, R.S.O. 1990.

⁵¹ For more on the use of the TPA and breach of peace legislation, see MDC 89-91.

rhetorical-law, by which I mean powers brought into being through speech acts. Through the enactment of rhetorical-law, police temporarily gained the power to identify, search and detain anyone with no legal recourse.

These counter-law and rhetorical-law measures facilitated the arrest of 1,118 people or more (McNeilly xi) over the course of the G20 weekend. These mass arrests, facilitated by the coordinated actions of security forces going beyond the powers provided by law, resulted in what the TPS after-action review refers to as “bottlenecks” in the EDC. These bottlenecks are blamed for the poor conditions and denials of rights in the EDC, yet the coordinated use of counter-law and rhetorical-law to mass arrest over 1,118 people calls into question the implication that the EDC was *unexpectedly* overloaded. The logic seems to be that the police illegally arrested too many people, and thus were unable to provide legal conditions of detention, or, more succinctly, that illegal arrest justifies illegal detention. I argue that the EDC was constructed, through physical, logistical, and bureaucratic measures, as a space that was incapable of fulfilling its intended purpose in a legal manner, thus constituting it as a temporary camp.

On June 29, when asked whether the “5-metre rule” ever existed, TPS Chief Blair responded “No, but I was trying to keep the criminals out” (Blair, qtd. in the Canadian Press). The after-action review calls the “5-metre rule” an “incorrect interpretation” of the PWPA (TPS 41). In her examination of the operations of Guantanamo Bay, Butler suggests there is a “ghostly and forceful resurgence of sovereignty in the midst of governmentality” that accompanies suspensions of law (Butler 59). This notion proves useful for comprehending the powers enacted by Blair, the ISU, and the police in regards to their use of rhetorical-law and the PWPA during the G20. This resurgent sovereignty, exercised by “petty sovereigns” (56), is distinct from old modes of sovereignty as unified

power. Security forces operate as “part of the apparatus of governmentality” (59) and come to exercise sovereignty through suspensions of law and the establishment of “rules that are not binding by virtue of established law or modes of legitimation, but fully discretionary, even arbitrary, wielded by officials who interpret them unilaterally and decide the condition and form of their invocation” (62). Butler’s formulation invites us to rethink the ISU’s “misinterpretation” of the PWPA as an act of petty sovereignty that affected the activation of law-less police powers during the G20. Blair’s statement, that the goal of “keep[ing] the criminals out,” justified the coordinated suspension of law demonstrates how the exception operates as a normalized aspect of policing practices and the criminal (in)justice system in Western settler colonial nations.

Discourses of (inter)national security helped provide justification for the excess of police powers enacted during the G20. Kinsman and Gentile argue that national security has taken on an international scope in the era of neoliberalism and global capitalism (Kinsman & Gentile 430). Canada’s membership in international alliances, like the G20, the FTAA, the WTO, or APEC, allows mobilizations against these alliances to become framed as national security risks (430). In 1997, during the APEC meetings in Vancouver, the RCMP defended APEC against protestors, demonstrating how “Canadian’ national security was defined by the Canadian state’s commitment to APEC as one vehicle to capitalist globalization” (439). The designation of members of international alliances as internationally protected persons (IPPs) (439) creates a situation in which national security becomes understood as the protection of Summit meetings and Summit delegates. In Toronto, the construction of the security fence, the establishment of the “Yellow Zone,” the enactment of the PWPA, the use of counter-law and rhetorical-law, the mobilization of 19,000 police and security officers, and the construction of the EDC

all attest to how a discourse of (inter)national security can temporarily activate an indiscriminate state of exception to seize control over the bare life of *even* white Canadian citizen-subjects. Such an understanding of the constitution of the EDC only underscores how “Torontonamo” was *not* like Camp Delta or KIHIC, as these spaces are constituted through race thinking to target racialized populations as security risks, exposing them to a normalized state of exception through indefinite detention in camps.

According to the TPS after-action review, 885 people arrested were detained in the EDC (TPS 46), yet the report produced by the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD) suggests that as many as 1,140 prisoners were detained in the EDC (McNeilly xi). EDC cages were gender-segregated; identified-female and identified-male prisoners were detained separately.⁵² Two types of cages existed in the EDC: 51 built for group confinement, and 25 built for solitary confinement (TPS 44). The group cages were 3-by-6 meters in size, while segregation cages were 3-by-3 meters. The walls and roofs of the cages were constructed out of wire mesh. Sheet metal was placed behind the mesh on three sides, a design that was exploited by prisoners as a site of resistance. Shaking the walls of the cage caused the wire mesh to strike the sheet metal, creating a sound described as “like thunder” by one prisoner (Sekhar 132). Group cages were built to hold around 10 prisoners, yet reports of overcrowding indicate they may have held as many as 40 in a single cage (Smith & Cowen 33).⁵³ Some reports suggest police purposefully filled cages beyond capacity, while leaving others nearly empty, in order to

⁵² Reflecting the role of spaces of incarceration in producing gender binaries (Stanley 6), I use the language of “identified-female” and “identified-male” to signal how the state segregates its captives according to state-assigned “sex” designations which may not correspond to the gender identities of prisoners themselves.

⁵³ See also Yang, “G20 jail photos.”

psychologically confuse detainees (MDC 93). According to the TPS after-action review, the EDC was “designed to hold 500 people ... but was capable of holding up to 750 people” (TPS 44). The OIPRD notes that planning was based on the assumption that a maximum of 500 prisoners would be detained in the EDC (McNeilly 201), and no contingency plans were developed should the number of arrestees exceed 500. Concerns raised in regards to gaps in the planning process were systematically ignored (213). The EDC evidently exceeded its maximum capacity by staggering proportions.

