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Abstract

In the wake of a rescaling of national state welfare responsibilities, urban centres, like the city of Toronto, have become new governance sightlines for managing the deleterious effects of a globalised restructuring of capitalist economies. Toronto is now trafficking its multicultural and “creative city” flare in regional and global markets to secure capital investment necessary to float its newly acquired fiscal responsibilities, including welfare and social services provisioning. And a host of local private-public partnerships have appeared as “shadow state” actors to assist in the suturing of disenfranchised communities to the operative logics of neo-liberal governance and globalised city aspirations. Social welfare and urban studies literature has not been attentive to the increasing reliance on visuality and the “aesthetic” more broadly in securing these desired social and economic outcomes. My ethnographically based dissertation picks up this analytical slack by inciting a two-fold intervention: First, I hone in on the efficacious properties of visual images produced within 3 different social policy spaces and their presumed roles in constituting the domains of social interaction and production. This analysis illustrates that different policy crafting
experts understand the “aesthetic” as a remunerative technology of governance - for regulating the problematics of socio-economic and racialised difference, and for mediating rifts in the social fabric as fallout from welfare retrenchment. Second, I examine the ways in which certain normativised aesthetic sensibilities connected to neoliberal urbanism serve as both a calculative resource for re-defining certain spaces and subjects as problematic and thus controllable, and an interpellative mechanism for assembling moralized subjects around the dictates of responsibility and (self) empowerment. The dissertation argues that although these aesthetic governance strategies are resulting in a depoliticisation of communities, and a moralised segregation of compliant and non-compliant subjects played out along racialised /economic lines, there exists a level of disruption transpiring in the spaces of policy implementation. In situ attention to these disruptions, layered with a reflexive analytical restaging of these events and a critical analysis of deployed governance strategies are proposed as a grounding for social work, research and social policy praxis.
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Introduction     Trafficking in the Visual
In the June 2012 issue of *Toronto Life*, a monthly magazine devoted to probing the contours of contemporary middle class urban living in Canada’s largest metropolitan centre, the editorial staff “giddily” unfolded its reasons for lauding Toronto as “the most envied city in the world” (p. 47). The following selection of top 35 celebrated moments of not only successful, but enviable, globalised urbanism resonate as thematic threads running throughout this dissertation: a construction frenzy while the rest of the world reels in economic recession (reason 1), the ceaseless gentrification of “some of the city’s dingiest corners” (p. 59) (reasons 5, 8 and 21); the effects of community policing in keeping the city “safer than ever” (p. 61)(reason 10); a functioning multiculturalism that is generative of vibrant cultural production (reason 16), sensory/culinary treats (reason 12) and amicability (“because we get along” (p. 61) – reason, 11); and because the city thrives on the “creative chaos” cultivated in places like Kensington Market (reason 23) (figs. 1, 2, 3 & 4). These examples punctuating Toronto’s awakening to “the euphoria of great expectations” (p. 47) are the imagined and material effects of local urban policies and national social/economic strategies cultivated since
Literary critic, Michael Warner, borrowing from the writings of Habermas and Charles Taylor, asserts the idea of the “public (and its corollary, counter-publics)” – as an “economic” formation that comes into play through an exchange of strangers drawn together by the circulation of different media forms. Based on principles of competition between circulating ideas, reflexive consumer choice and the presumed egalitarianism of interlocutors in the exchange of values, this model suggests that strangers are hailed into this “common mind” (a comunitas of belonging) not as a passive experience but one that renders participants “socially and morally accountable” while simultaneously suggesting that they have exercised choice in processing this passing appeal (Warner 2002). Betraying his epistemological roots, Warner claims that consensus, as an action, is mobilised through an “appeal to reason”. Further, Warner argues that publics are ideological in orientation: they provide a sense of affiliation and of active belonging, while simultaneously “masking or compensating for the real powerlessness of human agents in capitalist societies” (p. 82).

the mid 1990’s for positioning Toronto at the intersection of globalised flows of capital, information, people, and ideas. Fueled by objectives aimed at generating and sustaining economic and cultural competitiveness in the global arena, these deliberate multi-scale policies, while obviously resulting in certain sumptuous benefits for what urban guru Richard Florida (2007) labeled “globalisation’s winners”, have also materialized in new forms of socio-economic displacement, growing income disparities, fears of social unrest (Buffam, 2009), and paradoxically, emergent forms of resistance (Boudreau, Keil, and Young, 2009) that certainly received no mention on the pages of Toronto Life. For the record, the realities of welfare retrenchment and the dismantling of the apparatus of the welfare state effectively underscoring this apparent socio-economic fall-out, were absent from the magazine’s celebrations as well.

If Toronto Life enjoined its readership, through visual imagery and text, to “Love Toronto Now” and partake in its riches, a different type of celebration had occurred just months before, one that proclaimed the collective efforts of a “public” similar to that of the magazine’s presumed readership, for exceeding the United Way of Toronto’s 2011 Annual Giving Campaign Fundraising goal of 116 million. For Susan McIsaac, CEO of the UWT, the gifting was evidence of “Torontonians coming together in a common cause of caring – to create opportunities for a better life for everyone” (United Way of Toronto, 2011). The “positive energy” that McIsaac felt is also exemplary of the ways in which urban centres have become the new governance sightline for managing the deleterious effects of globalization (Boudreau, et. al., 2009). Indeed, not only are municipal governments (and affiliated bodies – social services, the police, social housing) now expected to coordinate policies oriented towards the regulation and control of goods and bodies moving across the city-
landscape, but a host of local informal and semi-formal assemblages comprised of corporate partners, business associations, resident associations, philanthropic agencies like the United Way, and importantly social service agencies have appeared in “the shadow of the welfare state” (Fairbanks, 2004) to exercise collective responsibility and commitment in the face of social displacement and devolutionary state welfare practices (Wolch 1990).

A vein of social work scholarship has been attentive to the different technologies of governance that have emerged at this interface of local state politics and informal assemblage investment, tracing the ways in which certain behaviours, subjects, and social phenomenon have been problematised as sites for intervention or regulation – including issues of poverty and inner-city sub-urbanism, racialisation and citizenship, and “risk” especially as displayed in the bodies of targeted subjects and the physical spaces of communities (Bhuyan, 2008; Bonisteel and Green, 2005; Chambon, 2008; Fairbanks, 2004; McKee, 2008; Reisch, 2008; Shore and Wright, 2005). Virtually absent from this productive examination, however, has been a consideration of the increasingly prominent role that visual media, culture and the “aesthetic” more broadly, have come to play in social services’ governance attempts to suture disenfranchised communities to the operative logics of a restructuring post-welfare economy (and in the Toronto context, logics aligned with globalised aspirations)(Brandstater, Wade and Woodward, 2011; Ghertner, 2010; Yudice, 2003).

