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Abstract
The no borders movement has been an important site of anti-imperialist resistance, and as such it provides a valuable point of entry into problematizing the contradictions that constitute the relations of consciousness, praxis and ideology. By tracing the recent history of no borders activism in relation to the intensification of neoliberalism, and the prevalence of diffuse models of power, the analysis illustrates the ways in which critical praxis has been limited by the current milieu. Working from an anti-racist feminist perspective I utilize examples drawn from no borders activism to demonstrate the very real limits of informal and incidental learning in social movements. The analysis argues against the supplanting of consciousness with subjectivity as a way to avoid the problems associated with structuralist analysis. Instead, I have suggested that critical education for social action requires a dialectical engagement with the social relations that we live in, contest and transform.
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Introduction

When I first began the research process my very crude and not yet clearly formed questions were centered on why the global and seemingly constant issues of displaced peoples and political asylum were often treated as exceptions, or deviations from the normal patterns of international and national politics. Similarly, if the flow of people into liberal capitalist democracies, such as Canada, is positioned by the state as an aberration to be managed and controlled, despite the permanency of war and displacement, how has our ability to struggle against these processes been affected? Put this differently in which ways have the ideological practices of the state oriented our resistance? As I began to unravel the issues and refined my questions it became increasingly clear that at the crux of this research were the interconnected themes of patriarchy, imperialism, consciousness and revolutionary praxis.

Patriarchal capitalist imperialism constitutes our current social context, and as such is the point of departure for this research. Through developing my understanding of capital and imperialism I began to flesh out and complicate the connections among immigration policies, the global division of labour, and women’s oppression. The deeper I immersed myself in the literature on imperialism, the more I came to understand that many of the current trends in feminist research have led us to a point where it is not possible to effectively theorize feminist struggle, or to even speak of anti-imperialist resistance as a necessary feminist project. This is not to say that feminism has not gained valuable insight from scholars and activists that have delineated the contours of identity based oppressions, and have drawn our attention to the ways in which forms of oppression, based on race,
disability or sexuality have existed within the feminist movement itself.¹ Rather, my concern is with the manner in which embodied experiences have been removed from the material context through the use of frameworks that privilege subjective experience or gender oppression as a purely cultural phenomenon, which then negates an investigation of patriarchy in its general form. Without a coherent analysis of patriarchy, feminist resistance becomes rooted in individualized and localized experiences, which can describe a particular moment but cannot form the basis for a theory of revolutionary feminist praxis. In other words, without an analysis of patriarchy we can neither struggle for critical consciousness nor against capitalist imperialism.

Consciousness and praxis provide a framework for exploring the ways in which our resistance has been and continues to be mediated by the ideological practices of ruling regimes. Using consciousness as a guiding thread, moreover, helped to focus the research on historical change and centered human agency. The entire research and writing process was guided by a dialectical materialist epistemology and ontology, which privileges neither broad structural context nor localized experiences, but rather focuses on relations. Fleshing out the connections between context and consciousness was at times quite difficult particularly because much of the work of adult education functions at the local and individual levels. Indeed, I came to notice that social movements are often unequivocally praised for their educational functions within localized communities (Gouin, 2008; Kilgore, 1999; Levkoe, 2006; Shantz, 2010; Walter, 2007; Welton, 1993). There is, however, a tension that much of the social movement learning literature does not contend

with and that is the problematic of working towards both the necessary local reforms and critical consciousness of capitalism on a global scale (Allman, 2002; Gorman, 2002; Holst, 1995). Here again it became evident that much of the work being done in the area of social movements was privileging localized group interactions at the expense of engaging with anti-imperialist praxis.

Moving from broad research themes (imperialism and critical praxis) to the concrete social context (anti-imperialist resistance in Toronto) focused the inquiry on a single area for investigation, namely migrant justice/no borders activism. Activists working in this area oppose the use of punitive policies against those who do not have the required immigration status to live in Canada legally. Further, as a broader social movement the migrant justice movement has been influential in areas pertaining to immigration, migration, indigenous sovereignty and women’s rights. As a primary focus for inquiry, this particular movement brings together each of the threads that formed the basis of my original questioning and provided a way to explore the Canadian state’s role in the processes of imperialism without diminishing the importance of human agency.

I set out to uncover the ways in which the current ideological practices of the state orient the work of resistance and thus contribute to our consciousness. The research began with the question “how has consciousness of the Canadian state impacted the work of migrant justice activism in Toronto?” From this central point of analysis, I have worked to draw connections between the consciousness of movement actors and the ideological practices of the state. By tracing the recent history of the no borders movement in Canada I began to notice and document the ways in which neoliberal ideology became operational in the area of immigration and refugee policy through the practices of national border

---

2 Throughout the thesis I have used the terms migrant justice and no borders movement interchangeably.
security as well as how this has re-configured the current character of anti-imperialist praxis. In fact, by juxtaposing immigration policies and the standpoint of resistance I was able to describe some of the ways in which the state obscures the global processes of displacement by criminalizing migrants.

**Purpose of The Research**

The purpose of the research is to deepen our understanding of patriarchal capitalist imperialism more generally through a specific investigation of the ideological practices of immigration and refugee policy, which work to obscure the capital-labour dialectic and in effect delimit our praxis. The corollary of this point is that a critical consciousness of our current social relations cannot develop through localized experience alone, but rather is dependent upon critical education that aims to develop and deepen our critical/revolutionary praxis. In its barest form the purpose of this thesis is in no way an especially new topic. In fact, the organization of the research was deeply impacted by Vladimir Lenin’s important pamphlet *What Is To Be Done?* The importance of the research, thus, does not arise because it presents a new way of theorizing praxis and adult learning or the learning that takes place in social movements. Rather, my hope is to build from and add to the work of critical adult educators that have described and demystified the social relations that shape our consciousness, impact our resistance and constrain our struggle. In doing so, moreover, I hope to demonstrate the importance of Lenin’s argument that critical/revolutionary consciousness requires revolutionary theory and critical education. On that note, I would like to turn attention to the importance of *What Is To Be Done?*
In *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin presented two important critiques of political organizing in twentieth century Russia, which despite being noticeably engaged with the debates of his time, continue to provide useful insight for those of us that are interested in resistance and struggle. His critique of so-called spontaneous resistance focused attention on the importance of revolutionary theory for social movements. Through observing the workers’ rebellions of his historical period, Lenin (1929) also noted that the “‘spontaneous element,’ in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form*” (emphasis original) (p.74). The argument that Lenin made here is that the initial rupturing of consciousness that draws people into the work and practices of resistance must not be conflated with critical consciousness and revolutionary struggle. There is, in other words, a decisive difference between consciousness-raising and critical consciousness.

Lenin’s critique of spontaneity flowed seamlessly into his criticisms of Economism, which, as he noted, restrictively focused resistance on more immediate economic gains and de-emphasized the politics of struggle. In short, trade unionism privileged workers’ resistance at the expense of critical consciousness (Lenin, 1929, p.79). Lenin (1929) continued on to argue:

Working class consciousness cannot be genuinely political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to *all cases* of tyranny, oppression, violence and abuse, no matter what class is affected. Moreover, that response must be a Social-Democratic response, and not one from any other point of view. The consciousness of the masses of the workers cannot be genuine class consciousness, unless the workers learn to observe from concrete, and above all from topical, political facts and events, *every* other social class and *all* the manifestations of the intellectual, ethical and political life of these classes; unless they learn to apply practically the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of
all aspects of the life and activity of all classes, strata and groups of the population.

(Emphasis original) (p.104)

For Lenin, therefore, critical consciousness does not develop out of individual experience alone, but rather is formed through an engagement with the complex and interdependent social relations of patriarchy, imperialism and capital. To put this differently, we cannot struggle against sexism without concrete knowledge of how it is internally related to racism, and class exploitation. With this point in mind, Lenin’s argument that critical consciousness can be “brought to the workers only from without”, must not be read as a form of elitist authoritarianism (emphasis original) (1929, p.112). Rather, if we look to the pedagogical implications of What Is To Be Done?, there is a clear argument that critical consciousness and revolutionary struggle require that we engage with the history of the social relations that constitute exploitation and oppression in their general and particular forms. In this sense, education for critical consciousness is necessarily a collective and social practice that draws upon an empirical investigation of the interdependence of exploitation and oppression.

A second point contained within this quotation is the argument that revolutionary theory is founded upon a dialectical knowledge of social relations. Lenin’s analysis suggested that critical consciousness in an embryonic form begins to develop out of our collective engagement with topical and political examples of exploitation and oppression. With this in mind, I want to suggest that social movements can play an important role in uncovering and articulating such examples. In other words, activist groups such as No One Is Illegal (NOII) can provide descriptive examples of particular expressions of exploitation and oppression. For topical descriptions to deepen our critical knowledge, however, they must be historically situated and connected to the broader social relations of
production and reproduction. In short, topical examples help to rupture consciousness, but critical praxis requires dialectical engagement and education. Part of the work of critical education must be to bring each of the particular examples of oppression and exploitation together in a manner that allows us to critically understand and struggle against the social whole. My research, therefore, takes up the problematic of revolutionary theory as both a form of critical knowledge production, and a practice of social struggle. Taking Lenin’s position to heart, my analysis utilized the topical examples, as they have been uncovered and described by the no borders movement, as a starting point for raising further questions of how we understand the relations of patriarchal capitalist imperialism. In doing so, moreover, I develop a critique of reformist praxis, which atomizes resistance by rooting the causes of oppression and exploitation in differing sets of social relations.

Paula Allman’s (2001) research in the area of critical adult education has provided, in my opinion, one of the clearest explanations of the relationship between our current milieu and the predominance of reformist praxis. For Allman, one of the central problems of anti-capitalist resistance, at this moment in time, is the difficulty of understanding both the appearance and essence of capitalist relations on a global scale. By emphasizing the dynamic nature of capital, Allman has argued that resistance movements often mistakenly posit the consequences of capital as the roots causes of exploitation. Allman’s research, moreover, has highlighted that the ideological threads that underpin liberal democratic policies, and neoliberal individualist practices have delimited the terms of resistance in such a way that our praxis is oriented toward reform, and ultimately reproduces existing social relations in differently mediated forms. Importantly, Allman does not employ the concept of false consciousness, which would posit a dualistic separation between matter and consciousness, but rather centered her analysis on the ways in which ideological
explanations of our current moment engender reproductive praxis in spite of a definite interest in anti-capitalist resistance. As such, the causes of our collective exploitation and oppression are occluded from view and resistance ultimately becomes reformist.

Allman was very careful not to argue against the necessity of reform for alleviating some of the harshest consequences of capitalist relations. Rather, the strength of her argument lies with the explicit recognition that for praxis to be critical/revolutionary people must be working toward transforming their consciousness, subjectivities and sensibilities whilst practicing forms of resistance (Allman, 2001, p.28). To put this differently, society cannot be transformed without a critical transformation in consciousness, which requires knowledge of the inner relations of capital. Social movements can provide people with a space within which they can work towards transforming their consciousness. Collective struggle to reform society (the work of social movements) must, therefore, be understood as a preparatory struggle that aids consciousness-raising (Allman, 2001). The purpose of critical education, then, is to prepare people to take part in the creation of an authentically democratic socialist society. Critical education, therefore, is understood as a pre-figurative experience of the types of relations that are possible within a transformed society (Allman, 2001, p.162-163). As Allman (2001) stated, “This idea is based on the recognition that authentic and lasting transformation in consciousness can occur only when alternative understandings and values are actually experienced ‘in depth’ – that is, when they are experienced sensuously and subjectively as well as cognitively, or intellectually” (p.170). Viewing Allman and Lenin’s analyses in tandem highlights the fact that critical consciousness is not an automatic process that arises out of simple acts of resistance. Rather, if we are to take social transformation seriously, then we must also critically reflect upon the ways in
which the interdependencies of exploitation and oppression can be occluded or obscured by the work of resistance.

Allman’s analysis alerted my attention to an area of concern with respect to the current character of political resistance in Toronto. A commonly articulated perspective at this moment in time is that center-less resistance is a more inclusive basis for political organizing. Such a perspective is operationalized through the practices of ad-hoc activist coalitions, which publicize issues across organizations while also maintaining structural autonomy. To be clear, I am not crudely dismissing the importance solidarity. My critique draws upon the work of Allman and Lenin, to argue that if we consider the impact of center-less resistance on consciousness we are then able to observe a correlation to reformism. In this sense, I suggest that center-less organizing must be understood as a structural condition that aids the reproduction of reformist praxis. In contrast to much of the work being done on so-called new social movements I contend that the de-emphasizing of revolutionary theory, at this moment in time, can actually be frustrating and demoralizing for those of us that are interested in creating meaningful and wide spread social change.

To illustrate this point I have drawn upon a conversation I had with an activist pertaining to an art project conducted for the May Day 2011 march. The project itself involved making a float with two contrasting metaphors for Toronto. The “sweatshop city” emphasized some of the harsh and devastating effects of global capitalism, which were represented through large grey overpowering corporate buildings that were sustained by the labour of a racialized woman. Conversely the “sanctuary city” was to represent the group’s vision of an equitable and sustainable community. We looked at photos of the float and discussed the intellectual (brainstorming, critical reflection) and sensuous
(choices of colour, texture, scale) work that had gone into representing the group’s political perspective through visual art. Not all that surprisingly the group had a very clear picture of how to build the “sweatshop city”. Building the “sanctuary city”, however, was a little more difficult. Below is a somewhat lengthy excerpt from this conversation, which I included because it helps to illustrate part of the problematic discussed by my thesis.

[Sweatshop city] There is, like, some barbed wires, like, all over these places. There is jail. We know, like, that what it is going to look like. There is, like, factory. And we decided to use a black woman as a, like, sitting on a chair with this sewing machine on top of the whole city. She is doing all of this work for the city. …..She is feeding the city with her work. It was very incredible how to visualize that.

Sanctuary city. ‘Oh god what to do?’ Ha ha ha ha.

We made, like, an installation on top of the float. A dream. An idea. It was all in green. Trees, flowers, stuff. There was a community center, libraries. Because it’s not just [group name]. It’s about more or less all the anarchist groups they believe in that ideal.

[We] don’t believe to create another ideal city. We already have services, we already have stuff. We need, we just need to use them… strengthen them, like… give power to them. So, we said, like, we were talking about that. How you want to create another city. An ideal city. A sanctuary city. And this was the discussion. Are we using this same infrastructure that we have?

We are saying: ‘Whose streets. Our streets.’ [A common chant at marches].

We don’t want to leave these spaces for the corporate state. So, lets just use them. ‘And which one [public spaces] is better?’

‘Community centers’

‘Why community center is good?’

‘Because of that, because of that, because of that.’

Ok. Let’s make a community center, but more, like, green, more like umm.. people friendly. So make a little garden over there and .. paint it with flowers and stuff. Libraries.
The…. hospitals and parks. We did like a little park. And, public transportation. There was a car coming and going, bicycles. So, it wasn’t, like, very complicated thing. I felt at that time that we actually don’t have that much idea what a sanctuary city it going to look like. We just have, like, very broad basic ideas of what you want to create.

We knew very clearly how a sweatshop city looks like. But, we had, like hard time to imagine the sanctuary city.

So, this question is a little hard because of the nature of what we have been doing… More pushing the state back. Not creating an alternative for the state. It has, like, some advantages and disadvantages. You feel you are making change. And it is more realistic. But at the end it’s not going to change the whole system.

So, just about sanctuary city; for me I think … it’s a little bit like this ideal place that we have community centers we have, like, places that people are using. We have, like, shelters we have …

Lets be honest with ourselves we will have ummm… In a very ideal place we will have… still have violence against women. So we need shelters. We need a very democratically managed places for people. Vulnerable people…… You know what. I’m just talking like that and thinking.; Oh god it’s the capitalism system… ha ha ha ha… what am I saying.

We need to change the capitalist system.

Yeah [sigh], I feel reformist. (S, personal communication, August 23, 2012).

This conversation stood out to me because it clearly spoke to the tensions between reform and reformism as well as the necessity of revolutionary theory. Pushing for reform in the area of migrant justice is incredibly important not only because it creates social protections and thwarts state violence, but also because it provides those involved with the opportunity to be cognizant of social change, and thus it is a form of practicing social struggle. However, as the above discussion illustrates, a tension arises because a clear picture of the transformed society is often very difficult to imagine. The conflict between knowing that reforms are needed and getting mired in cycles of short term acts of
resistance is time consuming and frustrating. In raising this point as a defence of revolutionary theory I am not suggesting that an objectified or static picture of a just society is possible or desirable. Rather, it is my position that a dialectical engagement with our social relations moves us away from the quagmire of reform versus reformism, and helps to create a clear picture of how we can better struggle for necessary local reforms and revolutionary consciousness.

**Conducting The Research**

Maintaining a balance between a critical analysis of social structures and the lived practices of people was of central concern for the research. As a student of anti-racist feminism, moreover, it was important to me that I maintain an epistemological commitment to the history of women’s struggle against exploitation and subordination. My research is grounded by a materialist ontology and concerns itself with the process and experience of social change, which of course must then be reflected in the methods used. Maria Mies’ (1979) paper entitled “Towards a Methodology of Women’s Studies” provided the foundation from which I grappled with the relationship between methodology and epistemology. Central to Mies’ concern was the structural separation of theory and practice. As she argued if research does not concern itself with the working lives of women and men, then it will simply reproduce the structural separation of theory and practice, which is characteristic of the capitalist mode of production (p.3). Following this framework the purpose of critical anti-capitalist, anti-racist research must be to expand our knowledge of exploitation and oppression, while concurrently aiming toward a transformation of consciousness and society. The corollary of this argument is that individualized subjects cannot be positioned as the object of investigation if our purpose is
to transform the social (Smith, 1999). I, therefore, viewed my discussions with people as a tool for better understanding the social relations that we live in and act upon. I have tried, moreover, to avoid making generalized claims about how or why people act because this would center the discussion on individuals (which often either pathologizes or extols experience) at the expense of critically engaging with social relations.

A second tension that arises when we problematize social structures is that they are in constant flux and are not uniformly experienced. Researching and writing about the social world must contend with both motion and differential subject positions, which can also be articulated as a problem of objectification. Dorothy Smith’s (1999) more protracted project of developing a sociology for women has clearly articulated the problem of objectification as well as suggested methodological tools to avoid such epistemic traps. Researchers and research participants must be understood as situated within social relations, and thus our consciousness is not separated from our social world. In other words, it is social relations that must be problematized and not individuals. In formulating the research my aim has been to make social relations and their ideological mediations observable.

I collected and kept written reflections of over a hundred and forty newsletters disseminated by NOII in a year and a half period (February 2011 – November 2012). These newsletters were used to identify common themes in the work of resistance. They provided indications of what was at the fore of activist work in Toronto, and because this work is done in coalition with other groups they provided a way for me to conceptualize a larger picture of left activist politics at this moment. I looked for common recurring themes and made note as to whether the information was being distributed as a call for action or to generally inform the public from a radical anti-imperialist perspective. When
generating themes for further investigation I removed any information pertaining to coalition organizing. After I removed much of the information that was disseminated in solidarity with broader anti-poverty actors I began to notice an intense focus on information and actions against criminalization, which signalled the importance of looking to the history of legislative changes. From here I surveyed the history of Canadian immigration and read through a number of Bills that have recently been debated in the House of Commons. Bringing together legislative and movement history provided a way to problematize the impact of ideology on praxis. Making the ideological practices of the state visible also requires that we understand why they are ideological. In other words, I needed to layer this information with a dialectical analysis of our current moment. Approaching the topic dialectically involved a continuous oscillating between problematizing what I could observe locally and questions that arose because of my engagement with an historical investigation of capitalism, patriarchy and colonialism.

As I just mentioned the media disseminated by NOII included information written by their allies. Once I had identified trends in the trajectory of migrant justice organizing I again reviewed the newsletters this time without removing the information that was produced in solidarity with another groups. This time I was looking specifically for the manner in which social struggle is being articulated at this moment in time. Here I focused attention on more detailed newsletters that resembled a traditional news article style. I was looking for examples of the way in which class, race, gender and status were expressed. I explored the manner in which these phenomena were depicted as relating to each other. Put simply, were race and class understood as mutually determining relations or categories of social life that intersect? Taking Dorothy Smith’s (1999) analysis to heart, I acknowledge that my own consciousness cannot be separated from the choices that I made
in selecting excepts for this component of the analysis. In an attempt to mediate this, I created Appendix 2, which includes the full versions of the newsletters. Additionally, I have also included here newsletters that spoke to the themes of the research, but did not quite align with my questions. As any researcher will certainly know, there are always pieces of data that seem to be somewhat dissimilar from the analysis more generally. Rather than simply exclude the data that I was unsure of I have included it in Appendix 2 because others may be able to make connections in places where I was not able.

Lastly, I corresponded with activists keeping written notes on informal discussions and recorded longer ones. I attended public discussions and made note of the types of information that was being exchanged. At this point it is worth noting that I attended such events as an observer, rather than an organizer. My purpose is not to generalize from the comments of individuals, and as such I used these discussions as a compass or frame for viewing government documents, and our social context more generally. I do not want to overemphasize the voice of individuals or conflate subjectivity with consciousness and thus I have avoided using extensive direct quotes from individuals as part of my argument.

**Limitations of The Research**

At the time that I was conducting the research NOII seemed to be under a fair amount of organizational stress, which was reflected by the individuals in the organization and their ability to engage with me. I found that people had very restrictive schedules and were doing their best with the limited resources that were available to them. It was very difficult for me to follow up on discussions that I had with particular activists. I would have very much liked to be able to include a greater array of activist perspectives in the written research, however it proved to be too difficult to co-ordinate with the hectic and
irregular movements of individuals. A similar problem has been documented by Pashang’s (2011) research. She noted that information pertaining to migrant justice activism prior to the 1990s is not well documented. Furthermore, many of the people that were engaged in this type of work have moved into different areas and cannot be located. Hence, there are significant gaps in what can be known about the history of migrant justice activism.

Internet based media has become an invaluable tool for migrant justice activists because it has allowed for the documentation of current campaigns, and thus also allows researchers to explore the evolutionary unfolding of recent political actions. In addition to the publicizing of migrant justice issues the NOII media has included the documentation of issues that pertain to the Canadian state’s role in the subjugation of indigenous peoples and the protection of mining companies as well as prejudices against queer and gender non-conforming people. Basic restrictions on time meant that I could not include a careful analysis of all of these issues and their relation to patriarchal capitalist imperialism. I felt that simply adding these issues into the mix without a full consideration of the politics of indigenous and queer resistance was inadequate. I did, however, include some of the newsletters that spoke to these issues in Appendix 2, so as not to deny the importance of this work for the movement more broadly.