Reports indicate that segregation cages may have been used in the detention of underage (Keaney 120) and injured (Gray 99) prisoners, though other reports tell of wounded or underage prisoners being detained in group adult cages (MDC 92; Wachsmuth 105; Pruyn 111). Whether the detention of minors in adult cages resulted from bureaucratic delays or the negligence of officers on duty, the EDC functioned, on a logistical level, as an exceptional space in which the legal rights of minors were denied. Following the Summit, the segregation cages gained infamy for their use in detaining prisoners identified by police as LGBTQ (Keaney 122; MDC 94). The after-action review claims the smaller cages were “constructed for persons who might require segregation from the general population due to violence or mental health concerns” (TPS 44), implying either that a) queer, trans and genderqueer prisoners were deemed at a significant enough risk of violence from their cisgender or heterosexual cage-mates as to justify preemptive isolation, or that b) being queer, trans or genderqueer constitutes a “mental health concern.” The former claim has been cited by some prisoners as the justification used by the officers who segregated them. A young queer man, whose interview appears in *Exposed*, relates how an officer told him to “act straight” because

“the people in here don’t really take too kind to your type,” before segregating him in a cell he describes as akin to a “dog pen.”

The logic of protection for LGBTQ prisoners via preemptive segregation appears bizarre, given the context. The young man in *Exposed* contends, “The only people who were homophobic in that building were the police.” Even the most rudimentary forms of intelligence gathering would have tipped police off to a themed day of Gender Justice, Queer Rights and DisAbility Rights on June 22, or to a central organizing role played by NOII-Toronto, a group which centralizes the voices and experiences of queer and trans migrants of colour (Hussan 37). A study of the 2009 Pittsburgh G20, at which a black bloc chanted, “We’re here! We’re queer! We’re anarchists, we’ll fuck you up!” (Avery-Natale 95) should suggest to police that even the most so-called “violent” contingent of the anti-G20 protestors were unlikely to be either homogenously heterosexual or tolerant toward queerphobic violence. Given that the 2009 Pittsburgh G20 Summit holds both temporal and geographic proximity to the 2010 Toronto G20 Summit, it seems likely that security forces in Toronto would look to it as a precedent. The OIPRD report confirms that the ISU consulted planners from the Pittsburgh G20 as part of its preparations for Summit security in Toronto (McNeilly 10).

Indeed, the police were perfectly aware of queer representation and resistance within the anti-G20 movement. The RCMP-led Joint Intelligence Group (JIG) used this knowledge in their pre-G20 undercover operations. The infiltration of an activist community in Guelph by undercover Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) detective Brenda Carey was one of JIG’s main intelligence-gathering strategies for a subsequent group conspiracy case. Posing as Brenda Dougherty, Carey inserted herself into the Guelph community and moved in with a group of activists (Mackrael & Morrow). She used a

bicurious identity as part of a cover story to endear herself to activists. The police were thus not only knowledgeable about the queer character of the anti-G20 mobilization, but exploited this knowledge to infiltrate activist communities. Whether Carey is actually a queer woman, or whether she is a heterosexual woman who posed as queer, does not change the strategy JIG employed. Queerness was transformed into a resource in service of the state, raising the question: does homonationalism require actual queers to function, or can queerness become a resource disconnected from queer bodies, harnessed by the state, and mobilized in the service of state interests?

The use of queerness as a resource to be harnessed by settler states to forward national projects is hardly unprecedented. The state of Israel has effectively mobilized queerness as a narrative about Israel, through a large-scale public relations campaign titled “Brand Israel” launched by the Israeli Foreign Ministry (Puar, “Citation and Censorship” 137). Commonly referred to as “Israeli pink-washing” by activists, including the Toronto-based Queers Against Israeli Apartheid (QuAIA), “Brand Israel” seeks to justify the ongoing occupation of Palestine by positioning Israel as gay-friendly in relation to a Palestinian ‘other’ imagined as “barbaric, homophobic and uncivilized” (138). The pink-washing of Israel “denies Israeli homophobic oppression of its own gays and lesbians ... [and] works to elide the presence of numerous Palestinian gay and lesbian organisations [sic]” (138). The discourse of gay-friendliness serves as a supporting narrative for the Israeli settler colonial project, functioning partially by disconnecting queerness from the lived realities of queers. Pride Toronto and the TPS faced allegations of pink-washing two days following the conclusion of the G20, when Blair was hosted at a cocktail party at the 519 Community Centre as part of Pride Week (McCann). Once again, a narrative of queer-friendliness was mobilized as part of a public relations

campaign serving the interests of the state; in this case, it worked to obscure the gendered, sexualized, and queerphobic violence that queer, trans, and genderqueer peoples experienced in the EDC only days earlier.⁵⁴ Through infiltration strategies and pink-washing attempts, the state agents involved in policing the G20 reveal themselves to be savvy about how queerness can be mobilized and exploited to serve state interests.

None of this is to efface the reality of queer- and transphobia in social movements, including mobilizations against the Toronto G20.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, this line of argument is intended to refute claim that police believed queer, trans and genderqueer prisoners were in such heightened danger from their peers in the EDC that preemptive segregation was justified. The logic of preemptive protection operated only as a justificatory discourse that allowed special punishments for prisoners identified as LGBTQ to be built into the EDC at a physical and procedural level. The inconsistency with which the segregation of LGBTQ prisoners was applied attests to the queer- and transphobic logics that underwrote these practices. In some cases, police identified prisoners as LGBTQ only to subject them to abusive treatment inconsistent with the logic of preemptive protection. One identified-female detainee relates how she witnessed someone who “[might] identify as genderqueer, or perhaps ... might identify as a trans-person” (qtd. in Keaney) being repeatedly shuffled between cages by officers who appeared confused about where to place hir

⁵⁴ This pink-washing campaign was unsuccessful, as queers arrived on scene to protest and disrupt the event. (McCann).

⁵⁵ For example, the entry on Carey on SnitchWire, a website dedicated to investigating and reporting on undercovers and informants, refers to Carey as a “bitch” and includes a post-script addressed to Carey: “We found your dildo. You should come here and get it so you can go fuck yourself” (SnitchWire).

(122).⁵⁶ The officers in question verbally mocked the individual, referring to ze as “it,” while moving zem from cage to cage (122). Gender-segregated cages, like those in all spaces of incarceration, constituted one of the ways in which gender and sexual policing, and the gendered the sexualized abuse of trans, queer and genderqueer peoples, was spatially organized in the EDC.