Consider as an example of this trend towards an increased reliance on the modality of the visual, social and governmental agencies’ strategic use of visual images to advertise their services with marginalized/disadvantaged groups and to garner funds. Websites, Youtube, commercialized print and television media, community based journals and magazines, brochures and pam-
of social work perceptions of “art” as inflecting or reflecting circulating economic, political and moral rationalities, and demarcations of distinction between differently marked subjectivities and their associated tastes and sensibilities (Jain, 2007). Jacques Ranciere’s reformulation of the “aesthetic” as a generalized organizing of the sensible realm, and specifically as a logic of a particular sensible regime informs the other point of intervention (see chapter 1 for details).

I flesh out this claim, both theoretically and ethnographically in Chapters 2 and 5 of this dissertation.

I refer to the “social” not as a sociological framing device, but in reference to Gille Deleuze’s technical term (1979) for an assemblage or range of knowledges about social environments, institutional apparatuses including associated knowledge producers and practitioners, modes of technical intervention, and ethical discussions especially as they become enveloped in political and technical concerns. Included in this term is a concern for how the practices of daily life are subjected to varying forms of social regulation and control, and the mechanisms for identifying and practicing social citizenship (Deleuze, cited in Collier & Ong, 2005).

If then, the practices of social policy and social work and their engagement with the problematics of the social have become increasingly awash with the visual, it is indeed curious that phlets, and publicly placed advertising campaigns, are some of the conduits that circulate these solicitous images to various targeted publics and unsuspecting passers-by. They adjure attention with colour, size, representational content, and placement. Some traffic an overtly ethical or political or social imperative. And others (also) attempt to lure with an affective appeal. In addition, one can reflect on a decade long trend towards employing visual media (photovoice; video projects) as tools for advocacy, risk remediation, as therapeutic intervention and for healing (Conway and Winkler, 2006; Delgado, 2000; Wang, 2004) or as data in research initiatives to retell the truths about social work practice, or of clients’ difference and marginalization/victimization (Knowles and Cole, 2007, Moffat 2000, Sakamoto, 2007). Others have used photo based methodologies (photo voice, photo staging) in conjunction with community groups to explore problems, to question conventional practices and assumptions, and effect change either at a local or policy level (Bhimani, 2003; Brown & Strega (2005); Sakamoto, 2007; Wang, 1997, 2000; 2004). Spatial mapping of income and health disparity, risk and immigrant concentration (Bell, Hoskins, Pickle & Wartenberg 2006; Hulchanski 2010; Murdie 2008), have become recognised practices of the visual in policy making arenas. Consider, finally, that social work has linked itself metaphorically or metonymically to the practice of visual art (England, 1985; Goldstein, 1999; Gray and Webb, 2008, 2009) and relied on art (literature, music, performance, painting, sculpture) as a source of inspiration or as an alternative form of knowledge upon which to rebuild the profession’s own knowledges about engagement with otherness (Chambon & Irving, 2003, Chambon, 2005, 2009, Stainton, 2009).
visuality’s presence, or what we might refer to as these contemporary attempts to harness the aesthetic in social policy/social work spaces in instrumentalist ways, has not been reckoned with analytically in any comprehensive manner. My dissertation picks up this analytical slack by inciting a two-fold intervention: First, I hone in on the efficacious properties of visual images produced and circulated within social policy and social work spaces, and their presumed roles in re/constituting the domains of the social in which racialized, gendered and classed subjectivities and interactions are configured and realized. This first sightline focuses on different policy crafting experts’ understanding of the “aesthetic” as instrumentalist remunerative resource for governing the problematics of socio-economic difference and mediating rifts in the social fabric as fallout from the movements of globalised capital entwined with neo-colonialist sensibilities. Second, I examine the ways in which certain normativised aesthetic sensibilities connected to neoliberal urbanism serve as both a calculative resource for re-defining certain spaces and subjects as problematic and thus controllable, and an interpellative mechanism for assembling moralized subjects around the dictates of productivity, responsibility, and (self) empowerment.

There are several subjects of study in the dissertation: visual images about, or produced by, youth deemed “at risk” within various philanthropic and social services settings - photographs, public service announcements appearing in both print and video format, and public murals; and visual calculative practices - maps, graphs, charts - produced by social policy experts. A few other aesthetic forms - textually based narratives that record feelings, sights and sounds of places and bodies, the sonic - deployed by various invested policy actors appear more casually. Finally, the subjects of the study are stakeholders implicated in the production and circulation of these images:

06_
Throughout the proposal, the intent is not to focus on those exclusive sites of the work of the social that Social Work, as a professionalized body, has carved out for its own exclusive domain. Rather, the spaces chosen for exploration are domains in which a wider social service work/policy delivery is offered, and in which accredited social workers may find themselves engaged (either through direct employment or through inter-agency connection). “Spaces of social work” thus refers to this larger, not wholly professionally regulated space in which the work of the social transpires.

07_
Interpellation as understood here borrows from Judith Butler’s reading of French social theorist Louis Althusser’s structuralist doctrine which accounts for the structuration of the subject through the dictates of language (the individual is “hailed” or interpelated into its gendered/racialised/sexualised subjecthood under the explicit/implicit terms of the mediating forces of language and culture – “the Law”. Butler, in her rereading, understands the formation of subjectivity as an embodied set of practices, rituals, performances that can both respond to and reiterate the codes set by language (“a passion-
ate complicity with the law” that is enacted via conscience), and simultaneously in their very act of repetition, can open up spaces for slippage, in which the dictates of the law are reworked, renounced (but this very complicity to be critical of the Law represents a threat to a stability which the response to subj ecthood promises) (Butler, 1999).

Two distinctive yet convergent political rationalities (as a schema of reality) (Brown, 2006) are considered in this dissertation – neoliberalism as a market oriented rationality and neoconservatism, as an unwavering moralizing rationality that fuses an understanding of justice with punitive social regulation. Although it will be the work of the dissertation (in particular, chapters, 2, and 3 through 5) to dissect how these different rationalities knot in very local and often contradictory ways (especially as evidenced or promulgated in the realm of the aesthetic) to alter what Brown refers to as the policy experts connected to a philanthropic agency (the United Way of Toronto and its corporate sponsors), a University of Toronto based research institute (the Cities Centre) and social reformers affiliated with the early settlement movement in Chicago; youth artists who attended social-arts based programmes provided by social service agencies; city bureaucrats and politicians; community activists; youth workers and community artists; a police constable; and an assumed moral public.