Concepts That Framed The Research and Analysis

It is worth briefly outlining some of the concepts and terms that are particular to the area of adult education and anti-racist feminist research. Irrespective of the philosophical tradition that an author may come out of as well as the understood political purpose of learning there has been a general consensus in the adult education literature around the meaning of the concepts informal and incidental learning as well as non-formal
education (Hager & Halliday, 2006; Foley, 1998; Duguid, Mundel & Schugurensky, 2007). Non-formal education is systematic teaching and learning that occurs in a range of social, non-institutional settings (Foley, 1998). The slightly more ambiguous concept of informal learning refers to all learning experiences that take place outside of the externally imposed curricula, and as such it may occur in formal and non-formal educational settings as well as incidentally in social settings. Informal learning as a concept, therefore, captures a wide range of learning activities and experiences including, but not limited to, social interactions, and political or cultural engagement (Dugid et al., 2007; Foley, 1998).

Hager has made a useful distinction between informal and incidental learning; although the context or learning situation may be the same for both types of learning, only informal learning includes conscious acknowledgement that learning has taken place (Hager & Halliday, 2006, p.288). In other words, incidental learning often takes place without conscious recognition. As noted by Foley, incidental learning is often embedded in peoples’ actions and consequently is not articulated as such. In this sense, it can produce contradictory (regressive and progressive) forms of consciousness (Foley, 1998). The empirical investigation of this learning is clearly problematic, and thus much of the literature on informal and incidental learning attempts to uncover and make visible the learning that has taken place.

As noted by Rachel Gorman there has been an increasing trend in the adult education literature to search out and professionalize informal and incidental learning. These learning experiences were previously unrecognized and are now part of a discussion around more efficient forms of workplace training, or the recognition of knowledge and skills attained by socially marginalized groups (Gorman, 2005, p.150). Although the literature on learning in social action and resistance is not oriented toward the
marketization of skills, the assumption that self-directed learning is socially beneficial and individually emancipatory has been carried through into much of this literature. Gorman (2002) has noted that discussions of learning and social marginalization have uncritically argued that the recognition of informal and incidental learning in social action automatically works against processes of social exclusion (p.122-123). The problem that Gorman noted runs through much of the adult learning literature, and is indicative of a non-dialectical conceptualization of consciousness and social historical context.

Although my research problematizes the limits of informal and incidental learning in resistance, much of my analysis was influenced by the work of Allman. Importantly, she has framed this issue through the usage of the terms consciousness and praxis (both critical and reproductive). The following Chapter gives a more extensive analysis of these concepts. For now, however, it is worth noting that framing my analysis with consciousness and praxis speaks to a relational understanding of learning and social change, which posits the above terms as a dialectical contradiction. In other words, consciousness and praxis are a unity of opposites in struggle that are united by an internal relation. Throughout my work the notion of internal relation refers to the dialectical contradiction that constitutes both opposites of a given relation, for example labour and capital (constituting capitalist social relations), or the subordination of women to men (constituting patriarchal relations). The existence of each element in the contradiction is produced by and dependent upon the relation as a whole (Allman, 2007). One cannot speak of consciousness without praxis; however, in writing the research I have often used one or the other term on its own. I have used praxis when I want to emphasize the active or action aspect of a learning process, and consciousness when I am focusing more specifically on the reflective. I do not intend, however, for a separation of the unity.
Akin to Allman, I also contend that consciousness and praxis are neither separable from one another nor external to individuals. As such, they cannot be false or incomplete because this would suggest that people themselves are not whole entities that act in the world as they experience it and reflect upon it. False consciousness as a concept, thus, reifies a dualistic separation between our social world and our individual reflections and actions. In order to avoid the implications of using language that would posit a separation of peoples consciousness and praxis from the objective social world I have steered away from ideas like partial or ideological consciousness. Rather, I have framed the discussion in terms of rupturing consciousness or critical consciousness in an embryonic form, or the inverse term reproductive praxis, which was typically employed by Allman. My intention is to emphasize that critical consciousness and revolutionary praxis are an ongoing process and not a singular moment of completed transformation.

Finally, the interchanging usage of capitalism and patriarchal capital was intentional. Capital is a mode of production or, in other words, a set of social process that requires value to be realized through exchange. It is also a set of social relations that organize life and labour, and thus capital and patriarchy are a unity. Working dialectically means that when we speak of one part of a relation we also invoke the other. However, we are trained not to think dialectically and so it is not always at the fore of our minds to think of the sexual division of labour or the oppression of women when we see the words capital or capitalism. Thus, when I want to emphasize the unity of this phenomenon I have used the term patriarchal capitalism. Likewise, when I want to emphasize capital as a system of circulating exchange value, or patriarchy as the subordination of women to men trans-historically I have used the relevant term on its own. Here again, however, my analysis does not separate this phenomenon. Making a parallel point Mies has noted that
oppression holds no value as a concept without exploitation. As she explicated exploitation is when an individual or group gains something by forcibly taking it from another. There is no purpose to oppress or subordinate others without the intension to exploit (Mies, 1986, p.36). Returning to patriarchy and capital, we can also note that there is no purpose for the subordination of women or racialized individuals without the exploitation of our labour.

Overview of The Analysis

My research has utilized the example of migrant justice activism to demonstrate the current limitations of informal and incidental learning in social movements. This argument is illustrated through the descriptive problematizing of the impact of ideology on praxis and the decentering of consciousness. Beginning with neoliberal ideology I focused attention on government policies and practices in the areas of settlement as well as immigration law. I have emphasized the connection between the neoliberal focus on so-called labour market flexibility and the use of migrant labour. Turning my attention to border security I flesh out the intensification of ideologies that work to criminalize particular migrants and restrict legal rights. Switching focus I then consider the transitions in activist praxis across the same historical period. By tracing the recent history of the Canadian immigration and refugee system in relation to no border activism I began to notice that there has been a significant intensification of ideologies pertaining to national security, which become operationalized through border control practices, and directly impact the lived experiences of migrants and non-status people. By reviewing our historical moment from each of these perspectives I was able to notice that government ideologies repeatedly relied upon and deployed a discursive construction of “good” versus
“bad” migrants. This dichotomy is malleable, which is to say that “good” and “bad” is defined in relation to the economic and political objectives of national policy at a given time. With the intensification of neoliberalism and national border security the “bad” migrant or “bogus” refugee has become the focus of government policy, which functions to both generalize criminality and individualize subjects. Migrant justice activism has had to respond to these processes, which has resulted in a politics of community-centric resistance.

Turning to the decentering of consciousness I critically engage with the current intellectual and activist milieu. I have organized the analysis around two themes: the theorization of new social movements, and the privileging of subjectivity. John Holst’s (2002) work on social movement theorizing has made a useful distinction between the literature in which social movements are a theoretical construct within sociology and the literature in which social movements are considered to be agents of social change. I have limited the literature reviewed in this section to discussions that have been influential to social movement learning theory or specifically discuss progressive or critical/revolutionary learning for the purpose of political action. In other words, movement theories such as structural functionalism or resource mobilization theory, which have been less influential to the more recent discussions in the adult education literature, will not be discussed. Holst then identified two important traditions within this literature: radical pluralism and socialist education. One noteworthy distinction is that the radical pluralist perspective selectively blends post-modern and post-structuralist theorizations of power and identity with a critical epistemology in such a way that social change is conceptualized as the domain of a lively civil society. I have utilized Holst’s
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3 See Buechler 2000 or Everyman and Jamison 1991 for discussions of these theories.
typology because it helped to make visible the ontological and epistemological
distinctions between the two, and provided a way to frame the relationship between
activism and the intellectual climate. My analysis draws connections between the
prevalence of pluralist perspectives and the privileging of cultural oppression by
movement actors.

The overarching analysis argues that the re-centering of consciousness is necessary
for critical informal learning and social transformation. My intention is to make a firm
argument for the fact that critical education must be explicitly anti-racist and feminist. The
corollary of this point is that a turn to critical subjectivity as a way to ameliorate the
shortcomings of non-feminist Marxism does not provide an adequate foundation from
which to build critical informal education. In other words, much like Allman and Lenin
before me, I intend to demonstrate that critical/revolutionary anti-racist feminist praxis
requires a dialectical reading of our moment. The thesis, therefore, concludes by outlining
a number of areas for further investigation that, in my opinion, would further the larger
project of re-centering critical consciousness and praxis.
CHAPTER II: Ontology and Epistemology

Introduction

In order to understand Marx’s theory of consciousness, a brief discussion of dialectical historical materialism is necessary. I have engaged with The German Ideology through Marxist and Marxist-feminist theoreticians that explicitly adhere to a dialectical reading of Marx (Allman, 2001, 2007; Carpenter, 2012; Carpenter & Mojab, 2011; Ollman, 2003; Rikowski, 2001; Sayer, 1987; Smith, 1990, 2011). This discussion does not provide a comprehensive explication of Marx’s method and ontology, but rather simply aims to frame my analysis of critical/revolutionary praxis, and explicate the theoretical foundations that underpinned my research. Learning to think dialectically has re-shaped my own understanding of feminism as a critical project of social change, and a way of viewing the dynamic constellations of social relations that structure the sexual division of labour, and engender cultural meanings. Weaved throughout this discussion is the additional argument that dialectical analysis and the centering of consciousness is a firmer foundation for anti-racist feminist research than intersectional analysis, which is at present a predominant framework.

Dialectical Historical Materialism

As Bertell Ollman (2003) has noted, Marx’s dialectical method is a way of thinking that brings into focus the complex of interactions that coalesce to produce phenomena as we experience them. Dialectical historical materialism seeks to understand both the essence and appearance of phenomena, thereby necessitating a consideration of how a particular relation arose historically, developed in a given social context, and fits into the social historical whole (Ollman, 2003, p.12-15). In this way, Marx’s dialectical materialist method focuses our
attention on the historical specificity of phenomena, while concurrently fitting that particular social relation into the transhistorical whole (Allman, 2007). Knowledge, then, is knowledge of a historically specific relation, which is also reflected in the abstracted universal concepts that describe and give meaning to a particular relation. By focusing analysis on relations, rather than static and externally related things, dialectical conceptualization centers our inquiry on motion, or social change, as well as the inner relations of particular phenomena. Concepts, moreover, may appear as externally related or independent phenomena, but cannot be fully grasped without understanding their relational evolution. For example, implicit in the concept capital is the wage-labour relation, and thus the negation of the labour-capital contradiction would necessitate the abolition of class as a social relation (Allman, 2007; Sayer, 1987). In short, dialectical historical inquiry orients our knowledge toward a deeper understanding of the less visible, and contradictory relations that constitute phenomena, which we experience as coherent things.

Thinking in terms of dialectical relations, rather than static categories, helps to orient our analysis toward a critical usage of concepts. Paula Allman and Glenn Rikowski’s respective discussions of the capital-labour, or class, relation have both demonstrated that definitions that focus attention on inequality or stratification fail to fully grasp the dynamic relations that constitute our reality. That is to say, neither capital nor class are things per se but rather must be understood as dynamic human processes and relations. Understood dialectically, therefore, class cannot be a particular type of concrete labour (such as the labour associated with industrial production) or a specific set of material interests. Rather, it must be understood as a critical concept that both describes and critiques the dialectical contradiction that constitutes the capital-labour relation (Allman, 2001; Rikowski, 2001). Likewise, patriarchy must be understood as a critical concept born from struggle that both
describes and critiques the exploitative relations that subordinate and oppress women (Mies, 1986). In this sense, women’s oppression is inextricably bound up with the exploitation of their labour as workers, housewives, caregivers and mothers. Patriarchy, therefore, names the general form of these relations, which are then expressed in particular social, historical and cultural contexts.

Himani Bannerji’s Marxist-feminist analysis of the social relations of race provided another eloquent example of the way in which dialectical analysis illuminates both the essence and appearance of phenomena. As Bannerji (2005) has explicated, “…one could say that modern ‘race’ is a social culture of colonialist and imperialist capitalism. ‘Race,’ therefore, is a collection of discourses of colonialism and slavery, but firmly rooted in capitalism in its different aspects through time” (p.149). This definition of race draws our attention to the inner relation between capital and the social historical processes of racialization, and as such race is understood as an evolutionary complex of social, cultural, institutional, political and economic relations and practices, as well as associated forms of consciousness. To put this more concisely, race appears as a cultural expression of domination and oppression, while its essence is firmly rooted in the capitalist history of colonialism and imperialism. Here again, it is clear that dialectical analysis provides the conceptual space to grasp the evolutionary motion of a given phenomenon, and thus orients our inquiry and knowledge production away from de-historicized, individualistic representations of reality.

Germane to my research area is the phenomenon of non-status. In our local context non-status is defined by Canada’s immigration and labour policies, and as such it appears as a relation between the state and migrants, which is expressed by the legal categories of citizen, foreign national and migrant. Non-status people, then, are those who do not have the
immigration status to reside in Canada legally (Berinstein et al., 2004). Although migrant workers have temporary legal status, Pashang’s (2011) research has demonstrated that most non-status people enter the country by legal means and are forced into this position, and as such it is an ideologically imposed identity. Non-status is different from legal categories, such as refugee or asylum seekers, because it names the relation that excludes people from political rights. At its essence non-status is rooted in the history of colonial capital, and is both required for and produced by imperial capital. In other words, it is also a dialectical relation of displaced labour and capitalism on a world scale. Pashang’s research, moreover, has demonstrated that it is not possible to understand the relations of non-status without looking to the history of colonialism and racism (2011, p.51). As such, non-status cannot be separated out from race, class and gender, but rather must be viewed as dynamically interwoven with them. On a similar note, while conducting media analysis for this research I came across an article about a non-status woman’s appeal to have the fees waved for her humanitarian and compassionate considerations appeal on the grounds that she could not afford them. In fact, she could not afford the fees because of her position in the labour market as a non-status racialized women (NOII, 2011, June 9). Here we can clearly observe that her specific experience of interacting with the Canadian state was mediated by a set of social relations that cannot be disentangled from one another.

Evident from the above discussion is that dialectical analysis provides a framework for fleshing out the historical development of specific phenomena, while also highlighting the ways in which a specific relation is implicated in many of the social relations that constitute our current moment. In other words, dialectical analysis draws our attention to the mutual dependencies of social relations despite their apparent differentiation. Approaching this same argument from an alternate point of entry, Bannerji’s critique of intersectional analysis
provided a pertinent reminder that non-dialectical analysis often obscures the connections among relations. As she argued, intersectional analysis creates an artificial separation between the social relations of oppression and exploitation, and thus locates the root of cultural oppression and economic exploitation in different historical processes. The consequence for our research is that people and their experiences are then expressed as aggregates of divergent, but momentarily overlapping (or intersecting) moments (Bannerji, 2005, p.144). Working with an intersectional framework, therefore, reifies an artificial separation between oppression and exploitation and fractures our understanding of our current social context. Following this argument, if the various forms of oppression and exploitation are posited as externally related categories that momentarily intersect, then we cannot further our knowledge of the social whole as way to collectively struggle against it.

**Limitations of Non-dialectical Feminism**

Through his critique of the Hegelian dialectic, Marx rooted his dialectical method in an analysis of human practices, and as such did not dichotomize ideas and material relations. In this respect, ideas can neither be disentangled from social historical context, nor can they be the guiding force of history. Rather, for Marx individuals participate in the production and reproduction of material relations and in doing so also produce their consciousness (Allman, 2001, p.4). Sara Carpenter (2012) has succinctly described this relation, “Understood dialectically, the ideal and the material exist in a mutually determining relation” (p.21). Moving beyond the limits of a structuralist reading of Marx, Carpenter’s analysis then noted that the social world, understood in terms of material relations, is not a system or structure,
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4 The usage of intersectional analysis does vary with the ontological and epistemological commitments of the author, and as such it is worth noting that the intersection of gender and race can be expressed in both materialist and idealist ways.
but rather is a complex of human activity and forms consciousness (p.21). Following this framework, our individual forms of consciousness must be understood as both influenced by and influencing the material relations that constitute the social, and our subjective experiences of the social. An important benefit of the dialectical historical materialist method, therefore, is that it does not elevate either social structures or individual subjectivities as we attempt to understand the formation and evolution of consciousness, and society. In other words, unlike frameworks that center subjectivity, identity and/or performativity, which have been a common reaction to structuralist analyses, utilizing a dialectical analysis of material relations allows for individual agency without reifying individualism.

_Dialectical_ historical materialism also allows feminist research to avoid many of the problems associated with de-historicised universalism and de-contextualized essentialism. In order to further demonstrate the benefits of dialectical historical materialism for research and critical education, I want to pause for a moment and consider some of the recent trends in feminist theory. It is my belief that feminism requires a clearly articulated definition of patriarchy, and thus the problematic of essentialism is drawn into view. The most well known discussion of this concern is, of course, Judith Butler’s deconstruction of the category “woman”. By calling into question the identity that the term “woman” represents she argued against the discursive construction of a coherently constituted female subject. For Butler, cultural and political representations of gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality and so forth converge in a manner that produces radical asymmetries among women. As such, one’s subjectivity and identity must be articulated in highly individualized terms (Butler, 2006, p.3). Furthermore, consciousness, or the inner relation of material objective reality and individual subjects, is removed from the discussion because reality has been separated out in to dissimilar but intersecting moments. Following Butler’s (2006) argument leads us to a place
where there is no common, or general form of patriarchy, and as such feminism cannot be a project of social change or revolutionary struggle. Feminist resistance is relegated to the domain of altering individual experiences of gender oppression. In a similar critique that focused on post-modern and post-structuralist feminism, Carpenter and Mojab (2011) have argued that this type of theorization abstracts embodied experiences from material relations in such a way that they cannot be returned to the social whole (p.8-9). When disarticulated from material relations race, class and gender become discursive ideas, thereby erasing the ways in which cultural and economic phenomena are reflections of one another (Bannerji, 2005; 2011; Mojab & Carpenter, 2011). Subjects and their embodied experiences are, thus, fractured in a manner that they appear as strictly individualized relations to a fragmented explanation of reality, and the social whole is obfuscated. In short, the general form of patriarchy is rejected leaving only localized and particularized expressions of women’s oppression.

The rich description of cultural oppression has certainly aided our understanding of how patriarchy and racialization function in particular moments, and thus feminism has benefited greatly from much of the phenomenological work that has been done. Such frameworks for analysis, however, remain rooted in a segmented understanding of reality. For example, Sarah Ahmed’s (2007) work on whiteness begins with an ontology that situates race and gender in social and historical context, but is simultaneously limited by the separation of these experiences from exploitation. Drawing from Husserl, Ahmed suggested that as embodied beings we inherit particular orientations to the world that make some experiences possible. As such race and gender become lived experiences of social and cultural history. Working with a philosophy of orientations, however, privileges the individual’s experience of reality at the expense of understanding the social whole. In other
words, localized expressions of oppression are disarticulated from exploitation in general, which then constructs an artificial separation between ontology and epistemology.

Akin to Ahmed, Iris Young’s (2005) phenomenological exploration of gender oppression begins with lived experiences and individual subjectivities, while grounding her analysis with an explication of social structures of power. Young, however, works with a causal relation between social structure and embodied experiences. In this sense, patriarchal structures act as limits or constraints on oppressed individuals. Here again, oppression becomes an exclusively cultural phenomenon that limits and/or creates the conditions for particular experiences. In this sense, consciousness can be described through an engagement with the material world. Material objective reality, however, cannot be explained through localized subjective consciousness. As such, race, gender and class are understood as externally related identities rather than mutually constitutive relations. Working within this framework, moreover, race, gender and class become contextual (or not generalizable) and intersecting experiences, rather than expressions of dialectical contradictions. In other words, the dialectical relations that constitute the historical evolution of capital, patriarchy and racialization are de-emphasized. This type of framing, moreover, makes it difficult for the work of anti-racist feminism to move toward a comprehensive theory of social change that could form the basis of anti-imperialist praxis.

Grasping the dialectical relations that constitute our social world and consciousness is a firmer foundation for projects of anti-racist feminism and critical social change because it creates the conceptual space to engage with embodied experiences in their full complexity. That is to say, dialectical inquiry requires that we work to understand experiences and structures in both their general and particular forms, thereby bringing into view the historical evolution of phenomena. This framework for analysis, moreover, does not separate
exploitation from oppression and thus we can more clearly grasp their relational interaction throughout history. The following section delves deeper into the relation of consciousness and reality, and as such further demonstrates the necessity of dialectic thinking for social struggle.

**Consciousness and Praxis**

Read dialectically *The German Ideology* provides a useful framework for understanding and problematizing consciousness and praxis. In their delineation of the materialist epistemology and ontology, Marx and Engels (1888) noted that an understanding of human history and consciousness must begin with peoples lived practices and sensuous experiences, which exist in relation with our physical and natural environment (p.42). Contained within this foundational premise are two important points that need to be drawn out and expanded upon. Firstly Marx and Engels were building a complex critique of both ideation and mechanical materialism, which artificially separate consciousness from peoples’ work and practice. This separation, as the idealists articulated it, positioned human consciousness as agent, and thus social relations were positioned as the product of ideas (Smith, 2011, p.22). Conversely, as Marx and Engels stated, “Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men in their actual life-process” (1888, p.47). One important caveat to note, however, is that the relation between being and consciousness should not be oversimplified to a causal relation (Smith, 2011, p.6). Rather, human consciousness is a dialectical unity of subjective agents, and material objects. The historical mode of social reproduction and production must, therefore, be understood as central to the formation of one’s consciousness – but is not its determinant. To put this
differently, viewed dialectically human consciousness is a dynamic relation that is rooted in
the existing material relations and also acts upon those same relations.