Group cages contained a bathroom with the door removed, which operated as a site of gendered and sexualized harassment. Identified-female prisoners were forced to expose themselves to on-looking male guards (MDC 94; Gray 100). Male officers took the opportunity to watch and make sexualized comments at identified-female prisoners, including minors (Keaney 120). In resistance, identified-female prisoners took to forming human walls with their bodies to conceal one another from the guards (Keaney 120). While this tactic may have functioned for those detained in cages with other people, identified-female prisoners kept in solitary confinement, including queer and underage prisoners, had no means to protect themselves. Sanitary napkins were provided only upon request and at the discretion of guards. One woman, who was menstruating at the time of her detention, was provided with only a single sanitary napkin (Keaney 121). During her strip-search, female officers threw her underwear on the dirty ground, pad side down; the woman was forced to put it back on with pepper spray residue, as well as particles of sawdust and paint chips, stuck to the napkin (121). The physical construction of the washrooms and the inadequate provision of sanitary supplies demonstrate how gendered and sexualized violence was spatially and logistically organized in the EDC.

⁵⁶ In lieu of knowledge about this person’s preferred pronouns, I have opted to use the gender-neutral “ze,” “hir” and “zem.”

Additionally, the bathrooms operated as a spatial organization of the ableism underlying the operations of the criminal (in)justice system. The physical inaccessibility of the washrooms was compounded by refusals of “the accommodations ... guaranteed to [persons with dis/abilities] by human rights legislation” (MDC 94). The gendered, sexualized, and ableist logics built into the construction of the EDC were supported by similar logics employed in the street by police.⁵⁷ Denial of medical care, even in the case of severe injuries, was a systemic problem in the EDC. The Movement Defense Committee received numerous reports of prisoners denied medical treatment (MDC 92). Denials of access to medication, even when medical notes or prescriptions were provided, were commonplace (MDC 94). A single physician, staffing the EDC’s only medical trailer, was assigned to look after the medical needs of over 1,118 prisoners (TPS 44), many of whom had been violently arrested by riot police employing tear gas, pepper spray, rubber bullets, and batons. The delays and denials that prisoners experienced in obtaining medical treatment, resulting in health complications for many, were a direct result of the pre-planned logistical functioning and physical construction of the EDC.

Though the after-action review describes a plan for the speedy processing of prisoners, in truth prisoners experienced delays as long as 24 hours or more. I was arrested at 2:25am on the morning of June 27, yet not processed until 12:41am on the morning of June 28, a delay of over 22 hours for a process that normally occurs immediately upon arrival in a police station following arrest (TPS 47). Prisoners were not permitted to access to phones until after being processed (49), effectively ensuring the denial of rights to telephone use and legal counsel. Arrests targeting MDC members

⁵⁷ See, for example, the interview with Brenda Bowles in *Into the Fire* (2011).

providing legal counsel meant that even when activists were allowed to use the phones, there may not have been anyone to answer the legal aid line (MDC 111). The after-action review acknowledges “bottlenecks” (47) occurred in processing, and implies these “bottlenecks” were unfortunate and unavoidable. The OIPRD contends that delays occurred as a direct result of poor planning, including no official process for dealing with prisoners facing no criminal charges (McNeilly 213-214), which included 740 people arrested on breach of peace orders (MDC 90). I contend that the delays in prisoner processing were strategically built in to the logistical functioning of the EDC. The logistical design of the EDC involved an excess of paperwork and procedure⁵⁸ paired with insufficient staff,⁵⁹ training,⁶⁰ and space⁶¹ required to carry out these bureaucratic measures. Supported by the counter-law and rhetorical-law measures that resulted in the arrest of over 1,118 people, this procedural design was set up to fail. It was not until the evening of June 27 that additional Court Services officers were assigned to assist in understaffed roles in the EDC (48). Effectively, the so-called “bottlenecks” created delays that ensured prisoners would not be released until after the conclusion of the G20 Summit, constituting the EDC as a space of exception in which due process did not exist.

The EDC contained a series of strip-search chambers, built out of particleboard. Over 100 surveillance cameras covered the corridors, cages and booking trailers of the EDC, monitored at all times by Court Services officers (TPS 44). This every-present gaze

⁵⁸ See TPS 47 in regards to the redundancy of booking and intake procedures, and TPS 46 in regards to the inadequate design of HOT sheets used at the scene of arrests.

⁵⁹ See TPS 46 in regards to insufficient “triage” officers to facilitate the hand-offs of prisoners to Court Services, and TPS 47-48 in regards to insufficient Court Services staff assigned to key roles in the EDC.

⁶⁰ See McNeilly 206-207 in regards to the inadequate training provided to EDC staff.

⁶¹ See TPS 47 in regards to the provision of only 12 booking trailers, and McNeilly 214 in regards to the inadequate capacity of the facility.

rendered the EDC a disciplinary space, in which the “disciplinary apparatus ... make[s] it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly” (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 173). The only areas not under CCTV surveillance were the strip-search booths, constituting them as blind spots in the disciplinary gaze in a manner that implicitly permits the use of sexualized and gendered violence by police toward prisoners. 245 prisoners were subjected to a level 3 strip-search, though required “search of person” templates articulating the justification for these searches were provided in only 59 cases (McNeilly 238). Level 3 searches exposed prisoners, and in particular trans, genderqueer, and identified-female prisoners, to sexualized harassment and violence. Many identified-female prisoners experienced panic attacks and triggered memories of sexualized violence as a result of subjection to strip searches (Keaney 121). Identified-female prisoners moved to a nearby jail were stripped a second time in front of male officers who watched and made sexualized comments (121). Standard strip-search procedure stipulates that searches must be conducted by officers of the “same sex” as the prisoner, demonstrating how the binary logics of the (in)justice system target trans and genderqueer prisoners for sexualized violence through erasure. One genderqueer individual, identified-female by the state, was surrounded by eight male officers who threatened to conduct the search; ultimately, they were searched by four female officers (Gray 99). I argue that strip-searches, which are conducted through the use or threat of force, must *always* be read as sexualized violence. That the (in)justice system requires and sanctions strip-searches should not suggest otherwise; rather, it suggests only that sexualized violence is a normalized part of the operations of law enforcement, the PIC, and, by extension, the settler colonial state.