The principle focus is my examination of images and targeted aesthetic sensibilities as they operate at the intersection of globalised late capitalist forces, circulating racialised logics, and the everyday local lives of people living within differently demarcated zones of the city. One of my central arguments is that visual images deployed in the social policy arenas that I investigate are doubly invested; they are deployed as techniques of governance for the regulation and containment of the subjectivity of (racialised, gendered, classed) youth deemed as plausible threat to neoliberal urbanist aspirations and they are mobilized in attempts to cultivate a public who are morally and affectively complicit with these regulating trends. A second argument suggests that different modalities within the aesthetic realm have been cultivated as a valuable knowledge resource about people, spaces, behaviours, and motivations that align most properly, although perhaps unintended and not resolutely, with a neoliberal political rationality attuned to principles of self-responsivisation and market culpability and at times tangentially, with a carceral sensibility that is abjecting of targeted subjects.

And yet, I will also trouble this reading of images and image production as singly productive of neoliberal governmentality, by suggesting that the images about youth and made by youth
in the various social policy settings explored in the dissertation; are caught in a web of ambivalence that trouble a notion of a cohesive public “we” that the invested agencies (United Way, the Spot, and perhaps the Cities Centre) and the City of Toronto claim as future aspiration and as current modus operandi. In one sense, mural making and the United Way’s targeted circulation of images are articulated as publicly enunciated mechanisms for nurturing the nascent displays of personal responsibility that manifest in these communities, as strategies for forging state, neighbourhood, social service and business alliances, and as tools for “building a better, stronger, healthier city for everyone” (United Way of Toronto, 2010). Perhaps more contradictorily, the two projects’ lingering commitment to an ethics of multiculturalism effects, at times, a quasi deterritorialisation of space giving rise to disruptive practices that test the limits of what liberal tolerance can bear. And yet, these techniques of governance while trafficking self consciously in the optics of hope for a sustained multicultural “community” contradictorily generate and mediate racialised discourses of fear that serve as a touch-point for regulatory practices of surveillance and securitization.

Finally this dissertation offers a cautionary tale about the need for social work (as an invested party in policy formation, practice formulation, and research) to be attentive to how aesthetic and moral knowledges and practices are being drawn upon to further globalised/localised economic strategies that result in an unintended (re)production of socio-economic inequities. In other words, by reflexively examining shifts occurring in the governance of the racialised poor, including its trafficking with the aesthetic, social work can, I would argue, be more productive in proposing counter claims as to what constitutes a livable and more just social world.

Methodological and Sightline Considerations:
Dovetailing the age of European enlightenment and the burgeoning of bourgeois power, was the discovery of the child as a specific subject with its own attributes of innocence, freedom and irrationality. The child was also understood as a site of raw sociability, requiring specific modes of moral, intellectual, and social intervention and guidance (Foucault, 2008). If according certain subjects a childhood was once a privilege cultivated within European bourgeois and upper class households, with the introduction of mass schooling in the 19th century, these practices were extended to the working classes as well. Childhood thus became a technique of governance necessary for shaping adult sensibilities in accordance with the needs of industrial capitalism and the aspirations of colonialist oriented nationalisms (Foucault, 2008; Prout and James, 1990). Adolescence, as discovered subject and understood as a liminal period between the innocence of childhood and the maturity of adulthood, had, at the height of industrial colonialism in the mid 19th century acquired its own unique set of attributes. While schooling for the middle and upper classes had extended the period of socialization deemed necessary to manage the chaotic energies thought to accompany the period of adolescence, no similar institutional intervention existed for working class youth (Skelton & Valentine, 1998). Anxiety about the need to contain the threat posed by the liminality of youth sensibilities in a

**Why Youth:** The justification for choosing to focus on youth (and specifically image economies that implicate or target youth as a principal subject matter) stems from four interrelated sources: First, the category and subjectivity of youth (and in particular racialised, aboriginal, and immigrant youth), as a modernist invention and as a problematic for intervention and engagement, have occupied a central place in social work practice, policy and research since the profession’s inception (Sharland, 2006). Relatedly, youth have been deemed a principal place for seeing and demonstrating the efficacy of technologies of a welfare liberalism at work, and more recently, as a privileged place for realizing or enlivening neoliberal preoccupations with risk management of subjects and environments and securing productive futures (France 2008; Jensen & Fraser, 2006; Yndigen, 2007). Secondly, arts based work with youth (specifically the production of durable materials or documents like video, photographs, newspapers, zines, spoken word and other music recordings, collected writings) has been a popular mode for engaging youth in productive activity not only because of the assumed affinity between youth expression, youth interest and new media, but because it affords tangible evidence of youth’s process of skill acquisition, their productivity, of the “results” of therapeutic intervention, and of the “realness” or authenticity of youth experience (Fleetwood, 2005). Third, the 1990’s witnessed a proliferation of visual representations of “youth as terror” in North American print and visual media (documentaries, televised news casts)(Giroux, 1996; Kelly, 1994) with different social agencies countering these images with images of youth that “demonstrated” the remunerative and rehabilitative possibilities of their programming. Alternatively, digital imaging technologies were employed by community based agencies with the assumption that these technologies would allow for a productive re-appropriation of racist/colonial-
ist (or sexist, or homophobic, transphobic) representations of otherness (Appadurai, 2005; Crath, 2010; Schnettler & Raab, 2008). Finally, at this particular historical juncture, youth, as a generalized/idealized subjectivity, have become a preferred sightline for advertising various commercialized products and commoditised lifestyles (Fleetwood, 2005).

More personally, my investment in this project is experientially motivated: I have almost two decades of advocacy, activist and community development based experience working with street-involved and inner-city racialised youth in Toronto, work that has challenged me to think about the effects of, and the different forms that techniques of governance and resistances take to, issues and experiences of racialisation and poverty. Relatedly, these social services experiences working and advocating with youth have led me to question the relationship between governance technologies that deploy images and discourses/practices that are intended to shape perceptions and experiences of gender, class, race, and sexual desire.