A second, and closely related, point derived from Marx and Engels’ articulation of the
materialist method, is that our relationship to physical and natural environments, in the
processes of reproduction and production, are integral to our consciousness. As such any
consideration of consciousness must engage with material subsistence and the mode of
production. As they argued:

The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of
the actual means of subsistence they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of
production must not be considered simply as being the production of the physical existence of
the individual. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of
expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so
they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they
produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material
conditions determining their productions. (Emphasis original) (Marx & Engels, 1888, p.42)

Consciousness, then, is the dialectical unity of sensuous experiences and social historical
reality, rather than an individualized product of ideation (Marx & Engels, 1888, p.122).
Implicit in this argument is the idea that an individualist ontology (whether in a liberal or
post-modern form) cannot adequately account for the necessity of our social and natural
relations to one another and our physical environment. Following from this point we must
understand consciousness and subjectivity as related but distinct. The latter is the subjective
internalization of the subject-object dialectic. In other words, subjectivity is an individualized
expression of consciousness.

A direct corollary of a dialectical materialist conceptualization of consciousness is
that human thoughts and actions are also a dialectical unity (praxis). As I just noted, Marx’s
theory of consciousness does not dichotomize consciousness and reality, but rather highlights their inner relation. In other words, human consciousness is always comprised of thoughts that develop out of action, which are situated within social relations. Further, this thought-action process informs our theorizing (or thinking and planning) for future action. It is important to note, that the theory of praxis does not posit a specific ordering of reflection and action, but rather draws our attention to the dialectical relation constituting thought and action. Further, praxis can be informed by the reflection-action processes of others in different social and historical contexts, and in this way is also influenced by external sources (Allman, 2001; 2007). The concept of praxis, thus, highlights the dynamic nature of consciousness and the importance of human agency for the character of social relations. In other words, as Allman (2007) has argued, it is through critical/revolutionary praxis that we transform society and ourselves (p.34). Praxis, however, should not be thought of as unequivocally critical or transformative. Uncritical theorizations (or thinking) and actions are expressions of uncritical praxis, which then reproduce the existing social relations of oppression and exploitation, albeit in different forms (Allman, 2001, p.167-169). While this formulation may appear as somewhat obvious, it is important to reiterate that the relations between objective matter, consciousness and praxis are neither direct nor causal and thus our uncritical praxis may appear as transformative while concomitantly maintaining its uncritical essence. It is in this respect that the concept of ideology, which mediates the subject-object relation, becomes vitally important.

**Knowledge and Ideology**

As we have seen, Marx and Engels critiqued the idealist for their separation of reality and knowledge, which also gestured toward a negative conceptualization of ideology. To
explore this point further we must first problematize the tension between knowledge and ideology. A dialectical Marxist epistemology is a contingent or conditional theory of knowledge, which denounces static, partial and decontextualized theorization. That is to say, that Marx and Engels understood that any knowledge, produced in a given historical context, would be influenced by the material conditions that predominate at the moment of its production (Allman, 2001, p.168). Similarly, drawing from Marx, Smith has argued that by understanding our concepts as expressions of reality that need to be historically situated and problematized we orient our inquiry toward scientific knowledge. If, however, decontextualized concepts are utilized as the foundation of theory we simply produce fragmented explanations (Smith, 2011, p.29-30). As Marx has argued, moreover, the point of theorization is not just to interpret the world, but rather – to change it (Marx & Engels, 1888, p.123). Marx’s epistemology and ontology, therefore, orient the production of knowledge toward the transformation of society, which is also a transformation in consciousness.

In contrast to historicized and contextualized inquiry, ideology, for many Marxists, is a type of decontextualized uncritical knowledge, which is produced in relation to the capitalist mode of production. If we consider, as Marx and Engels did, the dialectical subject-object relation contextually, then the division of labour into mental and physical, or base and superstructure, created the material conditions for the growth of ideology (1888, p.47, 64-65). Ideology, then, is a particular theoretical form arising out of the specific working experiences of the intelligentsia, and as such can be understood as a narrow or partial explanation of social relations. Ideological discourse naturalizes the ruling relations by inverting consciousness in such a way that social relations become disarticulated from one another and reified as “things”. In this sense, real world experiences and relations become mystified or supplanted by ideological explanations. Ideology, therefore, is not simply the ideas of the
ruling class but rather can be understood as a relation to lived practices that allows for the
cognitive inversion of phenomena and consequent theorizing that naturalizes this inversion
(Larrain, 1983; Ollman, 2003; Smith, 2011). Within any given period of the capitalist epoch
the subject-object dialectic is mediated by the ideological discourses in circulation, which
obscure our understanding of the ways in which the mode of production is dialectically
related to expressions of exploitation and oppression, which of course effects our
consciousness and praxis.

Dorothy Smith’s theorizations of consciousness and the relations of ruling will help to
flesh out this point further. Smith’s explication of The German Ideology noted that the
embedding of consciousness in peoples actual practices and lived experiences necessarily
includes looking to the vast array of concepts and phenomena that people encounter and
interact with. In this way, our consciousness is a dialectical relation with both physical (and
often tangible) phenomena, such as available technology, or the organization of work, and
the discursive traditions that become operational through legal codes, religious beliefs or the
organization of knowledge (Smith, 2011, p.23). As Smith’s analysis has emphasized, if
consciousness is embedded in social practices and sensuous activities, then the mode of
production, which coordinates production and reproduction, must be understood as
organizing and giving meaning to our objective reality. Elsewhere Smith also developed the
closely related concept of the relations of ruling. The relations of ruling drew into focus the
ways in which our societies are regulated and organized through interdependent complexes
of professional organizations as well as legal and administrative practices (Smith, 1999, p.49).
Bringing these two arguments together it is clear that our consciousness as individuals exists
in a dialectical relation with processes of governing, which mediate the relations of
production.
Nandita Sharma’s analysis of migrant workers in Canada can provide a useful example of this point as well as the consequent implications for embodied experience. Sharma (2006) demonstrated that immigration policies created the legal conditions for the increased exploitation of migrant workers by Canadian employers, while concurrently buttressing and reproducing racism and nationalism (p.19-21). The relations of production and practices of governing coalesce to produce a mutually constitutive consciousness of citizen and foreigner, which is also inextricably bound up with the colonialist ideologies that racialize particular people. There is, therefore, a dialectical relation between the mode of production and subjective consciousness, which cannot be severed from our bodies or the histories that give meaning to our bodies. Working with the dialectical method necessarily means that neither the individual subject nor material reality is privileged as the exclusive foundation or origin of consciousness. It is in this respect that it is important to emphasize that are sexed, gendered, and raced bodies exists in the particular manner that they do because of their specific relation to the mode of life and production.

**Patriarchy and Capital: A Unity**

At this point it is important to bring into the discussion the work of Maria Mies, which critically interrogated the relation of embodied subjects to nature. Her feminist critique of Marx and Engels noted that they employed male-centric thinking (typical of the historical period) when they theorized the individual’s relation to nature and, indeed, the category
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5 Those that are familiar with Sharma’s work will surely notice our divergent perspectives. She has problematized the category of migrant worker as part of a larger critique of globalization and nationalism. Whereas her analysis focused attention on the construction of the nation, I have located the problematic of borders in processes of capitalist imperialism. Chapter V includes a more extensive critique of her analysis. That said, her writing was part of my initial introduction to the topic and helped me to refine why I found imperialism (rather than globalization) a more useful framework for understanding the relations constituting status and labour. I have, therefore, drawn upon the descriptive elements of her work, rather than the prescriptive.
nature, which then oriented their understanding of human nature toward a male-centered model. In contrast to the earlier quotations from Marx and Engels, Mies has argued that men and women appropriate nature differently, and as such our sexed bodies mediate the subject-object relation to nature and the mode of production. In short, differently sexed and gendered bodies have a different relation to objective matter (Mies, 1986, p.53). It is important to stress that Mies was not making a biological argument, which would lead us toward biological determinism or de-historicized universalism. Rather, she clearly stated that femaleness and maleness are expressed differently in different epochs (with differing cultural organizations of gender), and are the consequence of protracted historical processes (1986, p.53).

Importantly Mies’ extensive historical analysis has demonstrated that the production of life and thus consciousness – which includes the production of new life and the sustaining of our bodies – is dialectically related to the sexual division of labour. To reframe this in the language of Marx and Engels, the sexual division of labour is central to the “mode of life”, and as such the organization of life and labour exists in relation with our sexed and gendered bodies. The nature of women and men is, thus, an embodied experience, which exists in relation to the historical organization and division of labour. Coupling Mies with Marx and Engels’ dialectical understanding of the subject-object relation helps to emphasize the central importance of both embodiment and material context for human consciousness and praxis.

As has already been noted, knowledge is produced in a definite social historical context, and as such will be influenced by the social relations and material conditions that prevail at that time. An historical materialist epistemology, therefore, provides a firm foundation for understanding and struggling against the social relations that subordinate women to men. It is, however, also important to use Marx’s own method to critically engage with the implications of his writings for women, our labour and our bodies. The feminist
scholars Silvia Federici, Leopoldina Fortunati, and Maria Mies have been very influential in this respect, and it is through their historical materialist analysis of the sexual division of labour, productive relations, and primitive accumulation that we are now able to see the ways in which Marx and Engels were influenced by the Western masculinism of their historical period. This particular strain of feminist critique has cogently demonstrated the ways in which women’s labour was naturalized and removed from the realm of consciousness production, thereby erasing the unity of patriarchy and capital.

Maria Mies’ dialectical analysis of reproductive and productive labour cogently explicated the ways in which female-centered knowledge has been obscured and erased by both bourgeois science and orthodox Marxism. At the crux of her critique of Marxist writings was the observation that both Marx and Engels (in their collective and independent writings) separated natural history from social history in a manner that positioned the production of new life as natural (or animal) rather than a conscious human act. As Mies (1986) noted:

> By separating the production of new life from the production of the daily requirements through labour, by elevating the latter to the realm of history and humanity and by calling the first ‘natural’, the second ‘social’ they have involuntarily contributed to the biological determinism which we suffer today. (p.52)

Furthermore, procreation and women’s unwaged labour were not considered a productive force, but rather were positioned as a pre-social occurrence that did not include conscious and reflective thought (Mies, 1986, p.49-52). Hence, not only is unwaged reproductive labour an act without consciousness and thus a non-social act, it also cannot be a driving force of history.

In contrast to Marx and Engels, both Mies and Federici’s historical investigations of women’s roles in procreation, birthing and social reproduction have demonstrated that
women across the globe have always exercised agency in areas of so-called natural activity (or non-productive labour) by controlling their fertility and the number of children they birth and raise. Although much of the knowledge that was developed by women was violently erased in the protracted transition to capitalism, women in both pre-patriarchal and feudal societies were more proficient at regulating their fertility through their shared female-centered knowledge and their relationship to natural environments (Federici, 2004; Mies, 1986). A second point worth noting is that feminist historians have also demonstrated that slave women resisted domination and the exploitation of their reproductive labour by enacting birthing strikes (Mies, 1986, p.92). What can be drawn from the feminist research of these authors is that women’s unwaged labour must be understood as a conscious social act with a definite history, and has been a site of contestation and social struggle.

From the vantage point of women’s unpaid domestic and reproductive labour we are more clearly able to see the unity of patriarchy and capital, which is at the core of the creation of surplus value. That is to say, that the patriarchal organization of life and labour is both the pre-condition for and result of capitalist social relations. This point can be observed in two respects. Firstly, as Federici (2004) demonstrated, the processes of primitive accumulation included the violent destruction of women’s knowledge of contraception, and the subordination of women’s reproductive labour to the requirements of capital. Our bodies, therefore, became the medium for reproducing the workforce. With the growth and spread of capitalist social relations throughout the globe, so too did the patriarchal sexual division of labour and the Western bourgeois family. As Mies (1986) has argued to understand the full complexity of capitalist social relations we must begin with the premise that the production of life, which has been conducted by women as unwaged labour, must be understood as the perennial basis of the exploitation of both men and women in capitalist social relations (p.48).
Secondly, as Fortunati’s (1981) analysis has demonstrated surplus value cannot be created without women’s unwaged domestic and reproductive labour. As such, there is an exploitative relation between capital and women in the production of labour power, or the (male) worker. This relation of exploitation, moreover, has been mystified by the historical naturalization of women’s reproductive and domestic labour. As Mies, therefore argued the process of capitalist accumulation is not possible without maintaining and newly creating the subordination of women to men (1986, p.38). In other words, patriarchy and capital must be understood as a unity, which means that in their current form they are in fact inseparable and mutually dependent.

Bringing each of these themes together and returning them to our central area of consideration, which is of course critical consciousness, we must emphasize two interconnected points. Firstly the capitalist mode of production is internally related to the patriarchal organization of labour, which has been mystified by the naturalization of women’s reproductive roles and practices. Secondly, when we begin from this premise it is undeniable that critical/revolutionary consciousness must be feminist and feminist work cannot avoid the co-constitution of exploitation and oppression. In short, critical consciousness must center the unity of patriarchy and capital. Throughout the discussion I have gestured toward the importance of critical education for revolutionary praxis, I will now turn more specifically to a critical consideration of how socialist educators have taken up the question of education for socialism. My focus here is on non-feminist Marxism, and as such I aim to demonstrate the implications of the exclusion of feminist thought from Marxist projects.
Education for Socialism

The perspectives and frameworks that are introduced in this sections have made an important contribution to the field of adult education in that they have argued for a critique of political economy as central to critical education, and in doing so draw our attention to the ways in which the social relations of exploitation are contested and reproduced by people’s lived practices. Authors within this tradition often include a detailed explication of Marx’s work, seek to make visible the inner relation between domination and education, and/or uncover the ways in which struggle is an educative process (Allman, 2001; Foley, 1998; Friere, 1970; Youngman, 1986). Additionally, there is a clear recognition that formal education has been greatly influenced by capitalist social relations, and thus there is also an interest in recovering the links between anti-capitalist resistance, and the learning that takes place in social settings (Foley, 1999; Youngman, 1986, p.2-3). Adult education and learning, therefore, is understood here as neither individualistic nor purely cultural. In its critical form, moreover, it must be directed toward the development of class consciousness and revolutionary struggle. It is on this note, that I will offer the critique that the raising of working class consciousness must not be conflated with critical/revolutionary consciousness. The purpose of this section, therefore, is to put forth the argument that praxis can only be critical when we begin from the position that capital and patriarchy are a unity, which developed in a definite configuration because of their inner relation with the processes of racialization. As such, revolutionary class consciousness is anti-racist feminist consciousness.

Griff Foley’s work on popular education and resistance has been primarily interested in uncovering the various ways people learn incidentally and informally through acts of political resistance. For Foley theorizations of critical learning must make connections between political economy, local politics, discursive interactions, and acts of resistance. At
the heart of Foley’s analysis, moreover, was a critique of the processes of domination that are embedded in capitalist relations (Foley, 1998; 1999). As noted in Chapter I, incidental and informal learning are not immediately obvious, and as such research into activism and education often attempts to bring these learning processes to the fore. Indeed, this very idea made up a large part of Foley’s project, and thus much of his work juxtaposed narrative reflections by activists with an analysis of the material conditions in which these actions occurred. His primary purpose has been to uncover and make visible if and when learning occurred (in both progressive and reproductive forms) (Foley, 1998, p.143-144). He then made the argument that while broad economic and political changes constitute the material conditions from which people begin to resist, these changes are not sufficient for critical transformations. Rather, there must also be a shift in consciousness through which people learn that political action is necessary and possible. This shift in consciousness is said to originate from an informal learning experience in peoples’ *everyday* collective practices (Foley, 1999). Foley (1998) argued, furthermore, that critical consciousness developed within individuals *organically* through informal learning that occurred during resistance efforts (p.149). In short, a critical class consciousness is spontaneously sparked during everyday social practices and is further developed organically through collective acts of resistance.

Rachel Gorman and Rachel Gouin’s respective anti-racist feminist critiques of Foley help to illuminate the problems created by de-emphasizing the role of in depth intellectual activity in the development of critical consciousness. Gorman (2002) has argued that Foley does not grant adequate attention to the dialectic between informal spaces of learning and the social relations of production and reproduction. In doing so, *everyday* expressions of sexism, racism, homophobia and ableism are left unconsidered (p.123). Foley’s argument that critical consciousness developed out of the everyday failed to consider the complex and interwoven
relations of oppression and exploitation, which Lenin’s analysis warned against. Class was posited as the center of anti-capitalist struggle. Foley, therefore, conflated spontaneous or organic consciousness with critical/revolutionary consciousness, thereby positioning consciousness in its embryonic form as the site of critical anti-capitalist learning, while leaving oppression and the exploitation of domestic labour largely unconsidered. Thus, not only did Foley’s analysis overemphasize the importance of sensuous experiences, he tacitly reproduced the very same relations he was critical of.

In a somewhat similar analysis Rachel Gouin has noted that Foley conceptualized the relations between capital, race and gender to be primarily ideological. This conceptual move allowed Foley to note the manner in which poor, women of colour in the global south have been disproportionately affected by capitalism, without further interrogating the history of this material relation (Gouin, 2008, p.162). Gouin, thus, suggested that Foley needed to further interrogate the ways in which systems of oppression and exploitation interlock. Ultimately, however, she found that if Foley’s framework for anti-capitalist learning is layered with women’s experiences, then an examination of incidental learning in activism could provide a way to further our understanding of oppression and resistance. In short, Gouin found fault with Foley’s lack of attention to oppression, but not the conceptual framework for adult learning in resistance.

In response to Gouin’s assessment of Foley, I would like to suggest that although she posited a material relation between gender, race and capital, she did not explicate the dialectical relation that constitutes these phenomena. As such, her analysis was able to draw connections between lived experience and consciousness without problematizing the usage of experience alone as the crux of critical consciousness and praxis. Gorman and Allman’s respective discussions of consciousness are again useful for further illuminating this
distinction. Gorman (2005) noted that consciousness-raising often occurs in a group setting as participants collectively articulate the contours of a particular oppression (p.143). In contrast, Allman (2007) described critical/revolutionary consciousness as occurring when people who critically questioned the existing capitalist social relations, worked toward abolishing these relations, and in doing so attempt to make life better for all people (p.34). It is important to note the different vantage points that each of these concepts works from. Consciousness-raising is rooted in a localized and particular experience, whereas critical consciousness seeks to understand social relations as a historical whole. There is in another words, an important move from the particular to the general that coincides with the move from consciousness-raising to critical/revolutionary consciousness, which cannot take place if experiences of resistance alone are taken as the sole object of critical adult learning. Gouin and Foley, therefore, run into a similar problem. Incidental learning in resistance cannot adequately engage with the dialectical unity that constitutes patriarchal capital and as such can work towards consciousness-raising but not critical/revolutionary consciousness.

In contrast to Foley, Frank Youngman understood that one of the important social functions for socialist educators was to aid the growth of a working class consciousness. His analysis attempted to follow the dialectical Marxist-Leninist tradition, which understood critical consciousness as developing through exposure to a comprehensive analysis of exploitation and oppression in their general and particular forms (Lenin, 1929). Adult educators were to play an important role in the fusing of social experience, theoretical explications of capital, and collective action (Youngman, 1986, p.34-35). Youngman’s model for critical/revolutionary education, therefore, did not emphasize either experiential reflection or action, but rather attempted to join the two, while also layering this with a knowledge of
capital in the abstract. In other words, at the heart of his project was an interest in education that was oriented toward sensuous and cognitive knowledge of capitalist social relations.

Youngman’s model for critical/revolutionary education and social action, however, ultimately encountered the same problems as Foley’s, because he employed a static non-dialectical conceptualization of class. Youngman defined class as a relationship to the means of productions (1986, p.15-17). Hence, for Youngman the proletariat was constituted by those who “own no means of production and have to sell their labour for wages in order to survive” (1986, p.16). Class consciousness, moreover, was conceptualized as the “awareness of members of a class of their common interests and how to advance them” (Youngman, 1986, p.34). The task of critical/revolutionary education was understood here as aiding the development of a working class consciousness that enabled people to understand the nature of capitalist society, and develop the skills and values necessary to overthrow this system (1986, p.34). Youngman, however, also failed to consider the unity of patriarchy and capital. In doing so, he occluded an analysis of women’s unpaid and reproductive labour from the theoretical explication of capital, which was to constitute part of the critical learning process. If the exploitation of women’s labour by capital is in not recognized as such, then the labour-capital contradiction cannot be fully grasped. Thus, not only did Youngman’s conceptualization of class remove much of women’s labour from the discussion, it also hindered a theoretical knowledge of the dialectical contradictions constituting patriarchy and capital, thereby preventing a comprehensive understanding of capital in the abstract.

Although Youngman intended to build a model for critical/revolutionary education that helped to cultivate a deep understanding of our epoch and a truly critical working class consciousness, by excluding women’s labour and exploitation his framework actually
undermines the growth of a working class consciousness that could struggle against – all cases and all forms of exploitation and oppression.

**Conclusion**

Dialectical historical materialism provides a framework for understanding social change as engendered by struggle. As I have emphasized, however, critical social transformation requires that Marxist theory and socialist education build from an engagement with anti-racist feminism. Without comprehensive knowledge of the unity of patriarchy and capital as well as the historical processes of racialization, which make up imperialism in its current form, we are left with an incomplete understanding of exploitation, and cannot learn from the rich history of women’s resistance. Critical education that does not begin from the premise that the subordination of women and racialized people is historically interwoven with capital cannot work toward a revolutionary transformation in consciousness. That said, I do concur with the Marxist educators that critical/revolutionary education is unlikely to occur within our current institutions, and as such it is important to look to popular struggles as a site of informal learning. Bringing together my analysis of informal learning and the production of ideological thought highlights an important area for consideration; activist praxis is immersed in and must respond to ideological thought and practice. The following two Chapters take up this very problem by critically engaging with the impact of ideology on consciousness and praxis at this moment in time.
CHAPTER III: Ideology and Praxis

Introduction

Social movements tend to be amorphous and often include groups with disparate goals and strategies. In the interest of clarity it is worth noting that I only traced the general recent history of migrant justice activism in and near the Toronto area and focused much of my attention on the most prevalent and broad organization: No One is Illegal. NOII became active as an organization during the mid-2000s with the rise of city-focused campaigns. As an activist group, they espouse quite a radical and often anti-imperialist perspective, and thus their work and political demands directly oppose the Canadian state. Additionally, I have drawn upon the research of authors that have worked with a range of groups across Canada and have used their findings in concert with mine (Berinstein et al., 2004; McDonald 2009; Nyers 2003; Pashang 2011; Sharma 2002, 2006; Wright, 2006).