The physical construction and logistical operations of the EDC constituted it as a spatial organization of the exception that functioned as a temporary camp. Supported by the activation of an exceptional state on the streets of Toronto through the enactment of counter-law and rhetorical-law measures, the EDC organized the suspension of rights guaranteed by national and international law. In some ways, the EDC operated at a camp that was indiscriminate in its scope; white citizen-subjects – the exalted subjects of Canada, around whom G20 resistance narratives are centered – became caught up in the exceptional logics of the camp. In other ways, the EDC was organized through gendered, sexualized, and ableist logics that ensured different peoples became caught up in its operations differently. As a camp that exposed certain populations to greater violence than others *despite* its supposedly indiscriminate scope, the EDC operated as a manifestation of the normalized state of exception that founds the Canadian settler colonial nation. Yet the narrative of “Torontonamo” produces the EDC as a wound to white citizenship. It does so by normalizing Camp Delta – and by extension KIHIC, and all other manifestations of the camp in Canada – while producing racialized populations as the appropriate targets of the exception. This turn implicitly relies on the construction of colonized peoples and peoples of colour as racialized “terrorists,” as enemies to national security, as perversely and queerly sexual (Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages* 37), and as dangerous, barbaric others whose presence threatens the civilized nation.

The New Normal of Citizenship in the Settler State

My critique of “Torontonamo” should not suggest that social movements in Canada have nothing to learn from the EDC. As a temporary camp brought into being in the context of mass mobilization against the Toronto G20 Summit, the EDC represents a

spatial and temporal organization of the exception that has plenty to teach about the normalized operations of white supremacist settler colonialism. First, the physical construction and logistical organization of the EDC offers a site of study for how spaces of incarceration and detention, which disproportionately keep Indigenous peoples and peoples of colour behind bars in Canada, organize and normalize sexualized, gendered, and ableist violence. Second, the conditions and interactions that brought the EDC into being reveal plenty about how the language of (inter)national security – a racialized and sexualized discourse that (re)produces whiteness and heterosexuality as the centre of Canadian national belonging (Kinsman & Gentile 432) – can activate counter-law measures against populations. The rhetorical-law extensions of the PWPA demonstrate how law enforcement function as a street-level “petty sovereignty” in governmentality, imbued with performative power over the lives of criminalized groups. The narrative of “Torontonamo” constructs the EDC as unprecedented and exceptional, preventing activists from engaging with the insights the space has to offer. Rather than interpreting the EDC as exceptional, we must view the EDC as only a highly visible manifestation of the normal operations of the exception in white supremacist settler colonialism. Its visibility makes it useful for analysis, but only insofar as we approach it as a reflection of the daily violence enacted against abjected populations by the Canadian white supremacist settler colonial state.

The EDC stands as a spatial demonstration that we are where we have always been in Canada: in a state where every subject is potentially *homo sacer* (Agamben, *Homo Sacer* 84), yet all subjects are positioned differently in relation to the state of exception (Morgensen, “Biopolitics” 72). G20 resistance narratives and the narrative of “Torontonamo” would have activists in Canada believe we are witnessing something

new: that rights have been eroded in unprecedented ways, and that Canadian democracy is under attack. This project set out to argue that what we are witnessing is only the normalized operations of a white supremacist settler nation founded on the exception. As Chapter Two argued, the line between insiders and outsiders in the Canadian nation shifts temporally and contextually, perpetually (re)defining subjects in relation to the state of exception. The G20 in Toronto brought about a temporary (re)drawing of that line in such a way that the rights of IPPs and an international capitalist alliance were elevated over the rights of Canadian citizens, yet this should not suggest an erosion of rights or a broken democratic system in need of repair. Rather, it should suggest only the continuation of a system that came into being, and continues to be sustained, by enslaving and exploited the labour of peoples of colour while elevating the rights of settlers of European descent over the dignity, humanity, and sovereignty of the peoples who are Indigenous to this land. The model of rights and citizenship in Canada is not broken. In abandoning populations to spaces beyond the protection of the law, citizenship in the settler colonial nation is functioning *precisely the way it always has functioned, and always was intended to function.*

Epilogue

Citizenship in the white supremacist, settler colonial nation, as this project set out to demonstrate, is a construct founded upon a normalized state of exception. In Canada, it is produced through the biopolitical process of settlement, which manages race, gender, and sexuality to ensure that Canadian national belonging emerges as a (white) racialized, (cis)gendered, (hetero)sexualized construct. As the narratives that emerged surrounding the mass mobilization against the 2010 Toronto G20 demonstrate, rights-based discourses of citizenship are often reproduced within social justice movements. These movements, despite presenting themselves as liberatory, operate as profoundly conservative and colonial reassertions of race thinking in relation to the normalized operations of the exception in Canada. White citizen-subjects, particularly those who are heterosexual, cisgender, middle-class men, (re)produce themselves as the proper recipients of rights, while producing political dissent as a patriotic enactment of the rites of nationals. Repression and police brutality against these proper citizen-subjects is presented as exceptional, effacing the reality that law enforcement and the criminal (in)justice system in Canada regularly act to expose racialized and Indigenous populations to a normalized state of exception that finds spatial organization in a proliferation of camps across this stolen land. Ultimately, dominant narratives within social justice movements serve to uphold white supremacy and settler colonialism in Canada, rather than challenging them.

The argument could be made that social movements for change are heating up in the Western world. The austerity measures called for at the Toronto G20, and implemented in Western nations in the form of cuts to social programs, resulted in large-scale protest in a variety of places, including France, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom (Klein xv). In the UK, a student uprising in November 2010 against education

cuts was followed by an enormous anti-austerity demonstration in March 2011. Four days of rioting overtook England in August 2011, following the police murder of Mark Duggan, a young black man. Though the media portrayed the events as random looting, the riots foregrounded resistance to systemic racism and classism in England. In the United States, protestors took over Zuccotti Park on Wall Street on September 17, 2011. The event marked the beginning of the Occupy Movement,⁶² a large-scale, multi-city mobilization initiated by an ad published in the back of culture-jamming magazine *Adbusters*. Vacillating between anti-capitalism and economic reformism, the Occupy Movement went international. Its deepest resonance was found in the United States, where over 600 cities formed local Occupy groups. Canadian cities participated as well, including sizeable occupations in Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver. In February 2012, proposed increases to Québec student tuition sparked the beginning of a popular movement that saw hundreds of consecutive days of mass mobilization in Montreal. This list represents only a few of the recent moments of uprising in Western democratic states. For those of us with the will to hope for better futures, the situation raises provocative questions about whether Western nations are approaching social and economic breaking points at which profound change may become possible. Now, perhaps more than ever, is an important time to take stock of the lessons to be learned from protest and the current state of social justice movements.