**A Case Study Approach:** Given that the focus on images as techniques of governance is exploratory and new to social welfare, social policy scholarship, I felt that it would be fruitful to engage in a comparative case study approach as a means of highlighting multiple perspectives on the issue. According to scholars writing on Case study methods (Ragin and Becker, 1995; Yin, 2003; Baxter & Jack, 2008) an exploratory case study approach is appropriate in contexts where the researcher wants to examine the “phenomena” to be studied within the “context” in which it performs or articulates itself (Baxter and Jack, 2008) and for which outcomes (the geography of production and reception of an “intervention”) are unknown (Yin, 3003). Moreover, a comparative approach, they suggest, can be employed as a means of illustrating “alternative” or complimentary general sense, coupled with bourgeois fear of an uprising of the working classes culminated in the beginnings of a social preoccupation with how to regulate the perceived undisciplinary, and ultimately threatening nature of working class youth.
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...perspectives on the issue” (Yin, 2003, pp. 13-16) or expressing similarities or differences across selected cases (Campbell & Ahrens, 1998). Finally, an “instrumental case study approach” allows for the case to operate as a site for the generation or refinement of theory; it is instrumentally employed for the expressed purpose of providing insight into externally referenced concerns (Stake, 1995).

Although Yin (2003) argues that a goal of comparative case study is to be able to “predict, through a specified theoretical lens, similar or contrasting results across cases” (p. 26), in the research process, I adhered more consciously to Jacques Ranciere’s method (see Chapter 1 for a detailed accounting) for moving through an “uncharted” territory: His approach, to quote Ranciere, is “to figure out the characteristics of the territory you are going through, the places it allows you to go, the way it obliges you to move, the markers that can help you, the obstacles that get in the way (Ranciere, 2009, p. 114). Thus, although the movement (both in terms of field research and in terms of writing) between the cases proceeded iteratively (Chambon, 2007) and was demarcated by an already formulated multi-layered theoretical apparatus, these explorations proceeded as a form of theoretical intervention without prescription. – a “type of moving map of a moving landscape” to quote Ranciere, a “map that is ceaselessly modified by the movement itself” (Ranciere, 2009, p. 120). What resulted in the wake of this method, I believe, are research findings that are both theoretically informed, and conversely, theory generating.

Three cases, which I expand on below in the section detailing the contributions of individual chapters, were deployed: Case 1 explored different calculative measures – numerically based or aesthetically driven – that differently positioned social/urban experts (from early social reformers...
to contemporary philanthropists, the United Way of Toronto, and social scientists, Toronto’s Cities Centre) have drawn upon to construct knowledge grids attuned to the sensibilities of different circulating liberal, economic, and racialised logics. Case 2 explored how the United Way of Toronto understands its visual image production in relationship to its current fundraising and policy-making goals and aspirations. The United Way was chosen as a site of research because it is a significant player in policy formation at a local and national level, and it contributes significant core and program funding to multiple agencies throughout the city of Toronto. What the United Way says through its reports, media releases, and indeed, visual image campaigns shapes how funding flows, what programming gets funded, and how social issues are understood, addressed, and regulated. In other words, the United Way, I would argue, can be considered a significant site for the production of knowledges and practices, and as such, its discursive and image productions need to be considered attentively and critically. Case 2 allowed me to think about the role of images produced by the United Way in staging certain ideas of governance and the social. Case 3 offered an opportunity to explore interventions, strategies and practices deployed in the policy field; how specific programs targeting the visual are articulated, interpreted, or countered by city bureaucrats, city councilors, youth, youth workers, police, funders and local neighbourhood/residents and business associations. In other words, Case 3 allowed for a critical examination of the operationalisation of a targeted technique of governance (the Graffiti Transformation Initiative) by focusing on public mural making at a youth serving site - the Spot, a satellite youth program of the Jane Finch Family and Community Centre.

**Fieldwork and ethnography:** The aims of this project - to explore the epistemological im-
Political rationalities are the ever transforming forms of reason, “styles of thinking”, and “intrinsic” moralities and knowledges that are mobilised as a means of rendering subject matter thinkable and “amenable” to different calculations for intervention. A whole set of “idioms and rhetorics” are convened in the process of identification, operationalised by experts, and in its neo-liberal guise, become an agentic part in the daily disciplinary practices of the self (see chapter for details). Chapter 2 fleshes these points out in more detail.

The findings presented in this dissertation are the product of 12 months of field research at the Spot (Jane and Finch), and other sites throughout the city of Toronto. Throughout this period, I relied on ethnographic approaches to field research including intensive participant observation, informal and semi-formal interviewing, note taking in the form of field notes, and visual methods of data generation (of my own and others’ making - photography and video). Eight months of the research were spent in the Jane Finch community; during this period, I participated in and observed the Graffiti Transformation Programme (3 -4 days a week), went on field excursions with the youth, painted murals and drew with youth participants, attended community events organised by the Spot (including “Freedom Fridays” – see chapter 5), walked around the neighbourhood accompanied by youth guides, participated and observed community events in the Jane Finch community, and actively participated in a community based anti-poverty activist group – JFAP.

Data generated from this level of investigation led me to select key informants for interviews. In the process of interviewing, a city bureaucrat responsible for the Graffiti Transformation
Project referenced community artist Jed B as being a particularly fine example of an artist who had worked effectively with youth and community members. After several of what I found to be rather inspiring and illuminating interviews with Jed, together with numerous walk-arounds in the Alexander Park/Kensington Market area where his project, sponsored by ArtStarts had transpired the previous summer (a neighbourhood in which I had lived and worked in for 15 years prior to moving in January, 2011), I made a decision to include this site as a secondary illustration of youth led community arts programming. Because this leg of the research lacked an ethnographic component, I relied more on semi-formal interviewing and analysis of rather extensive and unedited audio-visual video footage and photographic images that had been shot during throughout the 6 weeks of the ArtStarts project. For pragmatic reasons, I decided that field evidence from this site should not stage a formal appearance in my dissertation as a fourth case, although it does make a guest appearance in the conclusion. My research at the United Way of Toronto followed along similar lines: Most of the data generated came from semi-formal interviews although I did have an opportunity to observe a session in which a representative from the Marketing Department was training volunteers on how to use the promotional materials that had just been published.