In broad general terms the no borders movement includes an array of non-governmental organizations as well as activist and advocacy groups that work to alleviate and/or resist the negative impacts of state policies on migrant workers, immigrants, people living without status and first nations peoples. Some groups have mobilized around a particular community identity (such as place of origin or religious faith), while others (such as NOII or The Canadian Council for Refugees) have taken a more generalized approach. While surveying the history of migrant justice activism I began to notice three pillars or central nodes of mobilization: regularization, access to services, and fighting against detention and deportation. As noted earlier, much of the history of activism prior to the mid-1990s is difficult to trace due to a lack of documentation and the movement of people into different areas of work (Pashang, 2011). The history of regularization programs, however, presented itself as one key exception to this point. Not only is regularization a very common
demand across movement actors (both currently active and now inactive), it is also an area that has attracted interest from activist-academics. As such, there is a fair amount known about the history of regularization and its relationship to the government policies of the day (Berinstein et al., 2004; McDonald, 2009; Nyers, 2003; Wright, 2006). Although the fight for regularization programs could not be characterised as the beginning of the movement, it has made up a significant part of activist resistance since the 1960s and thus using it as a starting point will help to illuminate shifts in strategies.

Each of the three pillars continues to be important for the movement. Resistance to criminalization, however, has become an increasingly dominant focus. As can be expected, the predominant area of attention shifted roughly in accordance with the intensification of neoliberalism. Campaigns that have focused on access to services may not initially appear as resistance to criminalization, however, as the discussion will certainly make clear, the convergence of neoliberalism, and national border security has also threatened peoples experiences of everyday living. In short, there was a shift during the mid 2000s that centered resistance on the processes of criminalization, which also made the broader fight for political inclusion en masse much more difficult. I have, therefore, structured the discussion around highlighting the parallel between the intensification of neoliberalism and the increasing focus on resistance to criminalization, detention and deportation. However, to be clear, it is important to remember that migrant justice activists work in coalition with other political organizations, and thus, while we can point to and discuss distinctive moments in a movement’s history, such lines are not always so easily drawn.

A second, and perhaps less immediately observable, point that I began to notice through my discussions with activists, was that the shift in focus was also a strategic shift, which built from the reflective discussions pertaining to regularization and government
procedures (Anonymous, personal communication, September 2012). The rise of city focused campaigns (such as Don’t Ask Don’t Tell, Education Not Deportation, and Shelter Sanctuary Status) must also be understood as a strategic political move away from a more dedicated focus on regularization, which positioned the federal government as its key opponent. This shift gestures toward the relationship between government ideology and activist praxis. That said, this is not a simplistic causal relation, but rather speaks to a complex of processes. There is at once a shift toward city focused campaigns because the possibility of universal regularization has become increasingly unlikely, as well as recognition of the ways in which regularization actually has adverse effects on some non-status people. Hence, although migrant justice campaigns are responding to the injustices ostensibly created by government policies, this work also provided a critical space to engage in a collective re-thinking of how national borders function in practice, and the points at which daily living intersects with these borders. In this sense, the practices of resistance granted people the opportunity to discuss and unpack the contours of oppression in a manner that ruptured their consciousness, and shed light on the specific ideological practices that constituted part of the regularization process. By juxtaposing the intensification of neoliberalism, past regularization programs and city focused campaigns my analysis aims to flesh out the contradictory relations of resistance and government ideology, while also looking to the larger problematic of moving toward revolutionary praxis.

The Ideological Forming of National Borders

If we are to consider borders in a critical manner, then there are a number of interconnected points that need to be outlined. Firstly the nation-state, that is the territorial area that a government exercises its legal authority over, is defined and organized by a global
set of historical social relations that coalesce to give meaning to nation borders. Borders have meaning and legal authority because of the interconnected historical processes of imperialism and international law. Citizenship, then, must be understood as the legal category that organizes the relations between states and individuals. The practices associated with controlling national borders and the movement of people, moreover, are bound up with the historical processes of colonial domination. As such, borders impact the lives of women, racialized people and the working class in harsh and often violent ways (Pashang, 2011; Sharma, 2006). The practices of defining national borders and controlling the movement of people must, therefore, be understood as ideological because they obscure the historical relations which they are built upon, and normalize legalistic divisions between people.

Secondly, although immigration policies and border controls appear to be instruments for the exclusion of unwanted foreign nationals, they actually function in a manner that regulates the labour market and reproduces the heteronormative patriarchal family. This point can be illustrated by the fact that non-status people generally enter Canada by legal means, but are forced into a position of non-status because they are unable to achieve legal residency. As of 2005 over half a million non-status people live in Canada, and are employed in poorly waged and precarious jobs. It is only at politically or economically expedient points that the government confronts and punishes the labour of non-status people. Women’s labour in the family and the market, furthermore, is regulated through immigration categories such as “dependent”, or the Live-In Caregivers program, which function to normalize and reproduce the patriarchal division of labour within the family and the market (Pashang, 2011; Sharma, 2002; Ng, 1998). Bringing these threads together highlights that borders are differentially experienced and mediated by relations of class, race and gender. Furthermore, the liberal capitalist state is integral for the organization and regulation of migrant and non-status labour
within a nation. Borders, therefore, function in a contradictory manner. On the one hand, borders organize the division of labour within and across states, and on the other they obfuscate this very same relation. To put this more concisely, borders mystify the class relation on a global scale.

Policies associated with neoliberalism reorganized the ways in which we understand the movement of people across borders. This is due in part to the fact that neoliberal policies have been concerned with particular types of criminality. The Canadian government now stresses issues of identity, documentation and fraud (including welfare fraud) (Pratt, 2005). Those that have precarious status and documentation are being forced into the category of criminal through such policies. Similarly, Pashang noted that there are observable points of convergence between the rise of neoliberalism and the tightening of border controls, which also correspond with the post-Fordist period of economic contraction. She continued on to argue that, “At the same time, the change in the political climate shifted the discourse of humanitarianism to one of neoliberalism, giving rise to the dichotomies of “good” versus “bad” immigrants and “cooperative” versus “radical” organizations and workers” (2011, p.8).

I agree with Pashang’s point that the “good” versus “bad” dichotomy has been used to regulate the bodies and labour of non-status (including migrant workers) people, and has, indeed, drawn a division within the work of resistance. However, my research suggested that the ideological construction of “good” and “bad” immigrants was also operational during earlier periods, which her analysis had characterised as humanitarian. Thus, in subtle contrast to Pashang I suggest that the move away from so-called humanitarianism is a reorganization of emphasis that calls attention to the “bad” immigrant rather than the “good”. This shift in focus, moreover, has had the consequence of shifting resistance toward an implicit defense of a politics of humanitarianism.
The Ideological Practices of Immigration

As has been well documented, Canada, much like many other settler colonies, utilized immigration and settlement policies as a tool for building national infrastructure and the economy. Although immigrants provided much of the labour for these so-called nation-building activities, they were always subject to racist and sexist ideologies that regulated their movements and constrained their political rights (Knowles, 2007; Pashang, 2011). In fact, Pashang (2011) has noted that since 1908 the Canadian government has used its legal powers of deportation to detain and remove those who were deemed poor and immoral, which also included women who could not survive without charitable donation (p. 78). The point system, introduced during the 1960s, was intended to remove racism and sexism from the immigration system; however, it merely reconfigured such practices by introducing a class preference for skilled and professional workers (Pashang, 2011, p.78). Hence, from the very formation of the Canadian state, immigration policies have been utilized to fill labour requirements, while concurrently reproducing sexist and racist ideologies that deny political rights to these same groups.

More recently there has been a move away from the use of settlement as tool for attracting the necessary labour power, to practices that restricted immigration through the increasing preference for migrant labour. As Sharma’s (2006) research demonstrated the rise and consolidation of neoliberalism has undergirded this transition. Programs such as the Non-Immigrant Employment Authorization Program (NIEAP), which was introduced in 1973 with the budding of neoliberal reforms, created the legal conditions for the use of labour by Canadian businesses that did not have access to the rights conferred by citizenship. Such programs (now the Temporary Foreign Workers Program) have allowed Canadian employers to compete with production that is located in the Third World because migrant workers do
not have the same legal rights as citizens, and thus higher rates of exploitation are possible (Sharma, 2006, p.19-20). Consistent with this argument we can notice that since these programs were introduced the numbers of migrant workers admitted to Canada has in general increased, while the numbers of residencies granted in the categories of refugee or sponsored relatives have in general decreased. Furthermore, this present year has seen a fifteen per cent drop in the wages of temporary workers, and as of 2010 workers in the federal skilled workers program must have either a job offer or experience in one of the listed “in-demand” occupations (Sharma, 2006; Pashang, 2011; CIC, n.d. a; FJC, 2012). Interestingly, the Labour Market Opinion Statistics for the Temporary Foreign Workers Program (TFWP) show an overall decline in numbers of admitted foreign workers since 2008. When this data is organized by occupation type, however, it is clear that the overall decline is largely due to a decline in the admission of more highly skilled migrants. In fact, the numbers of agricultural and domestic workers on positive labour market opinions has remained fairly consistent despite the economic downturn of the past few years (see Appendix 1). Important for our purpose is that the Canadian government regulates and organizes the labour of immigrants and migrants in a way that supports local capital and the domestic economy. The concentration of migrant labour in low paying jobs, moreover, highlights the fact that the state continues to play an integral role in reproducing the racialization of the working class.

Approaching this topic from the perspective of migration, Binford’s research has demonstrated that liberalization in the global south ravaged local economies, thereby greatly increasing the numbers of un- and under-employed workers. As Binford (2009) argued, thirty years of accumulation by dispossession, “has produced an apparent complementarity of interests between poor countries with unambiguous labour surpluses created, exacerbated and transformed under neoliberal reforms, and wealthy ones with sectoral labour deficits,
especially in low-waged, unskilled and semi-skilled occupations” (p.504). Looked at from a transnational perspective, neoliberalism has created a set of structural conditions that push workers across borders into precarious employment. Within Canada this system prevents workers from circulating within the labour market by assigning them to a particular employer. Poor performance reviews, moreover, can lead to deportation or reduced access to re-employment (Binford 2009; CIC, n.d. a).

Through this very brief historical survey I want to emphasize that the Canadian state has always and continues to use its legal authority to set the conditions for non-citizen labour, which are, of course, correlative to the dominant ideologies of a given period. At this moment in time, we can, therefore, note that the ideological climate supports and reproduces the political exclusion of racialized workers. That is to say, that neoliberal policies have created a set of labour practices that limit migrant workers access to rights during the term of their employment. Although the practices of neoliberalism date back to the 1970s, the more recent merger of neoliberalism and border security practices has produced a particularly potent mix of xenophobic rhetoric. The work of resistance, therefore, must confront a political climate that aims to reproduce the structural conditions for high rates of exploitation, through an ideological politics of exclusion and criminalization.

Neoliberalism Intensified: The Current Ideology of Immigration and Criminality

Bill C-10 and then C-14, then. C-31. And you are just like ‘Oh my god’ ‘there is another bill oh, ok get organized’. Do that, do this, occupy that place, and it is very frustrating. We know that. We discuss that all the time. You can’t go back to, for example Bill C-4, that became law in 2009. You can’t go back and talk about that, because there is a new bill, and it’s worse
than that, and you just need to…. [sigh] yeah. In so many ways it’s more reformist than all of
these radical ideas that we are standing for.

In many ways we are just responding to the state’s new bills, new regulations. Like there is
not much time and energy left for doing some, like to demand something new, even to, like,
change the old stuff. Like, everything is getting worse and worse, and you need just to, like,
respond to that. (S, personal communication, August 23, 2012).

Since their first term in office the Conservative government of Canada has focused
the immigration and refugee debate on issues of national security and migrant criminality.
Although some of the harshest policy suggestions have not yet been signed into law, such
debates frame the ideological discursive of a particular period, and thus enter into our
consciousness (Smith, 1999). For example, the Preventing Human Smugglers from Abusing
Canada’s Immigration System Act (Bill C-4), which was first introduced to the House
of Commons in June of 2011, created the legal category of “designated foreign national” and
stipulated mandatory detention of such individuals. Focus is drawn to the practices of
strengthening national borders, while concurrently questioning the legitimacy of refugee
claimants in general. Public debate, and thus consciousness, is then organized around the
tensions between state sovereignty and the legitimacy, or moral character, of potential
immigrants. Groups, such as NOII, have mobilized to respond to these public discussions by
calling attention to the fact that “human smuggling” is a discursive ideal that misleading
constructs migration as criminal. They have argued that “smuggling” is a form of community
resistance that directly responds to global injustices (NOII, n.d. a). This critique and public
discussion draws attention to the ideological nature of national borders, thereby creating
localized ruptures in consciousness. As a form of praxis, however, counterpoising smuggling
and community resistance works toward a claim of political legitimacy, whereby political
inclusion is rooted in the liberal tradition of humanitarianism. Hence, as a form of resistance this argument both critiques the state system and relies upon it.

Similarly, despite having no evidence that marriage fraud is an issue for concern, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) produced information on protecting oneself against fraudulent activities for those considering marriage to a non-citizen or potential migrant, which was then coupled with further restrictions on the spousal sponsorship program. Subsequently, marriage fraud became an issue of public debate and movement actors mobilized in response (CIC, n.d. b; Canadian Council for Refugees, 2011; NOII, 2011, April 20). As the Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR) has noted, the issue of so-called marriage fraud is part of a larger government discourse that links migrants and immigrants to fraudulent and criminal activities. Such discussions, moreover, can increase the pressure felt by women with precarious status to remain in abusive relationships (CCR, 2011). This debate, regardless of what the truth may be and the particularities of women’s situations, organizes public discourse around a dichotomized and idealistically constructed passive feminine subject. Following this framing, resistance must work on the behalf of the voiceless migrant woman. To be clear, I am not suggesting that migrant and non-status women do not face very real vulnerabilities because of these types of public discussions. I am merely noting that the dichotomy itself fails to grasp the full complexity of patriarchal capital and the exploitation of women, which denies and obscures the history of women’s agency and divides women amongst themselves. Thus, not only does government discussion of marriage fraud perpetuate patriarchal and xenophobic ideologies, it organizes praxis around the protection of women as vulnerable.

At the time of conducting the research these issues made up a significant component of public debate. I have included the above two examples of governmental discourse because
they help to illuminate the relationship between public debate and consciousness, which of course then orients praxis. What can be observed is that government debates often set the parameters for activist responses. As such, the intensification of neoliberal and nation security ideologies have delimited the frames of resistance in such a way that resistance must first contend with a fight for legal protections. Such a framing sits well within the parameters of liberal capitalist democracy and focuses consciousness on the tradition of humanitarianism.

Shifting from government discourse to recent policy changes we can also note that the recent royal assent of the *Protecting Canada’s Immigration System Act* (Bill C-31) cemented the government’s shift away from a tradition that was often characterized as humanitarian. Included in Bill C-31 were provisions that would significantly decrease the time given to non-status people to prepare their claims; set mandatory minimum detention times for those deemed to be “irregular arrivals”, which could include minors; government officers are now able to arrest and detain permanent residents or foreign nationals if the officer believes the person could be a danger to public safety or is not likely to attend their claims hearing. The Bill, moreover, made a number of changes to immigration procedures, which included the taking of biometric information when applying for temporary residence visas, and rendered humanitarian and compassionate considerations ineffective (CCR, 2012; CIC, n.d. d).

Evidently, these recent policy changes have further solidified the Canadian state’s ability to exercise punitive control over non-status people in general. In more specific terms, we can also observe, through the increasing emphasis on biometric data, that criminalization has included the applying of state power to peoples’ individualized bodies. Neoliberal ideology, which individualizes subjects and externalizes social historical context, coupled with punitive policies can, therefore, be seen to underpin these policies changes.
The ideological practices of the current government have, evidently, emphasized issues of national security and migrant criminality. Such practices, however, have a much deeper and broader history that intensified with the events of September 11th, but were already underway prior to this date (Wright, 2006, p.6). With this in mind, it is worth noting that both liberal and conservative governments in Canada and abroad have implemented policies and agreements along these same lines. For example, in 2002 Jean Chretien’s Liberal government introduced a number of provisions to *The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (Bill C-11) that expanded the powers of border officials to detain persons on the grounds of suspicion. This same Bill shortened the times claimants had to prepare their cases (Pashang, 2011 p.81). In the area of international politics, The Safe Third Country Agreement (2002) between Canada and the United States (U.S.) required refugee claimants to make their claim at their first port of entry, despite the fact that the U.S. has been criticized for its practices of detention (Nyers, 2003, p.1082). Fingerprint data has been collected from detainees and non-status people under removal orders since 1993. Furthermore, the Canadian government has participated in the development of procedures for the sharing of biometric data internationally (CIC, n.d. c). Viewed collectively it is clear that the practices of criminalization are not specific to the current government, but rather are bound up with a more protracted intensification of border security, which interlocks with the neoliberal framework.

The above discussion highlights two distinct but connected tendencies in current immigration, labour and refugee policy. Firstly we can note that the current ideological climate is centered on national security and controlling borders. Secondly, there has been a shift toward the use of migrant labour rather than settlement. In both instances the Canadian government can be understood to be restricting pathways to residency and emphasizing its
power over non-citizens. This point, however, should not be understood as either an unambiguous tightening of borders or as restrictively located in the realm of political rights. Indeed, as the above analysis has highlighted immigration and refugee policy play an integral role in defining the position of migrant and immigrants in society and the labour market. Immigration policies and practices, moreover, have an ideological function that enters into our consciousness, sets the conditions for activists’ responses, and thus organizes our praxis. Switching primary focus to the work of resistance we can explore this same historical moment from a different vantage point, and in doing so can delve deeper into the impact of neoliberalism on the work of resistance. The point that I intend to highlight is that these increasingly restrictive and punitive policies have also confined the work of resistance within the bounds of liberal humanitarianism.

**Praxis: Locating and Understanding Canadian Borders**

*Despite the regrettable conditions in which many non-status workers and their families live, there is no consensus on establishing an amnesty program to regularize their status. Non-status people have not respected Canada’s immigration rules, and therefore many are of the view that Canada should not reward such people by giving them permanent resident status, especially when hundreds of thousands of people are patiently waiting years to legally call Canada home. In addition, and depending on how it was structured, an amnesty program could very likely exacerbate the problem of non-status migration if it simply attracted more people to come to Canada illegally. [Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, 2009]*
Regularization

In the past regularization programs have created the conditions for a particular group of non-status people to apply for legal status. They were first officially introduced by the government during the 1960s, and have been used at different junctures up until the mid 2000s. Although most programs have focused on a specific community, some have been more broadly implemented, such as the humanitarian and compassionate considerations program. It is worth reiterating that this program is the only regularization program in operation; however, as of the royal ascent of Bill C-31 this program has been rendered largely ineffective.

Regularization programs provide an interesting example of the relationship between activist resistance and state policy. The Chinese Adjustment Statement Program (1960 – 1972) gave Chinese migrants the opportunity to apply for permanent residency. This program arose in part because Chinese communities actively pressured the federal government to change the explicitly racist immigration laws that had excluded them from political rights and citizenship. Similarly, regularization programs were implemented for Haitians living in Quebec (1981) and Algerians living in Montreal (2002) as a response to respective international crises and public pressure. The Minister’s Review Committee (1983 – 1985) and the Deferred Removal Orders Class (1994 – 1998) programs created the conditions for failed refugee claimants now living without status to be regularized if they met the additional criteria. At the time of these programs the legal categorization of failed refugee claimants was considered an issue for concern by both the federal government and community groups (McDonald, 2009, p.67). A commonality across these examples is the appearance of humanitarian values as a response to injustice and the mobilization of communities. In other words, the Canadian government responded to the political exclusion of particular groups of
non-status people in a manner that was consistent with the liberal democratic organization of society and individuals.

The appearance of humanitarian values, however, does not negate or exclude the existence of more complex processes in the defining of borders and the organization of labour. In fact, through their comprehensive historical investigation of regularization Berinstein et al. were able to demonstrate that regularization functions as means for governments to “clear the decks” before bringing in new and often more restrictive immigration policies. They stated:

Regularization programs are often portrayed as the humanitarian act of a compassionate government. The history of such programs in Canada shows a more complicated reality. In the past, governments have sometimes regularized non-status immigrants because there was a need for more workers in the labour market. At other times they have done so in response to political pressure created by the campaigns of non-status immigrants and their supporters. Most often, however, governments have introduced regularization programs when they were planning to overhaul Canadian immigration law. [Berinstein et al., 2004, p.7]

Regularization, therefore, must be understood as a tool for regulating labour markets and the politics of citizenship. Interestingly, the current government did not utilize a regularization program to “clear the decks”, before introducing the latest round of immigration reforms. The appearance of humanitarian values by the Conservative government seems to be at odds with more recent policies changes, which have focused on the criminality of non-citizens, and has limited pathways to residency.

Delving deeper into the practices of and criteria for regularization highlights the less visible relationship between criminalization and regularization programs. In each of the official regularization programs, applicants were required to meet a number of conditions. Such criteria often included security and background checks as well as character assessments
(this condition was articulated as a “good moral character” or “successful integration into society”) (Berinstein et al., 2004). The programs, moreover, made many non-status people vulnerable to exposure and deportation. Of particular concern was that in many instances regularization programs have required that people apply in person or make their identity known. When an application was denied immigration officials now had access to information that identified that person, which aided the processes of detention and deportation (Berinstein et al., 2004; McDonald, 2009). As activist and author Jean McDonald (2009) has argued, these programs set the parameters of what constituted a “good” immigrant, and thus also defined the “underserving” or “bad” migrant, while concurrently creating the legal and technical grounds to criminalize them (p. 66-68). She continued on to argue:

Distinguishing the criminal from the good, the diseased from the healthy, the lazy from the hard-working, the newly arrived from the loyal, those who do not belong from the those who do belong, the regularization process is a nation-building practices. Not only are the purportedly “weak” sorted from the “strong” applicants, the national body politic must be protected from those deemed “unsuitable” subjects within the national territory. The technologies of detention and deportation are used to further contain and remove rejected applicants. (McDonald, 2009, p.71)

Through collective reflection on the implementation of regularization programs activists and academics were able to notice some of the tensions between the governmental discourse of humanitarianism and practices of criminalization that occurred through the implementation of regularization programs.