In Toronto, following the G20 Summit, liberal hopes and efforts turned toward agitating for inquiries into the actions of police and the ISU. Yet no amount of inquiries,

⁶² Unsurprisingly, the narratives of Occupy Wall Street and its offshoots are wrapped up in what Native Youth Sexual Health Network coordinator Jessica Yee describes as the “nationalist, patriotic language of imperialism” (Yee), drawing critiques from Indigenous activists across the United States and Canada. See especially Yee and Montano.

whether by the CCLA, the OIPRD, or the Ontario Ombudsman, resulted in more than token reprimands that satisfy only the liberal media and the white citizen-subjects for whom G20 policing appeared exceptional. The normalized operations of the exception in Canada continue, as they always have. New measures, like Bill 78, passed in Québec in May 2012 in response to the student strike, or Bill C-309, expected to pass in summer 2012, serve as reminders that the state of exception is always present, and always ready for activation in ways that serve the interests of the settler colonial state. Measures like the December 2011 ban on Muslim women wearing niqabs while taking citizenship oaths,⁶³ Bill C-31 (the “Protecting Canada’s Immigration System Act” which passed into law in June 2012),⁶⁴ or the new Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act⁶⁵ attest to the fact that the state of exception operates primarily through race thinking to target racialized populations for exposure to rightless-ness. Western democracy proves itself again to be founded upon a system that operates through raced, gendered, and sexualized logics to exalt particular subjects as national “insiders” while exposing others to a normalized state of exception.

The lessons of the Toronto G20 and subsequent mobilizations present a myriad of pressing questions for social justice activists in Canada. What might it look like to resist police brutality and repression against demonstrators in the context of a movement invested in resisting state violence, white supremacy, and settler colonialism? What might it look like for white settlers to answer Andrea Smith’s call to “think beyond the nation-state?” What might it look like to resist spaces like the EDC, not by naturalizing and

⁶³ For more on the niqab ban, see Payton.

⁶⁴ For more on Bill C-31, including measures that will expose refugees entering Canada through “illegal” or “irregular” means to indefinite detention, see Saad & Man.

⁶⁵ For more, see Cross.

reasserting the camp as a racialized space, but in the context of resistance to *all* spatial organizations of the exception? If we view the actions of the police during the G20 not as exceptional violations of rights, but only as an extension and fulfillment of the normalized operations of Western democracy in settler colonies, what frameworks for struggle present themselves? If trans and queer struggles refuse rights-based discourses that centralize hate crime legislation – refuse, in other words, to collaborate with the PIC, the criminal (in)justice system, and the settler colonial state that organize the oppression of queer and trans peoples – in what ways might liberation be envisioned? Most importantly, how can we build communities and worlds in which we might actually want to live, communities built on respect, consent, mutual aid, and social justice for all?

These questions are beyond the scope of this project. The purpose of this work was to produce a critique of the discourses of rights and citizenship that circulate as resistance narratives among social justice activists in Canada. These discourses have hegemonic power within movements, framing struggles on the streets and narratives in the media. As a result, social justice movements in Canada currently operate to reinforce and reproduce white supremacist settler colonialism. I wrote this document focused on the project of creating this critique, knowing that doing so would lead me away from direct engagement with the questions above and with social justice groups that *are* producing the kinds of anti-racist, anti-colonial, and anti-state struggles I believe are vital on this stolen land. Many organizations active in the anti-G20 mobilization centralized and operated under different narratives from the ones I critique. No One Is Illegal comes to mind, as do the Indigenous groups that staged a mass-scale protest for Indigenous sovereignty during G20 protests. A differently-focused study of the Toronto G20 would no doubt reveal a different set of lessons about social justice movements in Canada. Yet I

believe the critique produced in my work is vital; as activists, we must engage with our failures even more than our successes. As Foucault says, “where there is power, there is resistance, yet ... this resistance is never in a position of exteriority to power” (*History of Sexuality* 95). There is no centre of resistance, no pure revolutionary will or privileged home to rebellion; there are only multiple and constant sites of resistance. Resistance is inseparable from the powers that it resists, a seeming contradiction, which only underlines the necessity to engage carefully and critically with the failures in our movements. It is with this necessity in mind that this project has proceeded, in the hopes of providing new avenues into old conversations in order to shift the direction of social justice movements on this stolen land called Canada.

References

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans: Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. Print.
- . *State of Exception*. Trans. Kevin Attell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Print.
- Alfred, Taiaiake. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Alturi, Tara. "Lighten Up?!: Humour, Race, and Da off colour joke of *Ali G*." *Media, Culture, and Society* 31.2 (2009): 197-214. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.
- Anderson, Kim. *A Recognition of Being: Reconstructing Native Womanhood*. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2000. Print.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1973. Print.
- Austin, J.L. *How To Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. Print.
- Avery-Natale, Edward. "'We're Here, We're Queer, We're Anarchists!': the Nature of Identification and Subjectivity Among Black Blocs." *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* 1 (2010): 95-115. Print.
- Banerjee, Sidhartha. "Quebec student protest arrests climb to over 2,500." *The Vancouver Sun*. Postmedia Network Inc., 25 May 2012. Web. 4 June 2012.
- Baute, Nicole. "G20 officer: 'This ain't Canada right now'." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 20 Jan. 2011. Web. 11 May 2012.

Bill C-389: An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Criminal Code (gender identity and gender expression). 3rd Reading. 40th Parl., 3rd sess. [Ottawa]: Library of Parliament, 2011. *Parliament of Canada*. Web. 16 Apr. 2012.

Boesveld, Sarah & Anna Mehler Paperny. "Deaf man arrested in G20 protest gets bail." *The Globe and Mail*. The Globe and Mail Inc., 26 June 2010. Web. 17 May 2012.

Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso, 2004. Print.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c. 11.

Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA). "Canadian Civil Liberties Association files complaints against G20 police." *rabble.ca*. 15 July 2010. Web. 4 Sept 2011.