Different phases and components of the research process involved different forms of negotiation of my subjectivities of whiteness (as an appearance which betrays my mixed race – aboriginal and eastern European heritage), age (as non-youth), status as a student and an outsider to the different cultures (Jane and Finch neighbourhood; the United Way), and gender (as cisgender male). Gaining access to staff at the United Way was extremely challenging given that all calls are screened and vetted by a central communications hub. Service representatives informed me on nu-
merous occasions that because the United Way “receives four phone inquiries a day from students” engaged in some form of “research” that it would be impossible to forward my request for inter-views. I did manage to contact one person involved in marketing, and through her I was able to gain access to two other employees. I also interviewed the creative teams that were responsible for producing the public service announcement campaign (PSA) examined in Chapter 4. In each one of the interviews with United Way staff and people involved in the production of the Way out Youth PSA, I felt what I can only describe as an all too familiar expectation to collude, because of my assumed whiteness, in a formulation of a public (the “we” of the United Way campaign) that was driven in part by a covert impulse to mark non compliant racialised youth differently, and in part, by the frames of multicultural tolerance and belief in the responsivisation of individuals (see chapter 2 for an elaboration of this point). I made a tactical decision to abide by this interpellation for the sake of allowing people to speak “freely” to me (as a white researcher of an assumed classed, educational background), although I continue to ponder the ethics of doing so and the personal costs to my own constructed subjectivity. I have contracted to share portions of my findings with the United Way upon completion of the project.

Because of my work with economically, racialised and sexually disenfranchised youth in different non-profits in Toronto, and because of my role as a part-time College field instructor for students enrolled in a social service worker programme (from 2003-2008), I had established working relationships with several agencies in the Jane Finch Community. I drew on these connections to negotiate a field research site. From the beginning of field work I was received with a (not wholly surprising) mix of openeness and receptiveness from the staff of the Spot (some of whom
were previous students, and some I had met before in a professional capacity), suspicion (as someone who might contribute to the perpetuating of stereotypes of what is the most stigmatized area in the city), and weariness (the area has been poked and prodded by mostly white researchers for years). On all occasions, whether during programming, during community events, going on neighbourhood walkabouts, I was marked as an outsider to the community (by my whiteness and by my “arty, downtown” appearance as I was told by one youth). Moreover, given the youth centred nature of the Spot, I was by far always the oldest person in the room and someone who was clearly removed from this generation of youth cultures. Moreover, because most of the participants were young women, I was also aware of my positioning as an older, white male. In all of this, I decided to practice the advice that a client had told me 15 year previous – “to be real, because we can tell a bull-shitter a mile away”. In this context, I translated the advice in the following ways:

(i) to be cognizant of a protracted history in which people from ethno-racialised communities and youth deemed marginal (or “at risk”) in Canada have experienced exploitation at the hands of white (and sometimes racialised) academic researchers; and to be aware of the ways in which racialised and economically marginalised communities (and in the context of my research, the Spot and Alexander Park Housing Coop) have and are actively negotiating the power differentials that continue to mark their relationships with post-secondary academic institutions. To this end, I am slated to vet key research findings with the director of the Spot, Byron Gray, and will work actively with him to co-write a policy document that incorporates significant findings. I am also working with Jed B on several community arts funding grant initiatives. Ongoing conversations with staff at the Spot provided a further means by which the conduct of the research and my own actions could
be monitored to ensure that I was engaging in respectful, critically aware research.
(ii) to critically reflect on my own experiences of how my appearance of whiteness (despite my mixed race heritage) garners both privilege, and marks me as someone who can easily collude in an ongoing process of colonization; and to be attentive to the ways in which my gender, age, and racialised appearance (in interaction, and separately) were implicated in effecting power differentials in different contexts and within different relationships. I drew from my nearly 20 years of academic and community based activism and professional practice history working within racialised communities, and in particular, with racialised youth to help navigate these different interactions. I also understood that each interaction was unique and as such needed to be approached at an oblique angle from what I had previously experienced. I also made a decision with the youth outreach worker, the director of the Spot, and the community artist employed through the project that I would actively participate in all aspects of the programming and that I would not engage in anything but the most casual of inquiry for the first few months of fieldwork. Finally, I believe that my interest in art and my adequate “talents” in painting and drawing served as a touch point for forming relationships of trust with the youth and the 2 community artists.
(iii) to negotiate a tension between being an invested, curious outsider to the different youth cultures that were being practiced at the Spot, to the Jane Finch community itself, and the largely “Afro-centric culture” that was being promoted and cultivated at the Spot on the one hand (see Chapter 5), and the ease with which I could exoticise these “observed cultures” (by rendering them contextless, static and un-embedded) or assume that I knew anything about them (apart from previous personal/professional engagements with people living/working in the community, my
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personal experiences of being a participant or observer, from what I had read, or based on previous assumptions and readily available stereotypes). The fieldwork process became one, to borrow a sentiment from Edward Said (1995), of being a vigilant excavator of past knowledges and a keen learner of the present. (For a detailed methodological accounting, including field methods – data generation, selection and recruitment, ethics protocol, and interpretative strategies for image and text analysis, please refer to Appendix A).

In terms of how names of individuals and agencies appear in the dissertation, I adhered to the following protocol: For the names of workers, community activists and youth connected to the two agencies explored in Case 3 (Chapter 5) I used pseudonyms, although given how established the agencies are in Toronto youth policy, programme circles, I decided to maintain the two agencies’ actual names. For Cases 1 and 2, I have changed the names of the persons employed directly though the marketing department at the United Way. Given the public status (Fairbanks, 2004) of the names of city officials, together with the names of individuals connected to the production of the Way Out Youth Campaign, the actual names of these key informants’ were used throughout. (For a detailed methodological accounting, including field methods – data generation, selection and recruitment, ethics protocol, and interpretative strategies for image and text analysis, please refer to Appendix A – Detail of Methods).