It is clear that in practice these programs have reproduced and reified the “good” versus “bad” dichotomy, which must be understood as an ideological tool employed by the state. Much of this is known because of the collective work of academics and activists that reflected upon these campaigns. They noticed logical contradictions between their political
goals and the results created by the reforms. Indeed, what was noticed and documented was
the fact that humanitarianism and illegalization coexist and are grounded in the same
practices and policies. In other words, the “good” versus “bad” dichotomy functioned in a
manner that allowed the state to act in contradictory ways. Action and reflection, or activist
praxis, created a rupturing in consciousness that helped to make visible the contradictory
nature of fighting for reform. In concrete terms, the fight for political inclusion (through
regularization) also reproduced political exclusion and violence (through criminalization,
detention and deportation). Not only does this example provide a clear demonstration of how
reform easily slips into reproductive praxis, it also gestures to the very real limits of
incidental and informal learning. Reflecting upon the contradictory outcomes of
regularization programs informed the shift toward city focused campaigns, which, as we shall
see, have contributed to the localization of activist praxis.

Shift in Focus: Toronto as a Sanctuary

Six out of 15 adult respondents indicated that they needed to overcome feelings of fear to get
their children into a school. The fear of being reported to immigration officials by school
administration, or running the risk of being reported that a school-aged child was not going
to school, put parents in a very difficult position. [Sidhu, 2008, p.13]

My vision of a Sanctuary City is ideally a city under community-control, where access to
services and issues of justice are decided on the community level between coworkers,
neighbours, led by those most marginalized. It’s a city where immigration enforcement is
impossible (or outlawed) because community members believe and enact the view that no one
is illegal. [Anonymous, personal communication]
The mid 2000s saw the rise of many activist campaigns that directly focused on the lived daily experiences of non-status people. The shift to focusing on city level campaigns, rather than the federal government, was one way that activists sought to address many of the noted concerns with regularization programs and the precarious situations that they created (McDonald, 2009, p.74). Such campaigns aimed to create access to services and social institutions without fear of detention or deportation, and in Toronto, came together under the titles of the sanctuary city and Shelter, Sanctuary, Status. One noteworthy example was the Don’t Ask Don’t Tell (DADT) campaign that successfully fought for the rights of non-status children to attend public schools in Toronto. During 2007 section 49.1 of The Education Act was amended to state that school officials did not have to report a lack of immigration documentation to local immigration officers. Furthermore, a child could not be refused admission to a public school because their family lacked the government documents associated with status (such as a health card or social insurance number) (Sidhu, 2008, p.8). DADT was also directed toward the Toronto Police Service Board, which now has an official policy of not inquiring about immigration status without due cause.

Setting aside the obvious problems of implementation, this campaign was instrumental in focusing attention on the fact that national borders impact some of the most basic social practices. It is now well understood by activist and advocates that living without full legal status, creates the conditions for abject suffering and emotional trauma (Anonymous personal communication, June, 2012). As such the city level reforms have been incredibly important because they work to alleviate some of the brutal and often violent consequences of living without status. These campaigns, moreover, aim to empower communities to engage in local level civil disobedience (Anonymous, personal communication, July 21, 2012). Hence, these reforms are without a doubt very important.
The problematic of reformist consciousness, however, cannot be ignored. We must also ask what are the limits of a sanctuary city model for praxis?

At a strategic level these campaigns encapsulate the position that if full political inclusion (or universal regularization) is not formally achievable, then a safer city is one way to avoid the harm and violence implemented by the state. NOII has defined the objective of the sanctuary city thusly:

A Sanctuary City is one where all people, regardless of immigration status, can live without fear detention or deportation. It is a city where individuals can exert autonomous control over the places they gather at, their schools, their health centers, their food banks, their social services and their neighbourhoods. (NOII, n.d. a)

In this sense, the sanctuary city model must be understood as a set of reforms and objectives, but also as an expression of activist consciousness and praxis. Similarly, No One is Illegal activist Craig Fortier has argued that the Shelter, Sanctuary, Status campaign has the potential to make people think more critically about how borders are experienced as well as providing tools to directly resist nationalism. Fortier (2010), thus, conceptualized this campaign as shifting power to the local community, which then has the impact of creating an “open borders” philosophy (p. 14-15). The social tools of resistance advocated by NOII could be understood as a community based consciousness that is critical of citizenship, nationalism and the nation-state. Following this framework, local divisions (often based on racism or nationalism) within communities become the primary focus of anti-imperialist incidental learning and consciousness.

There is an important tension here between the necessity of reforms that ensure physical safety and the problematic of reproductive praxis. The practices and policies of the Canadian government have targeted non-status people in their local communities. Indeed,
examples of border officials targeting community and social services as a site to locate non-status people have been well documented (Hobbs & Sauer, 2005; Keung, 2009). As such, peoples’ safety and wellbeing is of real concern, and city focused campaigns make an important contribution to countering the current expression of state violence directed toward non-status people. However, by situating city focused campaigns in the larger context of neoliberalism we can notice that the targeting of local communities has pushed the work of resistance into a position where communities must protect vulnerable members from the state, which then organizes consciousness and praxis around an atomized conceptualization of the social. In other words, if the parameters of praxis are set within the domain of the city (or even a localized community), and are framed by disobeying federal law, then the local experience of oppression is elevated and separated from the trans-local. Confining praxis to the local community, therefore, diffuses power relations in a manner that fragments the social, which must also be understood as a fragmentation of our consciousness of social relations.

The sanctuary city campaign was, up until recently, accompanied by cases of direct action. These have involved a call for public mobilization against the detention and deportation of a particular individual. Individual cases have been organized around informing the public of the “good” non-status person that is being subjected to state violence. I do not want to get involved in how discursive construction operates or what tropes were employed. Rather, I want to emphasize that by operationalizing the “bad” “unlawful” migrant the state has repeatedly organized activist praxis. The work of activism in this instance is centered on the mobilization of public pressure against the persecution of a particular individual. The particularities of that person’s case then become the point of mobilization (see NOII newsletter for May 30, 2011). This sets the parameters of resistance around particular individuals, and the discussion is framed by the urgency of protecting that person as well as
the merit of that person as a community member. There is again an interesting relationship
here between neoliberal ideology and the work of resistance. By atomizing subjects and
occluding social context, neoliberalism operates in a manner that attempts to increase the
separation of refugee claimants from their social context both internationally and
domestically. Accordingly the work of resistance has been to draw public attention to the
benefit of social and political inclusion, which parallels a politics of humanitarianism. In this
instance the localization of consciousness, and the associated incidental learning, has been set
within the bounds of liberal capitalist democracy, and the more radical aspects of activism
were impeded. Consciousness and praxis, therefore, are limit to the realm of reform.

**Conclusion**

By describing the evolution of activist praxis in relation to the recent history of
immigration and labour policies I have illustrated the relationship between practices of
governing and the work of resistance. What is evident from my analysis is that neoliberal
ideologies have delimited the parameters of resistance in such a way that the fight for broader
political inclusion is increasingly more difficult, and the oppression of non-status and migrant
workers appears to originate from regressive and punitive state policies. In other words,
praxis has been organized by a politics of inclusion and exclusion, which requires the work
of resistance to protect or legitimate those with precarious status. Furthermore, movement
actors such as NOII have responded to the criminalization of non-status people by
emphasising community based resistance. However, if we consider social movements to be a
site of informal and incidental learning, then privileging the local community also has the
effect of delimiting consciousness. The localization of consciousness makes it more difficult
to differentiate between class exploitation on a global scale and the oppression that results
from the ideological practices of governing. In other words, the localization of consciousness makes it more difficult to discern between the processes of exploitation that are intrinsic to capital at this moment, and the ideological support of this process that engenders oppression. The history of capitalist imperialism, which is at the crux of migratory movements, is thus obscured by the ideology of neoliberalism. Re-framing this point with respect to reformist praxis, I have suggested that reform in the area of no borders activism has focused on mitigating the state violence that is committed against non-status and migrant workers. Thus, the rupturing of consciousness created through informal and incidental learning have, in this instance, been confined within the local setting, thereby further inhibiting the growth and development of revolutionary consciousness.
Chapter IV: The Decentering of Consciousness

Introduction

This Chapter illustrates the decentering of consciousness by considering the pervasive influence of post-modernism and post-structuralism on the academic field of adult education as well as its less obvious influence on activist media. In order to demonstrate this influence within the radical pluralist tradition the adult education literature is discussed in relation to its theoretical precursors. I problematize the relationship between the extolling of center-less resistance and a lack of attention to the ways in which social hierarchies are embedded in lived practices. Turning more specifically to consciousness, I then consider the influence of identity on processes of consciousness-raising. The conclusion of this section draws connections between the shift away from class analysis, typical to theories of new social movements, and the move toward subjectivity rather than consciousness. It is at this point that I argue that this type of theoretical move ultimately undermines any attempt to destabilize the historical social relations that constitute patriarchy and racialization. In other words, the decentering of class also thwarts our ability to destabilize oppressions based upon gender and race.

As was mentioned in Chapter I, by describing particular expressions of oppression or exploitation social movement actors can play an important role in rupturing consciousness. Furthermore, descriptive accounts of activist events and political actions are an important reminder of how political rights are won, and the inexorability of human agency (a point that is too often underemphasized by the mainstream media). It is equally important, however, to critically engage with the relationship between heterodox knowledge production, our current intellectual milieu, and consciousness. The initial discussion of social movement theorizing is intended to draw our attention to some of the intellectual trends at this moment in time as a
way to think critically about the relation between theory and practice. Although radical social movement actors in Toronto do not espouse the position that class relations are no longer of real concern, and do in fact directly oppose state policies, it is still important to examine closely the impact that the de-materialization of class has had on the production of heterodox information. To put this more concisely, how has the articulation of our current struggles been influenced by the intellectual milieu?

It is not possible to direct an act of resistance toward the capitalist system in its entirety, and as such the information disseminated by social movements can provide an excellent platform for the development of critical consciousness. The production of knowledge within social movements could be an important source of truly critical information because it aims not only to expose injustice, but also to encourage struggle. If, however, we locate injustice in the superstructure, which is in many ways a by-product of radical pluralism, then we create the conditions for reproductive praxis from the very rupturing of consciousness. Hence, it is not simply the description of class, gender or race that concerns me, but rather the manner in which examples of exploitation and oppression rupture consciousness and – orient praxis. As I will argue, while the activist media may not intend to undermine revolutionary consciousness, by rooting oppression in the processes of governing without unpacking why the state functions in the particular manner that it does, the political positions espoused by NOII actually parallel the radical pluralist perspective.

**New Social Movements and Learning Democracy**

Central to the radical pluralist understanding of learning in resistance is the differential classification of historical and contemporary social movements. In contrast, many socialist educators have argued that although there are some observable differences in the
strategies of new social movements, a dialectical materialist conceptualization of history brings into focus the ways in which social relations – including the social relations of struggle and resistance – are in constant motion (Holst, 2002, p.16). In other words, class struggle will appear differently at different historical junctures. Nevertheless, there has been a shift in the ways in which social movements are theorized (Buechler, 2000). As noted by Holst (2002), theories that posit a fundamental difference between new social movements and old working class struggles tend to focus on discursive texts and interactional exchanges among members (p.48). For many radical pluralists contemporary social movements are fundamentally different from social movements of the nineteenth century. Whereas earlier working class struggles directly opposed the state and fought for political and economic rights, theorists have argued that new social movements are drawn from the middle class and are disinterested in revolutionary change. Instead, new social movements have been conceptualized as working towards quality of life issues by changing symbols and cultural meaning or challenging the psychological conditions of society (Buechler, 2000; Holford, 1995; Holst, 2002; Kilgore, 1999; Melucci, 1992). In short, there is a shift in focus to the cultural realm as distinct from the political and economic. As the following discussion suggests this shift both strengthens the ideological separation between cultural oppression and class exploitation, and narrows the field of consciousness to the localized setting.

Historically situating the rise of new social movements in the period of welfare-state capitalism, Welton (1993) argued that the invasion of public administration agencies into the lifeworld created the conditions for the emergence of new social movements. New social movements, thus, created a social space to “truly democratize our public life” (p.154-155). Through building a critique of Matthias Finger’s argument in favour of post-modern education, Welton argued that new social movements do not wholly reject modernist values,
but rather revitalize political life in late capitalist societies by selectively radicalizing these issues. New social movements are understood as a space for the cultivation of grassroots democracy, and experiential learning. The principles of decentralization and non-hierarchical organizing, moreover, become the practices of community and political life. Democracy for Welton, therefore, exists within capitalist societies through strong civil society. Adult learning is about the transformation of democratic values through participation and experience (1993, p.163). To put this differently, adults informally learn the practices of democracy through community participation and grassroots experiences. In a similar analysis of Toronto’s food justice movement, Charles Levoke (2005) argued that civic virtues and democratic values are incidentally learned through participation in food justice groups (p.93). Levoke, however, took an uncritical view of this learning and in doing so does not consider the ways in which social hierarchies are always embedded in social interactions. Akin to Welton, moreover, Levoke suggested that non-hierarchical structures create a space for adults to learn about democratic practices (2005, p.93). Hence, for both authors the purpose of adult learning is a healthy liberal democracy and a respect for a plurality of social values. A respect for plurality, moreover, was privileged over an interrogation of marginalization and exclusion within spaces for critical learning.

In a more specific consideration of movement structures Jeff Shantz has argued that the decentralization of coalition style organizing is one of the key strengths of new social movements. That is to say, that he conceptualized the flexible, or leaderless, structure of new social movements as an expression of radical democratic practices, which would aid the progressive/critical transformation of society. Shantz’s survey of political organizing in Toronto argued for the development and expansion of left libertarian and anarchist tendencies within political movements. He stated:
Anarchist organizing draws upon and expands tendencies towards mutual aid and solidarity that are present in everyday life, informal workplace and community networks and relations, in order to develop a real world alternative both to capitalist and statist institutions and social relations as well as to authoritarian forms of organization based on the exceptionalism of political vanguards. (Sharntz, 2010, p.2)

What is important to note from this analysis is that everyday life and flexible community networks were uncritically posited as critical democratic spaces. Shantz, therefore, did not consider the ways in which social hierarchies are in fact embedded in these social spaces, and thus was able to assume a relationship between critical consciousness and leaderless structures.

Although Matthias Finger argued in favour of post-modernism rather than radical pluralism, I have included his analysis at this point in the discussion because his work highlights an interesting tension for the relationship between movement structure and learning. Starting from the premise that there is a crisis of modernity Finger (1989) argued that new social movements are fundamentally different from old movements in both their objectives and processes. For Finger the struggle for political emancipation was conceptualized as no longer relevant to industrialized society. Conversely, new social movements are oriented toward the fulfilment of individual, personal and spiritual transformations. Finger argued, moreover, that learning within movements is no longer directed toward social change, but rather is interested in personal fulfillment and cultural life (p.15-18). What is clear from his argument is that adult education is a process of individual development and transformation that only engages with social relations in so far as they may be an impediment to the individuals’ personal rights of expression. For Finger the atomized individual is the primary learning subject. As such, personal fulfilment or self-actualization
could be said to occur through a spiritual or affective learning process that does not need to engage with the social relations of production and reproduction. This framework, therefore, rooted learning in a fractured conceptualization of society and displaced objective context.

Consistent with an individualist ontology the structure of the community setting is of lesser importance. Finger argued that because education in new social movements is a means to achieving individual personal goals, rather than political change, structured and hierarchical organization are not necessary (1989, p.16-17). Although I disagree with Finger’s analysis of modernity and social transformation, viewing his analysis in contrast to the above authors helps to make visible the fracturing of the social context that occurs when learning spaces are disarticulated from the broader social relations. By uncritically positioning decentralized, grassroots democracy as a learning context that necessarily leads to a progressive transformation of both the self and society, the above radical pluralist authors are less able to identify the relationship between the atomization of learning and the fracturing of social context. Hence, at an ontological level of analysis there is a fundamental disjuncture between the potential of learning to practice democracy as a social good and the disarticulation of progressive movements from the broader social historical context. In short, the above proponents of radical pluralism do not problematize the relationship between movement structure and the limits of informal and incidental learning, and thus assume that learning in social justice movements will in general strengthen the progressive elements within civil society.

The Influence of Identity in The Decentring of Consciousness

The work of Alberto Melucci has become quite important to both the theorizing of new social movements and the radical pluralist position within adult education. His critique of
Marxist movement theorizing typifies the displacement of consciousness as a point of inquiry. For Melucci, resistance in post-industrial society no longer has an economic basis. The circulation of material goods is now mediated by exchanges of information and cultural symbols that manipulate the individual. Resisting these diffuse forms of power has moved social conflict toward building new forms of personal and collective identity (1985, p.195-196). Melucci (1992), thus, argued that analysis of social movements must engage with the ways in which members negotiate their differences to produce sets of share ideas and goals (p.47-49). He continued on to state:

The analysis should focus on the process through which the actors produce an interactive and shared definition of the goals of their action and the field in which it is to take place. To speak of goals means putting the accent on ends and on meaning, while the notion of a field refers to the possibilities and limits in which the goals are pursued. The definition which the actors produce is not a representation, or the reflection of structural determinism. It is an active relational process. I call it ‘collective identity’…Collective identity is a definition constructed and negotiated through activation of social relationships connecting the members of a group or movement. This implies the presence of cognitive frames, of dense interactions, of emotional and affective exchanges. (Melucci, 1992, p.49)

This analysis marginalized structural context by positioning the processes of collective identity formation within a “field” of action that is produced through the collective formation of goals. As such, “collective identity” privileged the localized negotiations of movement members. As Deborah Kilgore (1999) argued, Melucci conceived of collective identity as a fluid social construction that was produced through the continual processes of negotiation within a given community (p.198). In other words, collective identity was produced through discursive exchanges, and as such identity was understood as engendered through ideation. The ontology that underpinned Melucci’s analysis, therefore, severed movement members
from social historical context, and in doing so removed consciousness from the discussion. This focus on identity, rather than consciousness, rendered the dialectic between subjective agents and objective context less visible, and identity negotiation and formation was positioned as the object of the learning experience.

Drawing upon Melucci’s analysis Kilgore employed the concept of collective identity to build a theory of collective learning. Akin to many of the above authors, Kilgore understood the purpose of new social movements to be the transformation of cultural symbols and the contestation of meaning making processes. Collective identity was employed as a conceptual tool that allowed for the exploration of the ways in which heterogeneous persons and groups build alliances and challenge “quality of life” issues. The collective identity of the group is said to be in constant flux because of the various standpoints of movement members (Kilgore, 1999). Returning to a materialist conceptualization of consciousness, she then attempted to blend collective identity with critical consciousness. Consciousness was understood by Kilgore as an awareness of one’s actions, which in the context of social movements are directly connected to the formation of collective identity. Working within this framework collective learning is predominantly concerned with the dynamics of group identity formation (Kilgore, 1999, p.197). Bringing together the various threads of Kilgore’s argument suggests firstly, that critical consciousness is concerned with cultural and symbolic issues, thereby de-emphasizing the concerns of political economy and class analysis; secondly, the actions that result from learning are oriented toward the re-appropriation of symbolic exchanges, which positions ideations as the object of collective learning; and lastly, that the context for the growth of critical consciousness is the localized group.

Gorman’s participatory research with disability activists argued against the displacement of class in explorations of consciousness, and thus provided an insightful
response to Kilgore’s analysis. As Gorman (2005) argued, consciousness without a class analysis is simply subjectivity, and as such only certain social relations are visible (p.168). Furthermore, moving from a particular grouping of subjectivities into a critical consciousness of social relations in their general form is not possible with such a framework. A multiplicity of subject positions is the ultimate result of such an analysis. As Gorman (2005), therefore, argued, “In moving to one specific context to the next, we are left with the illusion that these subjective possibilities can be multiplied indefinitely” (p.168). Hence, by not engaging with a class analysis, and de-emphasizing the connections between local and extra-local subject experiences, Kilgore’s analysis moves away from consciousness toward subjectivity.

**Leaders and Class Consciousness**

Everyman and Jamison also utilized Melucci’s work in an attempt to understand social movements as a space for the development of new critical knowledge. By privileging “texts” created and circulated by social movements, Eyerman and Jamison (1991) emphasized the symbolic exchanges within social movements, and the diffusion of new ideas into society. Knowledge is, in other words, the product of discursive negotiations between movement actors produced as they act in resistance to a particular opponent. Influenced by a constructivist epistemology and diffuse models of the knowledge-power nexus (drawn from Foucault), the authors argued that social movements create a cognitive space for the creation of new ideas. This space has an impermanent quality and creates its meaning through the movements continuously evolving collective identity (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991). Consciousness is a product of this space, or as the authors have argued, “The content of this consciousness, what we call the cognitive praxis of a movement, is thus socially conditioned: it depends upon the conceptualization of a problem which is bound by the concerns of
historically situated actors and on the reactions of their opponents” (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991, p. 4). This perspective binds consciousness to a movement’s identity. Similarly, Holst has argued that although the authors draw a connection between thought (cognitive) and action (praxis), they underdeveloped this dialectic and consequently ideation, rather than sensuous practices and thoughtful reflection, became the focal point of analysis (2002, p.83). In other words, by centering the discussion on the processes that engender knowledge and ideology, Eyerman and Jamison move away from social movements as a social historical force that are oriented toward altering material relations, and in doing so also sever consciousness from its active element.

Returning to the adult education literature, John Holford saw Eyerman and Jamison’s analysis of social movements as a useful foundation from which to build a theory of movement intellectuals. Although Holford acknowledged that movement actors produce both ideology and critical knowledge, he presented the argument that movements need to be understood as important sites for understanding the interaction between society, knowledge and learning. Here Holford utilized the cognitive praxis approach to argue that the knowledge within a particular society is, in part, a product of the movements that have developed within it. Movement intellectuals (or leaders), therefore, also play an important role for informal adult education and incidental learning both within a movement and society more broadly (Holford, 1995). At this point it is important to note that, although Holford acknowledged that the production of knowledge must be treated critically, he did not problematize the extent to which a movement’s leaders have an interest (consciously or unconsciously) in the reproduction of social oppressions, and thus he assumed that any consequent adult learning would in general be progressive.
In an attempt to re-introduce class analysis to the study of new social movements and adult education, Holford stressed the incorporation of organic intellectuals (drawn from Gramsci) in the notion of cognitive praxis. This conceptual move, however, is highly problematic because of the disarticulation of the thought-action dialectic, as noted above. If movement intellectuals negotiate the discursive articulation of class identity, then class cannot be an objective material social relation (Foley, 1999; Holford, 1995; Holst, 2002). Hence, the epistemology and ontology that undergirds Holford’s argument removes the material base of class, thereby positioning it as a construct and not a relation. Furthermore, if class is removed from the material base, then critical consciousness and resistance are premised on discursive negotiations of identity, and the importance of the thought-action dialectic is again obscured.