---. "CCLA denounces the sweeping arrests at G20." *Canadian Civil Liberties Association – Association Canadienne des Libertes Civile*. Canadian Civil Liberties Association, 27 June 2010. Web. 14 May 2012.

Canadian Press, The. "Chief admits 5-metre G20 security rule didn't exist." *CBC News*. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 29 June 2010. Web. 11 June 2012.

CBC News. "Double-bunking provision included in prison expansion plan: Conservative MP says any double-bunking would be temporary." *CBC News*. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 7 Mar. 2012. Web. 30 April 2012.

---. "G20 protestor claims police took prosthetic leg." *CBC News*. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 7 July 2010. Web. 16 May 2012.

Charlie. "Not the Toronto Hilton: Torontonamo Bay 2010." *The Love Police: The Revolution is NOW*. 15 July 2010. Web. 9 June 2012.

Churchill, Ward. *Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in*

- North America*. 1998. Oakland: AK Press, 2007. Print.
- Clancy, James. Foreword. *Breach of the Peace: G20 Summit: Accountability in Policing and Governance*. By National Union of Public and General Employees & Canadian Civil Liberties Association. Ottawa, 2011. 6-7. Print.
- Contenta, Sandro. "Hundreds mark G20 anniversary with calls for Blair to resign." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 25 June 2011. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Cross, Allison. "Kenney launches crackdown on foreign criminals who abuse appeals process to delay deportation." *National Post*. Postmedia Network Inc., 20 June 2012. Web. 23 June 2012.
- CTV.ca News Staff. "Police actions questioned following G20 weekend." *CTV News*. Bell Media Television, 28 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- ctvtoronto.ca. "Another large demonstration follows the G20." *CTV News*. Bell Media Television, 28 June 2010. Web. 9 June 2012.
- Das Gupta, Tania. "Families of Native People, Immigrants, and People of Colour." *Canadian Families: Diversity, Conflict, and Change*. 2nd Edition. Eds. Nancy Mandell and Ann Duffy. Toronto: Harcourt Canada Ltd., 2000. 146-187. Print.
- De Sousa, Grace. "Reconstructing an Imagined Community: The Politics of Regional and National Identity in CBC Radio's *Jake and the Kid* Revival (1969-1970)." *Journal of Radio Studies*. 6.1 (1999): 134-149. Print.
- Des Rosiers, Nathalie. Foreword. *Breach of the Peace: G20 Summit: Accountability in Policing and Governance*. By National Union of Public and General Employees & Canadian Civil Liberties Association. Ottawa, 2011. 8-9. Print.
- Draper, Doug. "Thorold, Ontario Amputee Has His Artificial Leg Ripped Off By Police

- And Is Slammed In Makeshift Cell During G20 Summit – At Least One Ontario MPP Calls The Whole Episode ‘Shocking’.” *Niagara At Large*. Niagara At Large: An Independent Site for News and Commentary. 5 July 2010. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Dua, Enakshi. “Beyond Diversity: Exploring the Ways in Which the Discourse of Race has Shaped the Institution of the Nuclear Family.” *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist Feminist Thought*. Eds. Enakshi Dua and Angela Robertson. Toronto: Women’s Press, 1999. 237-259. Print.
- . “Racializing Imperial Canada: Indian Women and the Making of Ethnic Communities.” *Sisters of Strangers?: Immigrant, Ethnic, and Racialized Women in Canadian History*. Eds. Marlene Epp, Franca Iacovetta and Frances Swyripa. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. 71-85. Print.
- El Akkad, Omar. “G20 digital highlights (and lowlights).” *The Globe and Mail*. The Globe and Mail Inc., 28 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Ervelles, Nirmala & Andrea Minear. “Unspeakable Offenses: Untangling Race and Disability in Discourses of Intersectionality.” *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*. 4.2 (2010): 127-145. Print.
- Ericson, Richard V. *Crime in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007. Print.
- Fagan, Noreen. “Police presence divides Ottawa trans communities.” *Xtra! Xtra!*: Canada’s Gay and Lesbian Newspaper, 19 Nov. 2010. Web. 18 Apr. 2012.
- Fierce and Fabulous Krew. “Trannies and Queers Will NEVER Be “Allies” With the Cops! An Update On The Ottawa Trans Day Of Remembrance.” *fierce & fabulous krew in guelph!: Fucking Anarchy Up The Ass!* Fierce and Fabulous Krew, 23 Nov. 2010. Web. 18 Apr. 2012.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan.

1977. Toronto: Random House of Canada Ltd., 1995. Print.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Random House Inc., 1978. Print.
- Freeman, Victoria. “‘Toronto Has No History!’: Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada’s Largest City.” *Urban History Review* 38.2. (2010): 21-35. Print.
- Furniss, Elizabeth. *The Burden of History: Colonialism and the Frontier Myth in a Rural Canadian Community*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1999. Print.
- Gelderloos, Peter. *How Nonviolence Protects the State*. Cambridge: South End Press, 2007. Print.
- Gillis, Wendy. “Toronto police settle G20 human rights case against paraplegic man.” *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 6 Mar. 2012. Web. 17 May 2012.
- Gilroy, Paul. *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000. Print.
- Gray, Nat. “They Sought to Terrify Us Out of the Streets.” *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 115-124. Print.
- Guest Contributor. “Videos of the G20 O’Canada protest and police rush.” *blogTO*. blogTO, 28 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Henry, Frances & Carol Tator. “State Policy and Practices as Racialized Discourse: Multiculturalism, the Charter, and Employment Equity.” *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*. 2nd ed. Ed. Peter S. Li. London: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Hill Collins, Patricia. “It’s All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race and Nation.”

Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World. Eds. Uma Narayan and Sandra Harding. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000. 156-176. Print.

Hui, Stephen. "Video: Riot police charge G20 protestors singing O Canada in Toronto." *straight.com: Vancouver Online Source*. Vancouver Free Press, 27 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.

Hussan, Syed. "Collective Movement, Collective Power: People of Colour, Migrant Justice, and the G20." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 35-42. Print.

Intini, John, Julia Belluz, Josh Dehaas, and Stephanie Findlay. "The Summit: Showdown in the Streets: Cops and protestors clashed, but agreed on one thing: the other side was to blame." *Maclean's* 123.27 (2010): 27. Print.