The work of Images: Several questions about images and their relationship to the work of social policy frame the analysis that follows in the dissertation. Inspired by a British Cultural studies approach to reading images, a first set of questions focuses on the signifying and representational practices of images (Amin, 2009; Goldberg, 2009; Hall, 1997; Mercer, 1998; Wacquant, 11 My use of the phrase “cultural studies” follows in the path of social/psychoanalytic theorist Slavoj Zizek’s own employment of the phrase to describe a knowledge landscape that must be seen not as “a homogenized field” but as “a rhizomatic multitude connected through “family resemblances,” (Zizek, 2002, p. 25). For Zizek, “cultural studies” (so defined) “continues to rely on a set of silent (non-thematized) ontological and epistemological presuppositions on the nature of human knowledge and reality, usually a proto-Nietzschean notion that knowledge is not only embedded in but also generated by a complex set of discursive strategies of power (re)production”.)
2009): (i) what are the discursive referents which give power to these images?; (ii) do these images paint a single, continuous narrative or are their narratives complex, contradictory, fragmented?; and (iii) what are the levels of inter-textual referencing that occur between images (Pollock, 1994)? A second set of questions draws from Visual Studies, Post-Colonial Studies and Anthropology of Media approaches to images’ performative qualities (Jain, 2007; Larkin, 2008). In this assemblage of scholarship, images are considered from the vantage point of their “efficacy” or the “value” in their movement across different thresholds – classes, nations, genders, races and sexualities (Asad, 2003; Hirschkind, 2006; Manalansan, 2005; Poole, 2007; Puar, 2005). The following questions served as analytical departure: (1) How do images participate in the shaping of political, moral, economic and aesthetic landscapes? (Hirshkind, 2006). Relatedly, in what ways do images attempt to instill or instantiate different ideologies and in what ways do they perform these ideologies’ undoing? (Jain, 2006; Larkin, 2008); and finally, what epistemological renderings accompany the production and circulation of visual representations, such that images that abstract and “visually incarnate” social phenomena, are trafficked and received for their evidentiary status and for their ability to render the inaccessible accessible? (Bleichmar, 2009: 455)

(2) What types of domains of visibility (what can be seen, what is secured as seeable) (Huberman, 2005) are orchestrated through a continued production and circulation of images that bear an appearance of interchangeability (Poole, 1997) either in content, formal features, or techniques employed in their rendering (Larkin, 2006; Bleichmar, 2009)? And given the various memories, sentiments, ambitions, desires and fears that are brought to bear on these images by differently situated “interlocutors” in the exchange, in what ways can we understand this domain as being a politicized
space situated in relationship to the displays and production of power? (Asad, 2003).

3) In what ways can the circulation of images be said to interpellate different collectivities of subjects “calling them into being, uniting them in common actions of reading, listening, seeing” (Larkin, 2008, p. 202; Massad, 2007; McClintock, 1995; Puar, 2005). Michael Warner’s idea of a “public” (see footnote 1), embraced by Larkin (2008) and tangentially by Hirschkind, albeit with considerable revision

12 was mobilised in the dissertation for its analytical utility in thinking through how institutions’ ethical and economic interests become invested or implicated in the staging of publics through their circulation of specific images. Moreover, I also considered the question of the employment of specific narrative genres

13 (horror, “ghetto animation”, documentary drama/fiction, and “Request for Proposals” (RFP)) as an attempt to mobilize, instantiate and maintain certain publics (Benshoff, 1997, Cook-Kenna, 2008, Jain, 2010).

Chapter details: Aesthetics of Social Work is organized around a presentation of the three different Case studies, with the beginning two chapters outlining conceptual sightlines and different theoretical strategies for orienting the findings generated through research. Although the three Case studies are presented separately, findings from the other case studies together with theoretical insights that have been imprinted by the ethnographic encounter, reverberate in each case chapter. The first Chapter, Ranciere and the Aesthetics of Social Work Practice/Knowledge, pursues a critical reading of various tenets of social work scholarship that have grappled, in differing ways and to varying degrees with how “art” conceived of as a conceptual vehicle, metaphorical device, or as a mode of intervention, can be thought alongside the project of remapping social work practice towards more utopic, emancipatory or revisionist ends. In this chapter, I propose that political philosopher Jacques Ranciere’s theoretical insights into the conjunction between the “sensible”

12 Larkin (2008) is critical of Warner’s assumption of the discrete nature of publics and counter-publics (their boundedness in conceptual orientation). As Larkin notes, while Warner allows subjects to belong to different publics/counter-publics, the belonging to “incommensurable publics” would necessarily lead to an impossible schizophrenic existence. Larkin’s own work investigates the “transgressive and promiscuous” nature of publics – their ability to shamelessly borrow forms, styles and content from one another to further their own ideological claims.

13 Genre is a contested concept. For my purposes, I understand genre to imply a certain number of textual and social rules, regulations, grammatical structurings for articulating not only relationships between texts (whether they are visual, print, auditory, etc) but that are operative in their attempt to orchestrate relationships between texts and viewers. In other words, genre can be understood as a complex form of communication that imagines certain responses, articulate specific expectations, and can act as a mimetic force for rearticulating normative interests (Berry-Flint, 2007).
structuring of socio-political communities and the politicized practices/experiences of the aesthetic can be productively mobilized as heuristic devices to assist in the analytical mapping of this scholarship. Building on this first theoretical intervention, the concluding section of the chapter suggests a sightline for a “poetics” (Ranciere, 2006b) of social work/social policy political/aesthetic practice that might very well be disruptive to configurations of “consensual logic” operative in current social policy environments. These lessons from Ranciere as to how to think/write the knotting of the aesthetic and state/social services regulatory mechanisms, or politics at this particular socio-historical juncture of globalised neoliberalism and devoluting state welfarism, serve as a first methodological and conceptual scaffolding for the dissertation.

The second chapter, Reading aesthetic technologies at the crossroads of neoliberal and racialised logics, holds the conceptual scaffolding introduced in chapter one in tension with a second conceptual apparatus drawn from an array of authors writing within or at the limits of post-structural (and for some, post-colonial and anti-racist) conceptualizations of contemporary welfare governance, urban planning, securitization and the governance of racialised difference. This chapter begins by positioning social policy related research within a Foucauldian frame of “governmentality”. I then proceed to chart, via different theoretical interventions, several policy domains that help situate the different aesthetic technologies that I examine in the different case studies. A first sightline looks at shifts in liberal governance at a national (and globalised) scale and how these shifts have played out at a local Toronto governance level. While a second intertwined area of probing situates the emergence of moralism and risk as guiding principles for policy formation (particularly in its punitive guise for non-compliance), a tertiary theoretical sightline positions
a concomitant rise in what Wacquant (2009) calls the penal state. That these practices are highly racialised is accounted for and probed further in the construction of this conceptual scaffolding. Finally, Canada’s policy of multiculturalism, as both liberal mode of accommodation and as place of possible resistance, is positioned vis a vis its functioning within other racialised and neoliberal political governance strategies.