**General Limitations of The Radical Pluralist Perspective**

Pierre Walter’s case study of activist monks in Thailand incorporated almost all of the above theoretical threads (strong emphasis on civil society, collective learning and cognitive praxis) and in doing so clearly demonstrated the way in which the radical pluralist perspective has privileged cultural transformation as the predominant concern for adult education. Walter (2007), arguing in favour of the radical pluralist perspective, thus, stated, “post-Marxist theories of New Social Movements (NSM) see the informal and nonformal adult learning which takes place in NSM as a means of democratising civil society” (p.330). Whilst noting that women, the poor and people of colour were disproportionately impacted by the environmental costs of globalization, which was understood here as propelled by both the state and transnational corporations, Walter argued that greater democratization of social and political power would ameliorate these social “inequalities” (2007, p. 331-332). Following
this analysis, social injustice result from the invasion of governments and corporations into
the lifeworld, and democratic civil society actors are the driving force of social justice. The
artificial separation between these three spheres, which results in the normalization of liberal
capitalist democracy, is clearly observable in his analysis (Allman, 2001, p.142; Walter, 2007,
p. 330-332). Beyond this initial problem, his conceptualization of gender, class and race as
social inequalities, rather than relations, again separated these phenomena from their
historical development and material base. This framework for analysis, allowed Walter to
make the argument that the democratization of social and political power, or to put this
differently, greater equality of opportunity, would ameliorate the plight of poor, racialized
women. This point leads into a more general problem for the radical pluralist perspective.

The above authors theorize social movements in a way that centered analysis on
discursive exchanges, thereby shifting focus away from the material social relations of
exploitation and oppression. If gender, class and race are simply expressions of social
inequalities, rather than dialectically related to capital, then progressive transformations in
the cultural realm will end these oppressions. Following this framework, the role of adult
education is to aid the development of a consciousness that is critical of social injustices in
their localized expressions, while also being accepting of the structures of liberal capitalist
democracy (Allman & Wallis 1995; Ebert & Zavarzadeh, 2008). The shift away from
revolutionary struggle and working class consciousness, which epitomized the theorization of
new social movements, therefore, centered discussion on inequalities in a way that de-
emphasized the historical and material relations that constitute patriarchy and race. The move
toward subjectivity, moreover, works to disarticulate social expressions of exploitation and
oppression from one another in such a way that the historical processes of racialization and
patriarchal control become less visible.
Through my review of the radical pluralist literature I have attempted to make clear the manner in which the capital-labour dialectic has been obscured, which then decenters consciousness. Positioning the social relations of race and gender as inequalities the historical processes that produced these social relations are occluded, and forms of oppression and exploitation are disarticulated from one another. As I noted, the argument that class is no longer relevant to new social movements also obscures the materiality of patriarchy and race. Additionally, the shift toward subjectivities localizes consciousness in a manner that makes a critical/revolutionary consciousness of patriarchal imperialism impossible to grapple with. This type of analysis also obscures the ways in which relations of imperialism operate within Western nations. Hence, by de-emphasizing class and elevating the importance of cultural exchanges the analysis of new social movements has an ideological function. That is say, that it inverts consciousness of exploitation by normalizing economic inequalities and liberal capitalist democracy. The extolling of center-less resistance, which is central to the pluralist perspective, must therefore be understood as an ideological practice. This is particularly problematic because the intellectual milieu enters into the consciousness of activists. In this sense, ideological theorizations of movements also disrupt and distort the information produced by movements.

Before I turn more specifically to the standpoint of resistance it is worth clarifying a few points. Firstly, I am not suggesting that there is a causal relation between the theorization of new social movements and the practice of activism. Such an analysis would suggest that theories of new social movements are unequivocally accurate representations of social struggle, and would deny human agency. Rather, I am suggesting that the intellectual and academic theorizations that shape a particular social moment also enter into and influence the character of social resistance. In short, the sphere of political organizing cannot be considered
in isolation from the production of ideas within the academy. Thus, it is very important to critically consider the manner in which activist praxis is influenced by our recent intellectual history of post-modernism and radical pluralism. Secondly, I am not simply labeling activist media as ideological. Rather, it is my position that social movement based media can be influenced by the ideology of ruling regimes but is not ideological per se, because it written from a standpoint that is grounded by experiences that exist outside of ruling regimes and attempts to expose and resist the normalization of social domination. The inverse of this point, therefore, also holds true. That is to say, that unlike Holford I do not consider the current activist media to be critical knowledge, but rather a form of heterodox information. Lastly, my critique of the NOII media is not intended to dispute the importance of exposing state violence. Rather, I aim to pull into question the ways in which the relationship between state policies and the social relations of patriarchal capital were presented.

**Resisting The State as a Culture of Oppression**

In the year and a half period that I collected newsletters distributed by NOII there was no shortage of public campaigns to expose the impact of government policies on poor and racialized communities. Looking at this information as a whole I began to notice that injustice and social struggle were often framed by the theme of state violence. The following five excerpts from NOII newsletters publicized different issues, but did so in a manner that centered analysis on the state.\(^6\) Additionally, the fifth excerpt also draws our attention to the convergence of state violence and violence against women. It is worth noting that these newsletters were not atypical and as such they illustrate the political perspective espoused by NOII.

\(^6\) As was noted in the Introduction, I have included in Appendix 2 the newsletters in their full versions.
Excerpt 1

Rally Against Police Brutality – Tuesday March 15th

Our communities are under attack because the police exist to maintain a social order in this country that protects the government, the banks, and the rich while criminalizing the rest. Despite the trillions of dollars stolen, embezzled and extorted by banks and finance companies that led to this recession, the police are not in the habit of kicking down doors on Bay St. But they are kicking down doors, ticketing, arresting, beating and killing people in poor communities.

(NOII, 2011, May 11)

Excerpt 2

The Coming Cuts & How To Stop Them: Migrants, Unions & the Fight for Public Services

An escalating assault is being mounted against migrant workers in this country. Good decent jobs are on the chopping block and the public service we rely on to survive are being gutted. Early this year Harper slashed $53 million in settlement services. He intends to spend $39 billion dollars on plans and $10 billion dollars on jailing our communities. At the same time the $11 billion hole in the Federal budget will require cuts healthcare, postal service and other workers to fill. The Ontario budget cut nearly 1,500 public service jobs and axed the Special Diet while giving a $2.4 billion dollar tax benefit to corporations. Robbing us of our wages, benefits and public services to pay for more corporate tax breaks, jails, cops and wars is what they call “Austerity”. (NOII, 2011, May 11)

Excerpt 3

Undocumented in Toronto: Building homes we can’t live in: STOP THE CUTS

ACTIONS

On November 28th, Ford and his supporters on council plan to bring forward a budget that will see devastating cuts to services like libraries, childcare, shelters, programs at community centres, and more. On November 29th, City Council will also be voting on the proposal to sell-
off over 1000 units of social housing. This is completely unacceptable. Instead of cutting housing and public services, we need to be expanding them, ensuring that all residents, particularly those without immigration status have access to all services. (NOII, 2011, November 24)

**Excerpt 4**

**No More Deaths: Justice & Status for Migrant Workers!**

These deaths represent only the surface of a phenomenon that is much deeper, one that is, tragically, unexceptional. Persistent abuse and dangerous, grating working conditions lead many migrant workers to face injury. Such injured workers are regularly deported without compensation or medical support and, in some cases, are deported to their deaths. Other migrant workers and undocumented people are sexually, emotionally, and psychologically traumatized by abusive employers and an immigration system that works to ensure they are denied their basic rights. (NOII, 2012, February 13)

**Excerpt 5**

**NO ONE IS ILLEGAL: WHY WE ARE MARCHING**

We know that the systematic abuse, exploitation and devaluation of women and their labour, particularly that of migrant women and trans-people, is not a new reality nor is it a reality of the past. This remains the experience of migrant women in Canada today. Migrant women do the work that keeps this Canadian economy afloat, that ensures the health and safety of those who people love and care for. Yet their labour is labeled ‘unskilled’ by the racist and sexist standards of this country’s immigration system. Migrant women and trans-folk continue to suffer under dangerous work conditions, to be denied access to basic social services like healthcare, education, shelter and food.

Today, as we see massive cuts to shelter, tenant, transit, community, and immigrant services in this city and across the country, as we see that the budgets of those who regularly harass
and brutalize our communities – city police and federal immigration enforcement – remain grossly inflated, we must all clearly recognize the fact that in this so-called ‘age of austerity’ women and trans-folk, particularly those with precarious immigration status, are targeted even more closely for exclusion, abuse and exploitation by state forces.

A glaring example of this arose a few weeks ago when we found that the Canadian Border Services Agency had declared its intention to wait outside and entre anti-violence against women spaces in order to detain and deport women survivors of violence. This national directive was a direct affront to the victory won by grassroots organizers in October of last year, a victory that had forced immigration enforcement out of anti-VAW spaces.

Whether it be through cuts to or the denial of vital social services, sustained campaigns of intimidation and fear carried out by city and border police, or the systematic claw-back of hard-won grassroots victories, all levels of government have made clear their intention to continue to intensify those austerity policies and immigration control practices that target and hurt women and trans-people. (NOII, 2011, March 10)

Each of these passages highlights the way in which NOII framed and articulated the relationship between the Canadian government and marginalized people, which could best be described as adversarial. The oppression of migrant workers, non-status women and the working class is rooted in state policies and practices, thereby highlighting a culture of oppression and de-emphasizing patriarchal capitalism as the bedrock of this very system. This point, while it is notable in all of the excerpts, is most clearly observable in Excerpt 4. NOII highlighted that migrant workers endure dangerous working conditions, and often experience physical and psychological violence, which is inextricably bound up with their value as a highly exploitable workforce for local capital. Such conditions, moreover, are only
possible because of a culture of oppression engendered by state practices and labour policies. To be clear, I am not denying the violence of the state here. Rather, I am suggesting that the culture of oppression is necessary because capitalism itself is a violent process. Hence, state violence is a consequence of capitalist imperialism and not the root cause of violent repression.

Similarly, by linking budget cuts and austerity measures to white-collar crime (Excerpt 1) the state is positioned as the perpetrator of violence against the poor as well as the guardian of capital. Following this framework resistance is a relationship between an aggressive violent state and the oppressed (Excerpt 2 and Excerpt 1), which in effect posits the capital-labour contradiction as a secondary or auxiliary struggle. Much like the above theoretical literature, the localized expression of oppression becomes the primary area of concern. Although class remained materially constituted, the articulation of class struggle positioned it as intersecting with state violence, and as such oppression is disarticulated from exploitation. In other words, class exploitation and state instigated oppression was expressed as originating from different social processes, which fragments the social and – inhibits revolutionary consciousness.

By focusing analysis on the state praxis is organized in terms of either altering state policies or locally disobeying the state. This point gives rise to the problematic of center-less resistance. For example, Excerpt 2 and Excerpt 3 (which was done in coalition with Stop The Cuts) both look to the state for greater social protections, while most of the other excerpts highlighted the state as the perpetrator of racist violence. I do not intend to overemphasize the logical contradiction here. Rather, I want to suggest that without a clear understanding of why the state operates in contradictory ways, we actually work against critical praxis. Here again there is an interesting point of convergence between the radical pluralist valorization of
center-less grassroots democracy and the practices of resistance. As my analysis highlighted, the radical pluralist perspective suggests that as long as people are participating in democratic grassroots organizations, then society will benefit in socially progressive ways. Working within this framework both disobeying the state (through the sanctuary city model of resistance) and pushing the state for greater involvement in society will ameliorate injustice, and produce progressive transformations within individuals. In contrast, it is my position that if we do not understand the complexity of the state and its contradictory practices we limit our ability to struggle against its ideological function. From a theoretical perspective this point can be expressed as an important educative move from the particular to the general, which is not possible without drawing connections to the historical role of the state in the evolution of capital.

In each of the above examples there are clear points of convergence between the radical pluralist perspective and the privileging of oppression. The effect has been to emphasize the local expressions of oppression that are engendered through practices of state violence. I am not suggesting that NOII never draws connections between globalized capitalism and oppression. Rather, I am suggesting that the emphasis is on a culture of oppression, which then parallels the diffusion of power relations that is typical of pluralist frameworks. When we consider this analysis in relation to critical consciousness, we can observe that this creates limitations for informal learning. In concrete terms, the learning associated with the dissemination of activist media will be less able to move beyond a localized descriptive account.

Turning our attention to Excerpt 5 again highlights the complexity and contradictory nature of state practices. By juxtaposing the dependence of the Canadian economy on the labour of migrant women with targeted violence against women survivors (and in particular
those that are racialized) this excerpt draws our attention to the convergence of state power and patriarchy. The question that needs to be posed, however, is why does the state have an interest in maintaining and reproducing patriarchy? Although it is certainly true that the labour of migrant women is de-skilled and thus de-valued, the causes for this phenomenon are not exclusively a culture of state violence or archaic immigration and labour policies. If capital and patriarchy are a unity, as my analysis has argued, then the labour of reproduction is the material basis of capitalist exploitation. Indeed, surplus value cannot be created without the super-exploitation of women’s reproductive labour universally and the de-valuing of racialized women’s paid labour in particular. In this sense, violence against women, where it is organized by social and institutional structures, is necessarily a by-product of the relations of capital. The state, therefore, not only reproduces this violence but also regulates it, and as such it will be differentially experienced by racialized and white women. The root cause, however, remains the same.

It is important to emphasize that the causes of structural violence, despite being expressed in different forms, are rooted in the same set of historical relations. Disarticulating these relations from one another separates the oppression of women from the exploitation of their labour. My analysis here is intended to raise an important problematic. It is clear that there are very real limits to incidental learning, which inhibit a comprehensive understanding of localized expressions of women’s oppression and the general history of patriarchal capital. Continuing the struggle against patriarchy requires that we are exposed to and gain insight from the particularities of women’s oppression. It is in this respect that the activist media can play an important role in the process of raising a feminist consciousness within the public more generally. However, for these particular expressions to have real meaning for feminist consciousness they must be returned to the social whole. In other words, it is not sufficient to
know that the state directs violence towards racialized women, we also need to understand how this violence became embedded in the liberal capitalist democratic system.

**Conclusion**

There are clear points of convergence between the valorization of incidental learning and the prevalence of pluralist perspectives. As I have argued less cautious explorations of social movement learning have incorrectly posited causal links between new social movements and progressive social transformations. By juxtaposing the adult education literature with the NOII media I have illustrated commonalities between the academic and popular production of information. We can, therefore, observe the impact of pluralist models of power and resistance on activist praxis. Here again I have suggested that critical consciousness and revolutionary praxis have been constrained by our current milieu. Taking a step back, we must then ask how could the activist media be better used as a tool for rupturing consciousness and aiding the growth of critical consciousness more broadly? Bringing together this question with my critique of the localization of consciousness, I would suggest that this historical moment requires a stronger focus on the reflective (intellectual) component of the thought-action dialectic because one of the by-products of center-less resistance has been to de-emphasize social and historical context. As such, the fostering of informal education (rather than incidental learning) is one way to destabilize the radical pluralist perspective at a theoretical level and enrich activist praxis at a practical level.
Chapter V: Re-centering Consciousness for Anti-imperialist Praxis

Conclusion

This racist, chauvinistic, and manipulative use of black workers and women, especially black women, has been a sever cancer of the American labour scene. It therefore becomes essential for those who understand the workings of capitalism and imperialism to realize that the exploitation of black people and women works to everyone’s disadvantage and that the liberation of these two groups is a stepping-stone to the liberation of all oppressed people in this country and around the world. (Beale, 1970, p.150)

The discussion thus far has focused on a critical investigation of the impact of ideology and the decentering of consciousness. My analysis of no borders activism has delineated three interlocking points that fit together to build a larger critique of incidental and informal learning as well as the current expression of informal learning in social movements. First the intensification of neoliberalism has confined the work of resistance within the bounds of liberal democracy. A second, and closely related, consequence of the escalation of restrictive border and immigration policies has been the privileging of community level and local focus resistance, which can also be understood as the localization of praxis. Last we can observe a clear parallel between academic frameworks that privilege center-less resistance, and the attention of activists to the culture of oppression. That said, when we reflect upon the work of migrant justice activism as a whole it is equally important to notice a stated and well-documented popular interest in struggling against racism and sexism. There is, moreover, an avid interest in understanding the relations between national borders and injustice. This point would suggest that peoples lived practices and experiences make them cognizant of the continued salience of the state. However, as my analysis has demonstrated, incidental
learning becomes reproductive praxis. Bringing together these threads gives rise to the question of how to learn from existing and past struggles for the task of re-centering revolutionary consciousness.

Of central concern is grappling with the problematic of anti-imperialist informal education that centers racism and sexism without positing them as simply ideological by-products of the mode of production, which will then automatically disappear with the overturning of class exploitation. Although this problem is particularly conspicuous in non-feminist Marxist education, the substitution of subjectivity for consciousness ultimately falls into a similar trap. It is with this problematic at the fore of my mind that I suggest that a project of re-centering critical consciousness for anti-imperialist praxis should begin with a critical revaluation of the international and patriarchal division of labour, which has been institutionalized and reproduced by states and the nation-state system. Expanding out from a discussion of the transitions within capitalism, I suggest a number of areas for further investigation, which would aid the larger project of struggling for critical praxis.

The Limits of Re-imagined Subjectivity as a Practice of Resistance

Nandita Sharma is perhaps one of Canada’s best-known scholars when it comes to a critique of borders and migrant justice. As such, her work has been very influential for how we understand the impact of Canadian borders as well as how activists have practiced forms of resistance. At the crux of her critique are the tensions between national identity and the “unfreedom” of non-citizens. She contends that the binary construction of the white Canadian “free” worker and the “unfree” migrant other are subjectively internalized, and reproduced by both immigration policies, and the practices of individuals (Sharma, 2006). Sharma (2003), thus, proposed a politics of resistance that would “de-nationalize our imaginations and our
geographies” (p.39). Indeed, this very sentiment has underpinned much of the work conducted by NOII (Fortier, 2010). This point can be observed through the sanctuary city model of civil disobedience, which encourages people to challenge the ways in which they have internalized ideas of national borders and nationalism. Following this argument, by critically interrogating the ideological function of borders people are empowered to resist immigration laws where they are harmful to non-status and migrant people. In this sense, a politics of protection can also challenge dominant subjectivity. Additionally, it is worth pointing to the similarity here between the concept of “collective identity” and Sharma’s “de-nationalized” subjectivity. In both cases there is a renegotiation within a given community of what will constitute dominant forms of subjectivity. If we locate racial oppression as primarily an ideological construct, then the transformation in subjectivity that occurs incidentally through community based resistance, is sufficient for critical social transformation. Moving from subjectivity to revolutionary praxis, however, requires an anti-racist feminist framework that centers both the ideology of racist patriarchal culture and colonialism as a pre-condition for the current form of patriarchal imperialist capital. In contrast to Sharma, I have suggested that we must utilize activist critiques of cultural oppression, as a platform from which to trouble the relationship between locally based state instigated oppression and the class relation on a global scale.

Sharma’s (2006) analysis rightfully critiqued Marxist scholars for their inadequate attention to the relations of what she terms “unfreedom” within capitalist societies. “Unfreedom”, in her analysis, refers to both the legal condition for high rates of exploitation experienced by migrant workers and the imposed racialized identity that migrants embody. As she asserted such relations should not be understood as relics of pre-capitalist societies, but rather consistently make up a significant part of the capitalist mode of production. In fact,
I agree with Sharma’s point that inadequate attention to relations of this nature has led to an incomplete analysis of race and racism. By framing her analysis with the concept of “unfreedom”, however, Sharma tends to privilege the ideological practices of governing as the source of oppression and exploitation within Canada.

There are interesting points of both convergence and contrast between Sharma’s analysis of “unfreedom” and Ellen Meiksins Wood’s theory of imperialism, which will help to illustrate the problem at hand. Meiksins Wood (2003) demonstrated that capitalist imperialism is unique in its ability to create a separation between the economic power of capital and the extra-economic force of political and military institutions (among others) (p. 5). This point can be observed in two respects. Firstly at the level of international political organizations, we can observe that capital is independent from national governments, but is concurrently dependent upon governments to set the conditions for the exploitation of labour. This point can also be understood as a separation between the economic and political moments of capital, which allows capital to move beyond its national base, but also requires local states to serve the political needs of foreign capital. As Meiksins Wood (2003), therefore, notes:

One the one hand, the expansion of capital is possible precisely because it can detach itself from extra-economic power in a way that no other social form can; and, on the other hand, the same detachment makes it both possible and necessary for capital’s economic hegemony to be supported by territorial states. (p. 25)

Secondly, if we turn our focus to citizens within states we can also notice that the social relations of capital, unlike other forms of social organization (such as slavery or feudalism), created a division between the moment of exploitation and the granting of political rights. Hence, exploitation and freedom can and, in fact, do co-exist. There is, therefore, no need for
direct territorial control of areas because the international system of liberal capitalist
democracy ensures the legal protection of property rights globally, while concurrently
masking the processes of imperialist domination (Meiksins Wood, 2006; 2003). This analysis
is important because it emphasized the spatial and temporal separation of the labour-capital
dialectic, which is possible only because the state and the international system of sovereign
states acts as a mediating force by organizing labour within and across national borders. It is
on that note that we can observe a similarity to Sharma’s analysis, which is to say, that the
legal and political restrictions imposed on non-citizens makes up an important part of the
organization of labour within and across nation-states, and as such creates the conditions
necessary for the high rates of exploitation experienced by migrant and non-status workers,
which is required by local capital in a system of global capitalism. In subtle contrast to
Sharma, Meiksins Wood’s theoretical framework allows us to recognize more clearly the
contradictory position of migrant and non-status workers. It is not that they do not have
political rights (which would constitute “unfreedom”) it is that the separation between the
moment of political rights and concessions and the moment of economic exploitation is
particularly pronounced.