Into the Fire. Dr. Dan Dicks. Press For Truth, 2011. DVD.

Keaney, Shailagh. "Women Resist, Police Repress: Gendered Police Violence at the Toronto G20." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 97-102. Print.

Kellar, Dan. "Presenting the Movement's Narratives: Organizing Alternative Media." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 71-78. Print.

Kennedy, Brendan. "Disabled man files human rights complaint against police." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 27 May 2011. Web. 17 May 2012.

- . "Toronto police accused of racial profiling." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 9 Sept. 2011. Web. 17 May 2012.
- Kinsman, Gary & Patrizia Gentile. *The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010. Print.
- Klein, Naomi. Foreword: G20 Trials and the War on Activism. *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. xi-xvii. Print.
- Kraus, Krystalline. "G8/G20 Communique: 303 people head to court Monday." *rabble.ca: News for the Rest of Us*. Rabble, 23 Aug. 2010. Web. 9 June 2012.
- . "G8/G20 Communique: G20 activist claims police pulled off his prosthetic leg." *rabble.ca: News for the Rest of Us*. Rabble, 6 July 2010. Web. 16 May 2012.
- . "G8/G20 Communique: Police attack crowd after Oh Canada sung." *rabble.ca: News for the Rest of Us*. Rabble, 29 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- . "G8/G20 Communique: Police conduct midnight raids on activists, up to 23 arrested." *rabble.ca: News for the Rest of Us*. Rabble, 26 June 2010. Web. 17 May 2012.
- Larsen, Michael. "Kingston Immigration Centre Closes, Legacy Remains." *Prism: News and Views that Matter*. Prism Magazine, 20 Apr. 2012. Web. 8 June 2012.
- Larsen, Mike & Justin Piché. "Exceptional State, Pragmatic Bureaucracy, Indefinite Detention." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 24.2 (2009): 203-229. Print.
- Lawrence, Bonita. "Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. Print.
- Lawrence, Bonita & Enakshi Dua. "Decolonizing Antiracism." *Social Justice* 32.4 (2005): 120-143. Print.

- Legault, Barbara and Jodi Proctor. "Sexism and Assault in 'Torontonamo' Jails Brings More Shame to G20." *Canadian Dimension* 44.5 (2010): 11. Print.
- Lyracist. "Torontonamo (Airplanes Remix 2010)." 2010. MP3.
- Macgillivray, Emily Jane. *Red and Black Blood: Teaching the Logic of the Canadian Settler State*. MA thesis. Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, 2011. Print.
- Mackrael, Kim & Adrian Morrow. "Undercover agents knew of plans for downtown mayhem during G20." *The Globe and Mail*. The Globe and Mail, 23 Nov. 2011. Web. 7 Jan. 2012.
- macleans.ca. "G20 police seized man's prosthetic leg, called it a weapon." *MacLeans.ca*. Rogers Communications, 7 July 2010. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Malleson, Tom. "Building a Protest Convergence: the Toronto Community Mobilization Network." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 17-28. Print.
- Marin, And . *Caught in the Act: Investigation into The Ministry of Community Safety and Correction Services' conduct in relation to Ontario Regulation 233/10 under the Public Works Protection Act*. Ontario, Ombudsman of Ontario: 2010. Print.
- Martinez, Elizabeth Betita. "The WTO: Where Was the Color in Seattle?" *Colorlines*. 3.1 (2000): 11. Print.
- MayorVij. "2010 Mayor of Toronto Hopeful Interviews 'Toronto G20 Exposed' Director." *YouTube*. YouTube LLC, 11 Oct. 2010. Web. 27 Aug. 2011.
- McCann, Marcus. "Pride Toronto, Toronto Police cocktail party turns ugly." *Xtra! Xtra!*: Canada's Gay and Lesbian Newspaper, 29 June 2010. Web. 8 Jan. 2012.
- McNally, David. "Social Protest in the Age of Austerity: Prospects for Mass Resistance

- After the G20.” *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 201-212. Print.
- McNeilly, Gerry. *Policing the Right to Protest: G20 Systemic Review Report*. Toronto: Office of the Independent Police Review Director, 2012. Print.
- McKittrick, Katherine. *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 2006. Print.
- Mensah, Joseph. *Black Canadians: History, Experiences, Social Conditions*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2002. Print.
- mkmillard1982. “Peaceful G20 Protest at Queen & Spadina.” *YouTube*. YouTube LLC, 27 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Montano, John Paul. “An Open Letter to the Occupy Wall Street Activists.” *Zashnain @bedlamfury*. Blogger, 24 Sept. 2011. Web. 21 June 2012.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1995. Print.
- Morgensen, Scott Lauria. “The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 1 (2011): 52-76. Print.
- . “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities.” *GLQ* 16.1-2 (2010):105-131. Print.
- Movement Defense Committee (MDC). “Police Violence and State Repression at the Toronto G20: The Facts.” *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 87-96. Print.
- Nagra, Narina. “Whiteness in Seattle: Anti-globalization activists examine racism within

- the movement.” *Alternatives Journal*. 29.1 (2003): 27-28. Print.
- Namaste, Viviane K. *Invisible Lives: The Erasure of Transsexual and Transgendered People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. Print.
- . *Sex Change, Social Change: Reflections on Identity, Institutions, and Imperialism*. Toronto: Women’s Press, 2005. Print.
- No One Is Illegal - Vancouver (NOII-Van). “Seven myths about the Tamil refugees.” *rabble.ca*. rabble.ca: News for the Rest of Us, 20 Aug. 2010. Web. 30 April 2012.
- Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988. Print.
- Patton, Paul. “Agamben and Foucault on Biopower and Biopolitics.” *Giorgio Agamben: Sovereignty & Life*. Eds. Matthew Calarco and Steven DeCaroli. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007. 203-218. Print.
- Payton, Laura. “Face veils banned for citizenship oath.” *CBC News*. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 12 Dec. 2011. Web. 21 June 2012.
- Press for Truth (PFT). “About Press for Truth.” *Press For Truth*. Press For Truth, n.d. Web. 28 Aug. 2011.
- . “Police CCTV Footage of G20 Detention Center For The Public Record.” *Press For Truth*. Press For Truth, n.d. Web. 9 June 2012.
- Pruyn, Sarah. “‘Hop!’: A First Hand Account of Police Abuse at the G20.” *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 109-113. Print.
- Puar, Jasbir. “Citation and Censorship: The Politics of Talking about the Politics of Israel.” *Feminist Legal Studies* 19.2 (2011): 133-142. Print.
- . *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham: Duke University