My intent in complicating the theoretical landscape presented in chapter 1 is twofold: first, I propose a fleshing out of Ranciere’s rather tersely described concept of the “police” and his positioning of the term “consensual politics” by locating these terms alongside a scholarship inspired by Foucault’s understanding of governmentality. Second, although this chapter proposes that images (and specifically the production of images within different social services contexts) can be read as “technologies of governance” that do the work of different political rationalities (regardless of how completely or intentionally), this particular way of reading ascribes an inexorable (negative) power to the representational work of images – a position that will have been problematised in chapter 1, and addressed again in Chapter 5.

The Third chapter, Currency of the Map, charts the use of different aesthetic techniques for rendering knowable socio-political and economic urban landscapes. The chapter serves two purposes: it is principally a case study that historicises the practices of different aesthetic calculative practices within social policy work; the chapter also makes a series of countermoves to the material critically examined in the case study and provides an alternative “mapping of Toronto” to situate the proceeding case studies in chapters 4 and 5. As a first step, I offer a historical contextualization for social services deployment of mapping, as a technology of liberal governance, by introduc-
interactions of the social (please see chapter 1 for a fleshing out of these theoretical points).

Introducing the precedent that was set by Jane Addams and the residents of Hull-House at the turn of the 20th century in Chicago. Taking a century leap and shifting the sightline of analysis to Toronto, the chapter will then explore calculative processes that City Centre and the United Way of Toronto have utilised for constructing certain urban issues as socio-spatial problematics, and how these techniques are drawn upon to assign validity to certain modes of intervention aligned with a political economy of globalised cities. A final step intervenes in the epistemological grid rendered by these policy experts, and stages another set of socio-political coordinates for considering the complexities of image production as explored in chapters 4 (Case 2) and 5 (Case 3).

Chapter 4, *Monstrosities and Moral Publics*, examines a youth focused visual advertisement campaign sponsored by the United Way of Toronto that appeared on the Toronto landscape starting in 2007. In this chapter, I detail various dimensions of the social life of the generated 30 second PSA film associated with the campaign – the ethical, political and economic valences it is expected to convey, its semiotic exchange with other images and representations of youth, the publics it attempts to interpellate, and how it coheres as a corporate marker of the United Way. Finally, I consider the campaign as a technique of governance, shaped by and giving shape to certain political rationalities, that attempts to wield its influence in shaping policy directives targeting disenfranchised youth.

Chapter 6, *Off the Wall* (Case 3), examines the deployment and practices of community mural making as rationalized, aesthetic techniques for achieving two inter-related neo-liberal governance initiatives: the mending of a tear in the socio-economic fabric of the city, and the governing of disenfranchised/racialised youth in alignment with globalised creative city aspirations. In the
In the first part of this chapter, I offer an analysis of different institutionally placed stakeholders’ investments in realising the Graffiti Transformation Program as a form of knowledge grid aligning “normal” social behaviour, as framed within a liberal multicultural sensibility, with a market oriented and moralized understanding of how globalised urban centres and subjects should function. In the latter part of the chapter I draw from two events to highlight the various tactics that programme participants deployed to negotiate their compliance with these stated program imperatives.

In the concluding chapter, Concluding thoughts and a fourfold proposition, I consider the relevance of this analysis of different modalities of aesthetic governance for future social policy practice targeting racialised and economically disenfranchised youth living in globalised urban areas. I also forward some thoughts on how social work, as an inquiring practice intent on knowledge building, might think more intently about its critical engagements with visual fields in this era of welfare devolution and globalised neoliberalism.

In the Appendix to the dissertation, Appendix – Detail of Methods, I include a more detailed description of research methods followed in the preparation of this the dissertation as a supplement to what was already offered in the previous section of this introduction.

A Note on the Graphic Layout: My inclusion of footnotes and images within the body of the text serves several “functions”: Given that the dissertation attempts to instantiate a type of conversational flow between theoretical concepts and empirical data, the notes act as both guide to a technical language that might not be familiar to a social work audience, and as a type of parallel text to be read simultaneous alongside the usage of the concept within a more empirical setting. In a parallel way, images at first blush, are relied upon instrumentally to illustrate a point that I am

---

15 “Tactics” is Michel de Certeau’s technical term for the small practices that occur within the spaces of ordinary living, the everyday spontaneous transgressions or “poachings” of normative discourse used towards strategic ends (de Certeau, 1984)
making in the text. And yet, the placement of the images pays heed to Jacques Ranciere and art historian George Didi-Huberman’s critique of such a rationalist approach that desires to exhaust (or synthesize) all that images have to say. Rather, both authors point to either the “underside” of images (Didi-Huberman, 2005) - to the symptom formations operating within the rend of an image - the tear between its “visibility (its ideological/symbolic content) and its visuality (what it says in its multiplicity) or to the possibility of images as sites for disidentification (Ranciere, 2009(a); 2009 (b)) - the rend between explanations of policing (what is) and assertions of the strange (what might be possible). Thus, in one sense, the images will speak on their own terms in the text, perhaps disrupting, or offering another condition of possibility to that rendered by the field of visuality conditioned by the text itself.

**Final consideration: Positioning the investigations.** My research marks an intervention in the social policy and social welfare literature in two substantive ways. As social work writer Amy Rossiter (2005) argues, it is an ethical imperative that social work be critically reflective about, and contest the field’s concepts and constructions about the clients that it engages with and about the mechanisms and strategies that are deployed to engage with these targeted groups. Conversely though, Yoosun Park (2006, 2008) suggests that there is also a responsibility to be vigilant about our own modes of resistance and oppositional knowledge production. Reflexive engagement in the thinking through of our own ways of knowing and practicing evokes the following impossible questions (impossible because they reside at the limits of our own thinking abilities): How are we thinking? How do we know that we can think differently? How it is that we are thinking differently? In light of this call to interrogate processes of thinking, concept production and deployment,
my research becomes relevant on several fronts: First, it produces valuable knowledge about the epistemologies of the aesthetic operative within social work spaces. Second, and as a related point, the study offers insight into the different ways in which neo-liberal and racist/colonialist rationalities are produced, circulated and resisted via the image in spaces dedicated to working with youth deemed “at risk”. Finally, I see these interventions happening first and foremost in the practice of writing as a register of intervention/innovation in its own right. Following the path of Ranciere (I examine this point in explicit detail in Chapter 1 and then again in chapter 5), I suggest that writing allows the “practitioner” to position both regressive and possibly transgressive practices occurring within the register of the aesthetic as two simultaneously occurring interventions in the sensible. This placement of two “what ifs”, I assume, allows for other insights into how knowledge is/can be formulated and quite possibly, how we might think/practice differently than what we know now. 