The spatial and temporal separation between political rights and economic
exploitation does not negate the fact that ideological systems of oppression are necessary to
justify this exploitation. Unlike Meiksins Wood, however, Sharma stressed the importance of
ideology as a way to draw focus to the social necessity of racism. In fact, Meiksins Wood
(2002) has argued that racism and sexism are purely ideological systems and thus are
externally related to capital. It is on this point that there is a truly interesting point of contrast
and convergence between the two authors. By drawing upon a diffuse model of disciplinary
power to stress the significance of racist and nationalist ideology Sharma elevates the
discursive and ideological components of racism, which has the effect of decentering the internal contradictions of race and the history of colonial capital. Consequently, Sharma and Meiksins Wood end up in the same position, which is to say, that they posit race as principally separate from the relations of capital. We are, therefore, left with the same problem from each perspective – race is primarily confined within the domain of cultural oppression. In contrast, the following discussion argues that returning focus to the international division of labour is a way to move away from both the atomization of social transformation that occurs when societal change builds from a framework rooted in a collective transformation of subjectivity, and the de-emphasizing of racism and sexism that has been endemic to dominant forms of Marxism. Furthermore, exploring the historical evolution of the international division of labour, which could also be described as the transition from colonial to imperial capital, speaks to the question of why the state functions in contradictory ways.

**Returning Focus to The Social Whole**

Lenin’s classical theory of imperialism foreshadowed the growth of the current global financial system. However, he did not theorize from it and thus the current tensions between the political control of territories and the transnational flows of capital were not within his purview. The purpose of bringing Lenin’s work into this discussion is that his analysis problematized the development of the capitalist class on a global scale while concurrently emphasizing the importance of nation-states, and thus his analysis is an important reminder that colonial policy was a pre-condition for monopoly capital on a world scale. Through an empirical investigation of the banking system in many of the West’s economic powers, Lenin delineated the transition from capitalist free competition to monopoly capital. His analysis
detailed the historical processes that formed the foundation for the concentration of capital in only a few large banking trusts or financial monopolies. Although commodity production and industrial capital remained important, the circulation of capital through stock exchange allowed for the development of syndicates and the further concentration of capital. Periods of loss for industry, moreover, could be capitalized on by financial monopolies, thereby furthering the convergence of finance and industry (Lenin, 1939, p.208-211). Important for our purpose here is that Lenin’s analysis demonstrated the manner in which capital was organized within Western nations to create the conditions for financial monopolies. Secondly, by starting with national banking practices, as the precursor to imperial capital, his analysis focused attention on the particular configuration of the capitalist class nationally and then internationally.

Turning his attention to export capital, Lenin was then able to demonstrate the way in which colonial policy and financial monopoly converged. The export of capital tied national markets together in a manner that furthered the uneven development of industry, and drove the formation of international cartels. The colonial domination of particular territories created conditions apt for the investment of capital at higher rates of return, which of course drove the processes of colonial annexation and the scramble to control foreign resources and labour (Lenin, 1939, p.216-228). As Lenin noted, the struggle to control foreign resources at the level of national finance and international politics concomitantly drew small and medium capitalists (through the network of monopoly capital) into the relations of imperialist capital (1939, p.254). Financial monopolies, thus, helped to propel the world into capitalist social relations, but were also dependent upon colonial policies implemented by capitalist states. Once the world had been divided among colonial powers the struggle to re-partition the globe emerged (Lenin, 1939, p.266). In this sense, international monopolies as a class of capitalist
can be understood as distinct from political power, but also were dependent upon colonialism for their formation. The partitioning and re-partition of the globe, which can also be expressed as the division of resources and the power to organize labour, highlights the important historical function of borders. Thus, through Lenin’s analysis we can observe the evolution of the international configuration of the labour-capital contradiction, which of course is the class relation on a global scale. Grounding the discussion in this analysis, moreover, focuses attention on the evolution of the class relation as intermingled with colonial relations. In other words, racism and class exploitation are not separate parallel systems, but rather are grounded in the same historical relations.

Bringing this type of analysis into our current period Foster, McChensney and Jonna (2011) have demonstrated that monopoly capital on a world scale is today organized and perpetuated by transnational corporations, which have their headquarters in a particular Western nation, but are reliant upon global strategic alliances. The authors argued that price competition is viewed by big business as too dangerous and instead the focus is on the search for low cost production, which has meant that competition exists between workers rather than firms (Foster et al. 2011, p.2, 12). In other words, the practices of strategic alliance, subcontracting and outsourcing have created a set of conditions that support and promote global monopolies, while also strengthening nationalistic ideologies that divide working people. Bringing the threads of their analysis together they argued:

Today we often hear – in the ideology of national competition so often used to channel class dissatisfaction – that the U.S. workers are facing increased competition for jobs with Mexican workers, Chinese workers, Indian workers, etc. In our view, this is not a reflection of increased competition – certainly not in the sense that this term is used in economics – but of the growth of monopolistic multinational corporations, which, through their much larger
numbers of foreign affiliates, their still larger numbers of subcontractors, and their corrupt
domination of national governments and policymaking, are able to employ a strategy of divide
and rule with respect to the workers of the world. (Foster et al., 2011, p.13)

This analysis is helpful because it allows us to problematize the expansion of capital
throughout the world without denying (or erasing) the continued significance of national
borders. Competition between workers is both reproduced and normalized by practices of
governing and ideologies of nationalism, while concomitantly being necessary for the
maintaining of monopolies. There is, therefore, an observable relation between the local
repression of workers and global capital.

Similarly, exploring this issue from the perspective of non-status and migrant labour
Pashang (2011) has noted that there is a paradoxical relationship between the deregulation of
international trade (and finance) and the increased regulation of peoples’ movement across
borders. This is, in part, due to the interconnection of the high demand for commodities and
the necessity of a cheap labour supply. A cheap and highly exploitable labour force, however,
has been easily created through restrictive border policies and disciplinary labour practices
(but not so restrictive to prevent the use of non-status labour). In addition to this point, it is
worth noting that small and medium capitalist within Canada often utilize this labour force as
a way to remain somewhat competitive (Binford, 2009; Pashang 2011). There are clear
connections here between the colonial divisions that Lenin delineated and the current
international division of labour. Hence, the international expansion of capital is
concomitantly a restrictive regulation of labour within and across nations, and as such the
relation between monopoly capital on a world scale and the division of labour internationally
is not exclusively ideological.
Returning to the problematic of critical consciousness, it is clear that focusing attention on the local community does not begin to grapple with the complex interrelation of capital’s expansion and the repression of workers locally. Importantly, this point reminds us that we need further analysis of the contradictory relation between monopoly capital and the international division of labour, which has been obscured through the historical practices that constitute citizenship and liberal democracy. Furthermore, colonialism is the pre-condition for this phenomenon and thus we must also unpack the connection between the reproduction of racialization and the current character of global capital. Clearly these processes are made up of both ideological and dialectical relations, which need to be understood if we aim to avoid reproductive praxis. It is on that note that I suggest that we need further research into the manner in which imperialism functions within Western nations as a way to understand the inner relation of race and capital at this moment in time. Not only would this expand our knowledge of capital in the abstract, but also, and perhaps more importantly, it would help us to avoid the trap of conflating transformed subjectivity with critical consciousness. Furthermore, understanding why the nation-state reproduces nationalist ideologies through the interrelation of citizenship and criminality will further our understanding of the difference between oppression and the processes of exploitation that are intrinsic to imperial capital.

**Patriarchy and Race**

Turning more specifically to the mutual dependence of patriarchal capital and race brings to the fore another area in need of further research and critical exploration. Both Mies and Reddock have demonstrated that colonialism was not only the dispossession of resources, but has also included the coerced migration and patriarchal organization of labour. Bound up with the control of resources and the spread of capitalism were the processes of dispossession
and slavery, which are central to class formation, racialization, and the spread of the patriarchal family (James, 2000; Mies, 1986; Reddok, 1990; 1996). The lengthy transition to capitalist social relations on a global scale transformed direct violence into structural violence or, to put this differently, extra-economic coercion replaced the overt domination of people. The nature of colonialism, however, meant that this process did not occur in an even or linear fashion. As such, the replacement of direct domination with extra-economic coercion was dependent upon an unequal granting of political rights and concessions, which then institutionalized the interlocking processes of patriarchy and racialization.

Moving toward the current period of capitalist imperialism we can notice the continued significance of our colonial history. Labour intensive production has been exported to the old colonies (now considered developing nations) where production costs were lower. Such processes required political coordination between states and the implementation of capital friendly policies within states (Mies, 1986, p.113). Further, the granting of political rights to racialized men included the right to patriarchal domination of racialized women. The convergence of the international and patriarchal divisions of labour means that women’s oppression and exploitation globally is rooted in the same practices, but is obscured by the uneven granting of political concessions (Mies 1986, p.121; Jones, 1949, p.115). As Mies (1986) has demonstrated the processes of colonization included the domestication of European women, which then became the model for the sexual division of labour under capitalism globally. Central to this process was the de-humanization (naturalization) of racialized women, which concomitantly supported the normalization of the bourgeois family. Viewed dialectically, the formation of the male working class on a global scale must also be understood as the normalization and institutionalization of the sexual (patriarchal) division of labour within the home. Hence, although the exploitation of white and racialized women has
had different expressions throughout history, they share a common rooting in the processes of colonialism.

What is clear from this historical survey is that capital as a mode of production required the institutionalization of social separations, which is expressed through legal categorization, and functions as structural violence against women and racialized people. At the root of these separations is a patriarchal division of labour at the local level and an international division of labour at the trans-local level. Furthering critical feminist consciousness (and thus class consciousness) requires more research into the uneven and yet highly interdependent relationship of race and patriarchy. A clear example of this in our current society can be observed through the Live-In Caregivers program, which has created the conditions for the exploitation of young foreign-born racialized women by bourgeois Canadian families. It is a well documented fact that migrant women who work in isolated family homes often experience abuse and violence (Pashang, 2011). What is less clear is how these conditions are bound up with imperial capital and the reproduction of capital in general. In specific terms, we need a more detailed explication of how the increasing use of migrant and non-status domestic labour supports and reproduces the exploitation of women in general. This type of analysis would provide a foundation from which we can more clearly grapple with the common grounding of women’s exploitation without de-emphasizing the importance of how race and class are co-constituted. Hence, a return to critical feminist consciousness requires greater attention to the internal, rather than external, relations of race and patriarchy.
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Appendix 1

Temporary Foreign Worker Program
Labour Market Opinion Statistics
(Retrieved from Human Resources and Skills Development Canada)

Number of temporary foreign worker positions on positive labour market opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>62,645</td>
<td>47,145</td>
<td>48,915</td>
<td>47,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada - Total</td>
<td>204,400</td>
<td>131,035</td>
<td>140,505</td>
<td>151,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top three occupational groups according to the number of temporary foreign workers on positions positive labour market opinions

**Ontario 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Workers</td>
<td>13,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nannies and Parents’ Helpers</td>
<td>7,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery and Greenhouse Workers</td>
<td>6,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ontario 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Workers</td>
<td>13,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nannies and Parents’ Helpers</td>
<td>9,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery and Greenhouse Workers</td>
<td>5,645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ontario 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nannies and Parents’ Helpers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery and Greenhouse Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ontario 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nannies and Parents’ Helpers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery and Greenhouse Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of temporary foreign worker positions on positive labour market opinions, by skill type: Ontario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Type</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Finance and Administration</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations in Social Science, Education, Government Service and Religion</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations in Art, Culture, Recreation and Sport</td>
<td>7,455</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>6,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Service Occupations</td>
<td>21,095</td>
<td>12,170</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>9,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades, Transport and Equipment Operators and Related Occupations</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations Unique to Primary Industry</td>
<td>20,435</td>
<td>19,850</td>
<td>19,955</td>
<td>20,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations Unique to Processing Manufacturing and Utilities</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62,645</td>
<td>47,145</td>
<td>48,915</td>
<td>47,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
No One is Illegal Newsletters
(Organized by date)

March 10, 2011

Join the No One Is Illegal/OCAP/Women United Against Imperialism Contingent at the International Women’s Day March
When: Saturday March 12, 12:30 PM
Where: Bedford + Bloor (outside OISE) by the Raise the Rates and Status for All banners.

This IWD, join OCAP, No One is Illegal and Women United Against Imperialism in marching. This past year we have seen the provincial government CUT assistance rates while the federal government INCREASES immigration enforcement and deportation. It is women, and our families that face the brunt of these attacks. These are feminist issues! We demand the right to decent income and a future free of poverty. We demand justice for undocumented women. We demand Status for All! Please join the contingent!

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

NO ONE IS ILLEGAL: WHY WE ARE MARCHING

International Women’s Day has, since the first marches began exactly 100 years ago, been about women fighting as workers, as migrants, as community members and as radical political thinkers for dignity and for justice.

Only a few weeks after the very first International Women’s Day marches were held across Europe in 1911, 147 immigrant workers, almost all women, burned or jumped to their deaths in the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire in New York City because their employers had locked all the stairway and exit doors in the building from the outside. That following year, women marched on International Women’s Day to honour these migrant women, to insist that the tragedy of their deaths be remembered and to demand that all the injustices their story represented be struggled against and shattered.

We know that the systematic abuse, exploitation and devaluation of women and their labour, particularly that of migrant women and trans-people, is not a new reality nor is it a reality of the past. This remains the experience of migrant women in Canada today. Migrant women do the work that keeps this Canadian economy afloat, that ensures the health and safety of those who people love and care for. Yet their labour is labeled ‘unskilled’ by the racist and sexist standards of this country’s immigration system. Migrant women and trans-folk continue to suffer under dangerous work conditions, to be denied access to basic social services like healthcare, education, shelter and food.

Today, as we see massive cuts to shelter, tenant, transit, community, and immigrant services in this city and across the country, as we see that the budgets of those who regularly harass and brutalize our communities - city police and federal immigration enforcement – remain grossly inflated, we must all clearly recognize the fact that in this so-called ‘age of austerity’ women and trans-folk, particularly those with precarious immigration status, are targeted even more closely for exclusion, abuse and exploitation by state forces.

A glaring example of this arose just a few weeks ago when we found that the Canadian Border Services Agency had declared its intention to wait outside and enter anti-violence against women spaces in order to detain and deport women survivors of violence. This national directive was a direct affront to the victory won by grassroots organizers in October of last year, a victory that had forced immigration enforcement out of anti-VAW spaces.
Whether it be through cuts to or the denial of vital social services, sustained campaigns of intimidation and fear carried out by city and border police, or the systematic claw-back of hard-won grassroots victories, all levels of government have made clear their intention to continue to intensify those austerity policies and immigration control practices that target and hurt women and trans-people.

In opposition to these policies and attacks, No One Is Illegal-Toronto invites you to join our joint contingent for this year’s International Women’s Day March. We will stand high and chant loud as we march with you and our OCAP and WUAI comrades to denounce these anti-women austerity measures and immigration controls. We demand that women and trans-people have full access without fear to all essential services regardless of immigration status! We demand that all women and trans-people be free from the violence of deportation! We demand our services, our spaces, our safety and our dignity! We demand status for all! Join us!

March 15, 2011

Rally Against Police Brutality - Tuesday March 15th

Tuesday March 15th — 5PM
51 Division (Front and Parliament St.)

One week last summer the police turned the whole City into a prison. But in poor neighbourhoods, it’s the G20 everyday. Communities are under attack by the Police because they are poor, homeless, racialized, First Nations and immigrants. We are further abused when we fight back. Our communities are under attack because the police exist to maintain a social order in this country that protects the government, the banks, and the rich while criminalizing the rest.

Despite the trillions of dollars stolen, embezzled and extorted by banks and finance companies that led to this recession, the police are not in the habit of kicking down doors on Bay St. But they are kicking down doors, ticketing, arresting, beating and killing people in poor communities.

March 15th is the International Day Against Police Brutality. A day to bring awareness to the violence, torture, intimidation and harassment by our governments’ Police Forces. We, the people, the victims and the survivors will come together to raise our voices to show that we will not stay silent!

The Toronto Star recently revealed that of the 3,400 investigations the Special Investigations Unit has conducted into the Toronto Police in its 20-year history, only 95 have resulted in charges, only 16 of those in convictions, and only 3 of those officers actually went to jail.

Yet we know the police are guilty. Homeless people and people with mental health issues are routinely harassed, beaten and sometimes killed by police in this city. Non-status women seeking a safe haven from abuse are dragged out of shelters by Immigration enforcement officers on tips from two regular sources: the police, and the very abusers these women are attempting to escape. Racialized communities are targeted daily by police.
As part of this internationally observed day, a rally has been organized for Tuesday March 15th. We will be meeting outside of 51 Division at Front & Parliament. OCAP and other community organizations invite everyone to come out and show support for victims of Police violence.

No more Police brutality! No more impunity!

~As organized by OCAP and several community groups, including No One Is Illegal Toronto, Jane-Finch Action Against Poverty, Barrio Nuevo, the Toronto Drug Users Union and the Community Solidarity Network. Call for more info! Ontario Coalition Against Poverty ocap@tao.ca 416-925-6939

May 11, 2011

[NoOnelsIllegal-Tor] The Coming Cuts & How To Stop Them: Migrants, Unions & the Fight for Public Services

The Coming Cuts & How To Stop Them: Migrants, Unions & the Fight for Public Services

http://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/stopthecuts
http://www.facebook.com/StoptheCuts

On September 27th or shortly after, Rob Ford will put in place a plan to cut up to $800 million dollars from public services in Toronto. He will attempt to privatize TTC, public housing and more, shut down shelters, youth centres and arts programs and will begin charging fees for free public services. These changes will impact two communities the most: Migrant, undocumented, racialized and poor communities that use these services and unionized workers that provide them.

Unless we stop him.

We write today to inform our communities of the upcoming fight. Please see full details of the budget changes below. We are calling on unionized workers and community activists to organize fighting neighbourhood committees across the GTA to intervene in the 'public engagement' strategy. We ask that you commit to solidarity, mutual aid and respect in the struggle ahead. We insist that the fight now is not only to stop and reverse cuts to public services but to expand them, making them accountable and accessible to all people, irrespective of immigration status.

An escalating assault is being mounted against migrants and workers in this country. Good decent jobs are on the chopping block and the public services we rely on to survive are being gutted. Early this year Harper slashed $53 million in settlement services. He intends to spend $39 billion dollars on planes and $10 billion dollars on jailing our communities. At the same time the $11 billion hole in the Federal budget will require cuts healthcare, postal service and other workers to fill. The Ontario budget cut nearly 1,500 public service jobs and axed the Special Diet while giving a $2.4 billion dollar tax benefit to corporations. Robbing us of our wages, benefits and public services to pay for more corporate tax breaks, jails, cops and wars is what they call "Austerity".

The worst impacts of coming cuts will be felt by those of us already shut out of public services, those without full immigration status, immigrants, people of color, those of us who experience the violence of police and border guards every day. For those of us without papers, with empty stomachs, working for slave wages, with peanuts in our pockets, the fight against austerity has always been ours. For those of us who don’t have the luxury of paying for education, health, food, housing, transit and recreational programs, the struggle against austerity is the struggle to live.

On May 1, 2011, nearly two thousand people took to the streets in the shadow of a Supreme Court of Canada decision to stop migrant farmworkers from unionizing - the latest in a series of attacks on
unions and migrants (See reportback at http://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/MayDay). The next day we saw right-wing, anti-immigrant Stephen Harper win a majority in Canadian parliament. We now face a federal government that will push through further racist immigration laws and dismantle basic support systems for our communities. In the months ahead, No One Is Illegal - Toronto will be keeping close watch on Harper and his cronies as we fight against Ford’s cuts. You can hear about breaking news at http://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/stophethecuts and follow our Cuts related facebook page at http://www.facebook.com/StoptheCuts. We will be using this as a central informational hub so please link these pages on your website and email strings.

On Tuesday, April 26, members of No One Is Illegal - Toronto packed into City Council Chambers side by side with CUPE Local 416 workers and union activists to defend 300 unionized solid waste jobs against privatization. Though 70 deputations argued late into the night against the privatization measure, the committee voted to pass the motion in a matter of minutes and the final decision is to come down on May 17-18. It is obvious that the Ford administration has already made up its mind to sell off, privatize and cut back essential services. It is just as obvious that we need to fight back. What we said to the Councillors at City Hall that day, we say here again: 'This is just the beginning.'

We know that Public Sector Unions in Toronto, in Ontario and federally will fight against these cuts and these attacks. CUPE Local 416 and 79 are determining their responses. The Canadian Union of Postal Workers are in a legal strike position as of May 25th. In Toronto, a broad network of allies are beginning to speak about neighbourhood based organizing. A broad group of migrants, undocumented people and immigrants will be part of this effort.

It's time to get organized. It's time to build neighbourhood committees, organizing against local cuts and connected to a city, province and country wide mobilization against austerity. We need to meet in our community centres, in our schools, and in our parks, to create plans to challenge what's coming at us from every turn. For the next few months, we at No One Is Illegal - Toronto commit to focusing our energies towards building a local movement for public services. In the proud history of the Union movement, we echo: An injury to one is an injury to all!

The Ford Austerity Agenda

- what he has already done -
  - Cancelled plans for an 11km railway line connected to the Spadina subway, shutting out 40,000 daily riders, low wage service workers, part-time and shift workers in the eastern Scarborough and Finch West areas.
  - Cut 41 weekend and late evening bus services – affecting mainly retail and service workers (industries with higher concentrations of migrant and undocumented workers.)
  - Spaces for homeless and vulnerable youth are being cut. Dufferin Mall Youth Services has been closed and many shelters are under severe financial pressure.
  - Shortened contracts for employment counsellors.
  - Sold twenty-one Toronto Public Housing homes.
  - Increased Toronto police salaries by 11.5% making the unaccountable Toronto police the highest paid police force in Canada.

- what he intends to do -
  - Pay $3 million dollars to consultants so that they can cut $530 to $775 Million from the City’s 2012 budget.
  - Cut off or privatize shelters, housing & support, solid waste management, transportation services, parks and recreational services, childcare, art funding, TTC and libraries. These services are primarily used by migrants, by poor and working people and by people of color.
  - Institute user fees, charging money for community services that were free until now. The Ford logic is that fees should be charged where “a service provides a direct benefit to specific users or groups of users.” What that means is that services that are beneficial “only” to immigrants or women or children or poor people will now have user fees.