- Press, 2007. Print.
- Rankin, Jim. "Race Matters: Blacks documented by police at high rate." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 6 Feb. 2010. Web. 22 May 2012.
- Razack, Sherene H. *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007. Print.
- ReetReeter. "G20 Toronto police arrest a young man on College St." *Youtube*. YouTube LLC, 26 June 2010. Web. 17 May 2012.
- Rider, David. "Miller pushes for compensation, blames Ottawa for G20 chaos." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 28 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Robertson, Ian. "Deaf man charged with assaulting cops not protestor, friends claim: Emomotimi Azorbo granted bail after being charged with assaulting police at a downtown G20 protest." *The Toronto Sun*. Canoe Sun Media, 26 June 2010. Web. 17 May 2012.
- Scott, Mac. "Community Organizing for a Global Protest." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 29-33. Print.
- Sears, Alan. *A Good Book, in Theory: A Guide to Theoretical Thinking*. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2005. Print.
- Small, Peter. "Judge allows one G20 class action lawsuit to seek certification, while staying a second one." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 30 Aug. 2011. Web. 14 May 2012.
- Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. New York: South End Press, 2005. Print.
- Smith, Neil & Deborah Cowen. "'Martial Law in the Streets of Toronto': G20 Security

- and State Violence.” *Human Geography*. 3.3 (2010): 29-46. Print.
- SnitchWire. “Police Infiltrate Anarchists and Activists (Guelph, Kitchener, Ontario).”
SnitchWire: So you get what’s coming to you. Blogger, 30 July 2010. Web. 8 Jan. 2012.
- Spade, Dean. *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. Brooklyn: South End Press, 2011. Print.
- Srivastava, Sarita. “Troubles with Anti-Racist Multiculturalism: The Challenges of Anti-Racist and Feminist Activism.” *Race and Racism in 21st Century Canada*. Eds. Sean Hier and B. Sing Bolaria. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2007. Print.
- Stanley, Eric A. “Introduction: Fugitive Flesh: Gender Self-Determination, Queer Abolition and Trans Resistance.” *Captive Genders: Trans Embodiment and the Prison Industrial Complex*. Eds. Eric A. Stanley & Nat Smith. Oakland: AK Press, 2011. 1-11. Print.
- Tehowe. “Everything is OK – the Toronto G20 Redux, Pt 1.” *Toronto Media Co-op*. The Dominion News Cooperative, 3 Nov. 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- . “The Criminalization of Dissent – The Toronto G20 Redux, Pt 2.” *Toronto Media Co-op*. The Dominion News Cooperative, 3 Nov. 2010. Web. 9 June 2012.
- Test Their Logik. “Torontonamo.” *A*. 2011. CD.
- Thobani, Sunera. *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Inc., 2007. Print.
- Topping, David. “The Fourteen Essential G20 Videos.” *Torontoist*. Ink Truck Media, 30 June 2010. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Toronto Community Mobilization Network (TCMN). “Schedule of Events.” *G8/G20 Community Solidarity Network*. n.d. Web. 5 June 2012.

- Toronto G20 Exposed*. Dir. Derek Soberal & Adam Letalik. TorontoG20Exposed.ca, 2010. DVD.
- Toronto Police Services (TPS). *Toronto Police Service After-Action Review, G20 Summit, Toronto Ontario, June 2010*. June 2011. PDF file.
- Torontonamo. "About." *Torontonamo: Links about G20 police actions*.
Torontonamo.com, n.d. Web. 9 June 2012.
- Vallis, Mary. "Amputee alleges G20 police ripped off his prosthetic leg." *National Post*.
National Post, 6 July 2010. Web. 16 May 2012.
- Van Kirk, Sylvia. "The Impact of White Women on Fur Trade Society." *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History*. Eds. Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1977. 27-48. Print.
- Wachsmuth, David. "One Day in a Cage: Notes on the Temporary Detention Centre." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 103-108. Print.
- Walcott, Rinaldo. *Black Like Who?: Writing Black Canada*. Toronto: Insomnia Press, 1997. Print.
- Walker, James W. St. G. *A History of Blacks in Canada: A Study Guide for Teachers and Students*. Quebec: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1980. Print.
- Ward, W. Peter. *White Canada Forever: Popular Attitudes and Public Policy Toward Orientals in British Columbia*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978. Print.
- Winks, Robin W. *The Blacks in Canada: A History*. 2nd ed. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997. Print.

- Wolfe, Patrick. "Structure and Event: Settler Colonialism, Time, and the Question of Genocide." *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subalter*. Ed. Dirk Moses. London: Berghahn Books, 2009. 102-132. Print.
- Wood, Lesley J & Glenn J. Stalker. "Surveying the Landscape: Local Protestors and Global Summits." *Whose Streets?: The Toronto G20 and the Challenges of Summit Protest*. Eds. Tom Malleson & David Wachsmuth. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2011. 177-185. Print.
- Yang, Jennifer. "Deaf man cleared to G20 charges." *thestar.com*. Toronto Star, 6 Feb. 2012. Web. 17 May 2012.
- . "G20 jail photos raise 'alarm bells' for police chair." *thestar.com*. The Toronto Star, 2 Nov. 2011. Web. 6 Jan. 2012.
- . "Inside a G20 cell: Video image shows conditions in detention centre." *thestar.com*. The Toronto Star, 2 Nov. 2011. Web. 6 Jan. 2012.
- Yee, Jessica. "Occupy Wall Street: the Game of Colonialism and further nationalism to be decolonized from the 'Left'." *Racialicious*. Racialicious: the intersection of race and pop culture, 30 Sept. 2011. Web. 21 June 2012.
- "You Should Have Stayed at Home." Dir. Tamar Weinstein. *The Fifth Estate*. CBC. 25 Feb. 2011. Television.