- the Core Services review timeline -
(note: There are three reviews under way, Core Services, Efficiency and User fees but we are only "allowed" to engage with the Core Services review)

- **May - June 2011:** Web and phone surveys and by-registration focus groups
- **July 2011:** Special Standing Committee Meetings on Core Services, Efficiency, User Fees and Childcare
- **August 2011:** City managers report to Ford and his Crones (aka Executive Committee)
- **September 2011:** Executive Committee makes recommendations for cuts
- **September 2011:** Special meeting of the entire City Council to set Budget directions for the next three years.

- public consultation around Parks and Recreational services -
  - Scarborough: May 11, 7 p.m. at Don Montgomery Community Recreation Centre - gym
  - North York: May 19, 7 p.m. at Mitchell Field Community Centre - gym
  - Etobicoke York: May 30, 7 p.m. at Etobicoke Olympium - gym
  - Toronto East York: June 9, 7 p.m. at Wellesley Community Centre - gym

---

No One Is Illegal-Toronto is an all volunteer, unfunded, grassroots migrant justice organization that fights for a decent livelihood, food, education, healthcare, childcare, shelter, accessible services, freedom of movement, justice and dignity for all people, particularly undocumented and migrant worker communities in Toronto. We also act in solidarity with Indigenous movements for self-determination and organize against wars, economic and environmental attacks that push people out of their homes in the first place.

**May 30, 2011**

**All Out: Stop Alvaro’s Deportation!**

**Emergency Rally**

519 Community Centre (Outside)

**Tuesday, May 31, 11am**


**Write, Phone, Tweet Media & Immigration**

**Monday, May 30, All Day**

Friends and Supporters of Alvaro Orozco:

Alvaro was just informed that his deportation date has been set for **Thursday June 2**. Alvaro has requested a deferral and, if necessary, his lawyer will be going to the Federal Court of Appeal to argue for a stay on his deportation until his Humanitarian & Compassionate (H&C) application is decided.

It's a strong application and Alvaro was notified in October to expect a response by April/May 2011. We are confident that Citizenship & Immigration Canada will do the right thing and grant Alvaro his H&C.

**But right now, we need to first make sure that Alvaro is not deported on Thursday**! We will be holding an emergency rally on **Tuesday May 31 at 11am at the 519 Community Centre at Church and Wellesley**.

Please spread the word. All out!
Add yourself to the emergency action network phone tree by emailing your number to nathan.prier@gmail.com

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

Write, Phone, Tweet Media & Immigration
Monday, May 30, All Day

1) Despite all our actions, Alvaro's story has not made it to the mainstream news. Write letters to editors asking that they cover Alvaro's story.

CP24: breakingnews@cp24.com
CTV: news@ctv.ca
CityTV: news.to@citynews.ca
CBC: tonews@cbc.ca
Toronto Star: lettertoed@thestar.ca
Globe and Mail: letters@globeandmail.com

2) Contact Jason Kenney at 403-225-3480 or Kenney.J@parl.gc.ca or Twitter: @kenneyjason

Contact Vic Toews at 204-326-9889 or Toews.V@parl.gc.ca
(You can text these numbers)
* Even if you are not presently living in Canada, you can contact them!

3) Contact your MP (in their local riding)

4) Make sure to remind the Minister and your MP that:

* Alvaro has established ties in Canada and specifically in Toronto and this has been his home all of his adult life

* That Alvaro has a pending Humanitarian and Compassionate Grounds Permit (H&C) application that shows his commitment to the queer community, the arts community and Toronto in general and that he had close personal ties here in Toronto

* We want Alvaro’s H&C application to be looked at as soon as possible or for the Immigration Minister himself to intervene in this case and the Public Safety Minister to stay his deportation.

4) If you haven’t done so, please sign our growing online petition...
http://www.change.org/peti

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

On Friday, May 13 at 8pm, prominent Queer artist Alvaro Orozco was arrested at Ossington subway station after police racially profiled and ID’d him. Alvaro, who has lived in Canada since 2005, was expecting a decision on his Humanitarian and Compassionate application any day now, but instead he was picked up and handed over to immigration enforcement because he has no status documents (no charges were laid against him by the police).

An accomplished artist and dedicated advocate for queer and newcomer youth, Alvaro received the 2010 Street-Level Advocate Award from the Toronto Youth Cabinet and City of Toronto in recognition of his work with LGBTQ and newcomer youth. He has exhibited art works at the Mayworks Festival,
Migrant Expressions Photography Exhibition, Under the Bridge Art Exhibition, Toronto City Hall and at the Pride Art Exhibition and has also worked with Jumblies Theatre as a photographer and prop-designer in three large productions.

Alvaro’s arrest has sparked a wave of resistance in Toronto’s queer and arts community with people enraged at the injustice of detention and deportation that tears away a member of our family simply because an immigration and refugee board member decided 6 years ago that Alvaro did not deserve refugee status.

In the weeks that have followed, our voices have grown louder and stronger as we continue to demand Status for Alvaro! Status for All! We are now calling an emergency rally and press conference outside of the 519 Community Centre to call for a stay of Alvaro’s deportation until his H&C has been heard!

Support Alvaro! Demand Justice!

November 24, 2011

Undocumented in Toronto: Building homes we can’t live in
STOP THE CUTS ACTIONS
Rally for Housing and Public Services! Stop Ford’s Cuts!
26 Nov. 12pm - 2pm.

Meet at Moss Park, Sherbourne and Queen St E
Parkdale Forum: Hands Off our Affordable Housing and City Services!
26 Nov. 2pm - 4pm.
220 Cowan Avenue.

Join Stop the Cuts at Ford’s Budget Launch!
28 Nov. 9am - 12pm.
City Hall.

I work construction, working on condos but I live in a dump. The landlord knows that my sister and I don’t have papers and harasses me everyday. I was kicked out of a youth shelter for having no papers too and I don’t know where we will go if we get evicted.
- Alejandro*, November 20, 2011

On November 28th, Ford and his supporters on council plan to bring forward a budget that will see devastating cuts to services like libraries, childcare, shelters, programs at community centres, and more. On November 29th, City Council will also be voting on the proposal to sell-off over 1000 units of social housing. This is completely unacceptable. Instead of cutting housing and public services, we need to be expanding them, ensuring that all residents, particularly those without immigration status have access to all services.

Consider housing:

- In 2006, the Labourers’ International Union of North America reported that there were 20,000 undocumented workers in Toronto’s construction industry. These people were working in the most dangerous aspects of the industry, often without safety equipment or decent pay. The housing boom in Ontario has happened on the back of undocumented labour. Today, the number of workers is probably much higher. [1]
On December 24, 2009, Alexander Bondorev, Aleksey Blumberg, Fayzullo Fazilov and Vladimir Korostin, migrants without full status, fell off the side of a building while working because they did not have access to safety equipment, rights they could not demand because of their lack of status. [2]

- Non-status people, particularly women, have the highest rates of homelessness in Toronto, are the least likely to get permanent housing, are barred from social housing and are routinely unable to access shelters [3].

- Most shelters and transitional homes in Toronto, be it for youth or families, ask that undocumented people regularize their status during their stay at the shelter - an option just not available to most undocumented people in the current immigration climate.

- No One Is Illegal - Toronto organized to force immigration enforcement out of Anti-VAW shelters in Toronto in November 2010, but they returned in February 2011, insisting that they would enter Anti-VAW spaces provided that shelter managers of executive directors gave them permission. [4]

- Subsidized housing in Toronto is completely off-limits to communities without immigration status. You cannot even get on the list to apply for social housing or subsidized housing if you do not have immigration status (a list that is 10 years long).

As Toronto communities organize to defend autonomous communities such as Occupy Toronto and to evict Rob Ford, as we struggle to stop the cuts and defend public services, we must commit to expanding public services to ensure that all people in this city can live with dignity and respect. Please educate yourself on these facts and please forward widely.

February 13, 2012

No More Deaths: Justice & Status for Migrant Workers!
http://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/node/661

In another tragic incident, 10 migrant workers died in a car crash in Ontario this month. It is not the first time. In September 2010, Ralston White and Paul Roach died while working at a farm in Southern Ontario. In December 2009, Alexander Bondorev, Aleksey Blumberg, Fayzullo Fazilov, Vladimir Korostin, migrant workers without full status, fell to their deaths when the scaffolding they were working on collapsed in half. Year after year, migrants without full status die in Ontario and neither the government nor their employers have taken any serious remedial action.

These deaths represent only the surface of a phenomenon that is much deeper, one that is, tragically, unexceptional. Persistent abuse and dangerous, grating working conditions lead many migrant workers to face injury. Such injured workers are regularly deported without compensation or medical support and, in some cases, are deported to their deaths. Other migrant workers and undocumented people are sexually, emotionally and psychologically traumatized by abusive employers and an immigration system that works to ensure they are denied their basic rights.

With nearly 500,000 people without any immigration status, over 300,000 deemed temporary foreign workers, as well as refugee claimants, students and others working in the country without full labour protection, these tragedies are bound to happen. When asserting your basic rights means risking
confrontation with a violent system of detention and deportation, any solution that does not include full immigration status for all residents of Canada is bound to fail.

On Friday, February 17, No One Is Illegal - Toronto will be at the "Family Day Action to Demand Justice for Migrant Farmworker Deaths" organized by Justice for Migrant Workers. Meet us at the Coroners Office at 32 Grenville St (College and Bay) at 12pm. [Please share on facebook: http://on.fb.me/xWU8iL]

In Canada, migrants have long been forced to fight relentlessly for their right to life and for their right to a life of dignity. This struggle arches back over a century to that of the Chinese Railroad Workers in the 1880s. The cycle of violence and death faced by migrants without full status has changed in name, but not in impact. Let us continue to organize and fight for justice and dignity for all migrants without full immigration status. Let us declare Status for All!

More information:

Toronto Star Editorial by Justice for Migrant Workers, “Surge in migrant labour makes reform imperative”:\http://www.thestar.com/opinion/editorialopinion/article/1129018--surge-i...

Migrant Workers, No One Is Illegal - Toronto: http://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/taxonomy/term/26

Details of "Family Day Action to Demand Justice for Migrant Farmworker Deaths": http://j4mw.tumblr.com/post/17312843708/family-day-action-to-demand-just...

Interested in joining the struggle for justice for migrant and undocumented workers? Email nooneisillegal@riseup.net

============================================================================

February 8, 2012

Toronto’s 7th Annual Rally for Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women
Rally Starts at 1230pm: Police Headquarters 40 College Street at Bay, Toronto
Feast at the 519 Church Street Community Centre; 519 Church Street following the Rally.
http://www.facebook.com/events/107180609402087/
Please signs and banners about the missing and murdered women only.
Tokens will be available at the rally.
Raising our Voices to Demand the United Nations Investigate Missing & Murdered Indigenous women in Canada

According to research conducted by the Native Women Association of Canada (NWAC) under the Sisters In Spirit Program, over 600 Indigenous women have been murdered or gone missing, most of them over the last 30 years.

Despite clear evidence that this is an ongoing issue, the federal government decided in the fall of 2010 to end funding to Sisters in Spirit. Instead monies in the amount of $10 million have been dedicated to a central RCMP missing person centre. The same institution - who, along with the Vancouver Police Department, failed to properly investigate Pickton in 1997 - is now at the centre of a public inquiry in Vancouver. The sham inquiry into the failed Pickton investigation has been boycotted by 20 of the 21 groups who were granted standing due to the denial of adequate funding for legal defense.
Pickton, who was convicted for six murders, has admitted to killing 49 women. A total of 18 murders occurred after he was arrested and released for the attempted murder of a sex worker in 1997. This is blood on police hands, yet RCMP officers testifying at the sham inquiry state “there are few things they would change about how they did their work.”

It should come as no surprise that the Committee to End Discrimination Against Women at the United Nations has accepted submissions put forward by advocates of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside (DTES) as well as the Native Women's Association of Canada and announced their intent to launch an inquiry into Canada's missing and murdered Indigenous women.

This inquiry procedure is used to investigate what the Committee believes to be very serious violations of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The Canadian government, however, must consent in order for this to move forward. Alongside groups across the country, Toronto's February 14th organizing committee comprised of No More Silence, The Native Youth Sexual Health Network, The Native Women's Resource Centre and other Indigenous and feminist organizations will be mobilizing at Police Headquarters at 12:30 pm to show our support for such an investigation.

On February 14th we come together in solidarity with the women who started this vigil over 20 years ago in Vancouver's DTES, and with the marches and rallies that will be taking place across this land. We stand in defense of our lives and to demonstrate against the complicity of the state in the ongoing genocide of Indigenous women and the impunity of state institutions and actors (police, RCMP, coroners' offices, the courts, and an indifferent federal government) that prevents justice for all Indigenous peoples.

List of Feb 14th Memorial Marches in other communities:
http://womensmemorialmarch.wordpress.com/national/

March 12, 2012

KI's fight against mining continues.
Update from Toronto KI Support, March 8, 2012
http://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/node/672

When the mining trucks come to rip up the land
What part of No don't you understand?
When armed guards are what you've got planned
What part of No don't you understand?
You're poisoning the the water, the plants, and the land
What part of No don't you understand?
KIs here, you gotta meet their demands!
What part of No don't you understand?

Toronto -- On Monday, March 5, nearly 150 people gathered in a packed hall in downtown Toronto to hear KI Elder Mary Jane Crow, KI Councilor Cecilia Begg, KI Councilor Randy Nanokeesic, Steven Chapman - KI Lands and Environment Unit, and Richard Anderson, KI Watershed Coordinator. In a hushed room, the community leaders declared their relentless commitment to protecting their
sovereignty and their territory.

On Tuesday, March 6, KI community leaders were at a rally at the Prospectors and Developers of Canada's annual convention to demand that Ontario and GLR cease mining. Joined by Sid Ryan from OFL, Maryam Adrangi from Council of Canadians, Ramsay Hart from Mining Watch, Shane Moffat from Greenpeace and Krisna Saravanamuttu from CFS-Ontario, the KI Leaders spoke in front of a 30 feet banner that declared, "Protect KI Sacred Lands".

These actions, organized by Toronto KI Support, came after days of intense maneuvering by God's Lake Resources Inc. and the Ontario Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.

On Saturday, March 3, God's Lake Inc., issued a press release announcing a 3,000 metre diamond drill program. Ominously, the press release stated "The Corporation is also canvassing Security Companies to ensure the smooth completion of the drill program." KI's Chief Donny Morris responded in a statement saying, “We are mobilized to go to Sherman Lake to protect our land. I cannot allow our graves to be desecrated by a company that is hiring private security to trespass on our Homeland by force. That is no way to do business”.

Then on Sunday, March 4, in an extremely rare and unilateral move, Ontario wanting to avert the PR disaster the events in Toronto would mean, withdrew 23,181 sq km of land in KI Homeland from mining exploration in response to KI's longstanding decision to place a full moratorium on industry in their Indigenous Homeland. The press's release by Rick Bartolucci's office accepted that "KI asserts jurisdiction over the land". KI Councillor Cecilia Begg responded on Monday in Toronto saying, "These are our lands, Ontario has no right to take them or give them back."

That Ontario is willing to put out Sunday press releases to stop mining in massive parts of the province is proof that the KI efforts are having an impact. The struggle, however, is far from over.

The claims and leases at the heart of KI’s conflict with GLR are unaffected by ON’s move and the dispute over protection of burials and sacred landscape remains unresolved. Any day now GLR Inc. could begin exploration in KI which could give rise to immediate action by the community. Chief Donny Morris is already at the site in Sherman Lake and issuing short Youtube reports (See the first one: http://youtu.be/HO6LHL6seps)

In Toronto, where the headquarters of the company, and the government officials responsible are located, a movement is growing to support KI Nation's struggle to assert over sovereignty over their lands. The Toronto KI Support committee formed after a call by No One Is Illegal - Toronto, is now a network of grassroots activists that have worked to build education and awareness on KI issues across the city. We organized a successful phone campaign against Rick Bartolucci, the Minister of Northern Development and Mines, and have been doing targeted posterering to ensure that GLR and Ontario mining bureaucrats know they are being watched.

Now - as KI leaders return to their homeland - we in Toronto will be waiting for direction. If a blockade goes up in KI, we will work to make their effects felt in Toronto. If God's Lake tries to force itself on KI territory and if Ontario remains silent, we will take mass, public action in Toronto to stop them. To make sure you can join us, please sign up for email updates at www.KILands.org and "Like" www.facebook.com/TorontoKISupport.

If you are interested in coming to meetings and support the organizing, please emailTorontoKISolidarity@gmail.com

Until all are free,
Toronto KI Support.
VIDEO/PICTURES

* Video: Short doc on KI’s struggle by Praxis Pictures: http://youtu.be/qXrjcRnaxxs (launched March 5th)

* Video/Pics of KI’s rally on March 6: http://allan.lissner.net/pdac-protests/

* KI’s response to Ontario government’s withdrawal: http://youtu.be/v1-kxRuQkXg


* For more pictures and videos, visit: www.facebook.com/TorontoKISupport

SOME MAINSTREAM MEDIA COVERAGE

CBC: Mining company vague on plans despite protests http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/story/2012/03/06/tby-ki-protest-at-pdac.html


Financial Post: PDAC 2012: Ontario tries to avoid PR disaster with First Nations http://business.financialpost.com/2012/03/05/pdac-2012-ontario-tri

July 23, 2012

Friends!

Last week Toronto was shaken up by the shootings in Scarborough and the deaths of Shyanne Charles and Joshua Yasay. In the immediate aftermath and as the families were still in shock, Toronto Mayor Rob Ford took it upon himself to blame immigrants for the deaths, calling for the shooters to be deported. Though many commentators were quick to criticize Rob Ford, Immigration Minister Jason Kenney came out in support insisting that the shootings must be linked to immigration and calling for passing of Bill C-43, which among other provisions allows the immigration minister to take away any immigrants’ temporary status for an undefined “public policy” considerations. This is important.

While Rob Ford is usually found publicly stating his anti-immigrant, anti-women, anti-poor and anti-queer opinions, Jason Kenney has perfected the art of lying from both sides of his mouth to gain immigrant votes. His support for Rob Ford, however, proves what many of us already know. Jason Kenney is as anti-immigrant as Rob Ford and him and the entire Harper government should be opposed just as much as Rob Ford has been here in Toronto.

This past weekend we also joined migrant workers and their allies at a vigil to mark the six month anniversary of the Hampstead car crash that killed 11 workers in southern Ontario. Over a hundred people gathered at Justice for Migrant Workers’ invitation to remember the dead and stand up for the living. See a CTV news story on it here: http://bit.ly/OngSkk.

This coming week we are encouraging allies in Toronto and Ottawa to attend court for security certificate detainee Mohammad Mahjoub on 24-25-26 July. The hearings will feature the cross-
examination of "CSIS #3", an anonymous CSIS agent whom Mr. Mahjoub and his lawyers have called as a witness. Warren Woods, another official who was involved in issuing a new certificate against Mr. Mahjoub in 2008, will also be cross-examined. While the court will be in Ottawa, the hearings will also be publicly accessible by videoconference in Toronto.

Also, we have endorsed the event Contested Futures: Tar Sands and Environmental Justice on July 30th. Please consider attending, details follow.

In solidarity and in struggle,
No One Is Illegal – Toronto

November 19, 2012

Sounds of Solidarity Rally at Toronto Immigration Holding Centre
FREE THE THREE! FREEDOM FOR MIGRANTS! END DETentions!
https://www.facebook.com/events/131094017044205

On December 9th, join us from across Southern Ontario for a family friendly demonstration outside the Toronto immigration detention centre in solidarity with security certificate detainees Mohammad Mahjoub, Mohamed Harkat and Mahmoud Jaballah and all those locked up in immigration detention.


We will be a noisy, musical presence to express our support for those locked up inside. We will have live performances, drummers and hot chocolate! Please bring whistles, pots, pans and other noise makers, dress warm and bring a flashlight. Speakers and performers to be announced shortly.

December 10th marks the 10th year anniversary of Mohamed Harkat’s arrest under a security certificate. Mahjoub will be in court in Toronto for a detention review, once again calling on the judge to free him from over twelve years of arbitrary, indefinite detention. And it is International Human Rights Day.

Sounds of Solidarity Rally
Toronto Immigration Holding Centre
December 9, 2012 at 4pm.
Meet at 2:30pm at Fed Court House, 180 Queen West for buses

Actions in Other Cities:

Ottawa: Visual presentation/rally on Parliament Hill on Dec. 10th at 10am.
Montreal: Rally at Laval Immigration Prevention Centre on Dec. 10th at 10am. Colourful car convoy leaves Rosemont metro at 9am.
Vancouver: Action on December 10th, evening (details tbc: check NOII-Vancouver website or fb).
Calgary: Info-Picket at 615 MacLeod Trail Southeast on Dec. 9th. from 1pm to 2pm.
Saskatoon: Action at 12pm on December 9th.

Other cities to be announced. Please see http://bit.ly/dec102012 for full list.

For over a decade now, Mohammad Mahjoub, Mohamed Harkat and Mahmoud Jaballah have lived in
arbitrary and inhumane detention as a result of security certificates. Mahjoub was imprisoned for 8 years (including 2.5 years in solitary) and over 4.5 years under continuing house arrest and conditions; Harkat was imprisoned for 3.5 years (including 1 year in solitary) and 6.5 years under house arrest and conditions; Jaballah was imprisoned for over six years prison (including 1.5 years in solitary) and 5.5 years under continuing house and conditions... yet, none of them has ever been charged.

Mahjoub, Harkat and Jaballah are three of the thousands of migrants in Canada who spend more time in worse jails simply because they don’t have full immigration status. With the full implementation of Bill C-31 in December, and with Bill C-43 looming in Parliament, increasing numbers of migrants will find themselves behind bars. Since the Harper government came in to power in 2006, over 72,000 people have been locked up in immigration detention. This includes families and children as well as those jailed in maximum security prisons without access to service or programs.

On December 9th and 10th, insist Free the Three! Freedom for Migrants! End Detentions!

Attend an action near you or organize a workshop, info-picket or action in your community. Email justiceformahjoub@gmail.com: we can provide flyers, media release, and other support.

Please also take a moment to sign the statement against security certificates at www.harkatstatement.com/

In solidarity,

Justice for Mahjoub Network
The Justice for Mohamed Harkat Committee
Justice for Jaballah
No One Is Illegal – Toronto
People’s Commission Network
Anarchist Black Cross – Toronto