16 I would like to thank Kajri Jain for this suggestion.
Chapter 01

Ranciere and the Aesthetics of Social Work Practice
On the one hand, it’s perfectly true that if what you want is changes in policy, you’re not likely to get them from art. On the other hand, if what you want is a vision of the structures that produce both the policies we’ve got and the desire for alternatives, art is almost the only place you can find it. (Walter Ben Michaels, 2011)

Mel Gray and Stephen Webb have written a challenging set of papers (2008, 2009) that attempt to recast social work practice as “an art in the service of a politics of liberation” (2009, p. 111). This proposed project of orienting a social work ethics towards its agentic-political “beingness” - as “artistic expression” - heralds a disordering of a “productionist and instrumental rationality” (2008, p. 414) that they argue has encroached upon the domain of social work practice since the late 1980’s with the advent of late capitalist modalities of global and national governance. In a parallel move, Adrienne Chambon (2010) has written a provocative piece that appeared in another social work journal a year following Gray and Web’s publications. Rather than focusing on the metaphoric alignment of, or ontological positioning of, arts and social work, or the use of arts programming in the work of the social, she asks alternatively, “what can practice of arts do for social work” (p. 219). Here, Chambon is interested in reading between and across two sets of discursive/material/relational practices – art (and in her piece, two artists’ works), and social work - that she argues make interventions, in their own ways, into “the cultural landscape”, shaping and disrupting the social, political, economic, intimate and relational fabric of life. This exploratory work of transcription and transposition can result, she claims, in a renewed understanding of social science, and specifically social work ways of intervening and being present in cultural space.

These two recent attempts to re-align social work with the work of art as dissonant “political” (Gray and Webb) or “cultural” (Chambon) practice, are illustrative of a host of social work practices...
and health science writings that have appeared in social work and allied journals over the past few years. In their tenure and ambitions, they complement, albeit, critically so, a protracted history of social work writing in which the practices of social work are positioned in light of, or in connection with, what is commonly understood as “art” or more precisely, “aesthetic practices”. The writings within this tradition are clustered into isolated nodes of thought covering a range of practice sites - research, clinical or community engagement, social policy formation and implementation, advocacy and activism, epistemology/knowledge production, pedagogy, method, the subjectivity of the practitioner himself/herself - with faint lines of communication traced between some but not all of these groupings. Depending on the philosophical/sociological traditions (implicitly) drawn upon, the literature has manifested in what amounts to be divergent and at times, contradictory readings on the “nature of art”, “the nature of the work of art” or “the aesthetic” deployed to characterize social practice. I would argue that this literature grapples, tout court, with how art as a conceptual vehicle, metaphorical device, or as a mode of intervention, can be thought alongside the project of remapping social work practice towards more utopic, emancipatory or revisionist ends. In other words, for this assemblage of authors, the ‘work of the social’ (Gray and Webb, 2009) can be necessarily imbricated with ‘art’ and ‘politics’, such that this coupling or layering serves as an orienting marker to think social work within or against socio-political environments dominated by (neo) liberal democratic rationalities and practices.

In this chapter, I introduce a number of French philosopher Jacques Ranciere’s key theoretical insights into the conjunction between the material, sensible, and symbolic structuring of socio-political communities and the practices/experiences of the aesthetic, as heuristic devises to
assist both in the analytical mapping of this social work scholarship on “art” and in establishing a theoretical ‘poetics’ (Ranciere, 2006b) for reading/writing the case studies forwarded in the dissertation. The paths leading to and around Ranciere’s intellectual corpus are by now well marked: Ranciere’s writings and thoughts currently hold court in contemporary European continental philosophy circles, along with writers like Alain Badiou and Slavoj Zizek, to name a few. As Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Paris VIII (St. Denis), he was the key invited thinker at the European Graduate School in 2009; he continues to teach as a guest professor in a number of other Universities, including Berkeley, Rutgers, and Harvard; and he occupies a place of prominence in a host of journals devoted to explorations of contemporary thinking around issues like human rights, aesthetics, and politics. Moreover, as his writings have become more readily available in English translation over the past decade, English speaking scholars, artists, and writers working within and across the disciplines of art theory/criticism, philosophy, education, architecture, geography, anthropology, political science and sociology have made similar productive turns (cf, Chamber, 2009; De Genova, 2010; Holmes, 2009; Nyers, 2008; Panagia, 2000). Unfortunately, with the exception of Gray and Webb (2009), who make only casual reference to Ranciere’s work, I am aware of no others in Social Work who have followed suit. Bracketing aside the value of Ranciere’s currently held intellectual currency for trading within academic circuits (which in itself might propel some to embrace his work), I would argue that his theorizing on equality, and his understanding of politics and the aesthetic offer an extra marketable value to enhance and disrupt current social work scholarship on social policy governance (and by extension, the scholarship’s relation to social work practice conceived of in its most expansive sense).
Several questions reworked from Ranciere’s own questions about what drives his writings (2002, 2010) introduce these technical terms and serve as orienting markers to this chapter, and proceeding chapters (specifically, Chapters 3 through 5): (1). How is it possible that a form of aesthetic expression created by social work’s clients is understood as “art” and then further identified with representations of everyday life (and specifically, with the representations of a traumatic or marginalized/oppressed life)? (2). Tangentially, how does it make sense that social work practice has been construed as an artistic form that heralds or evokes liberatory or ethical forms of social life? (3). Alternatively, how is it possible to understand the work of the practitioner/policy maker herself as an art maker implicated in the (co-)creation of forms of life that are imagined as both a self contained work (“a created form”) and an expression of a renewed sensibility and mode of coping with social experience? (4) How is it possible to make sense of the pedagogical, therapeutic, redemptive or political function that is imputed to images produced or utilized within social work practice and spaces? And finally, in what ways can we consider the aesthetic as both inherent to the work of the social, and as a possible site for disruption to the ways in which social work constructs its own grids of knowledge/power?

Through these questions, and via an elaboration of Ranciere’s technical terms outlined below, I propose an exploration of the working suppositions operative within social work scholarship about the visible, the thinkable, the sayable that knot in specific ways certain understandings of what is conceived as artistic works/aesthetic practices and what are comprehended as workable/conceivable forms of “political”, ethical or “social” experience and practice (Ranciere, 2002). Specifically, my intent for this chapter is twofold: First, to tease out the epistemological assumptions
that ground these various representational couplings of “art” as form and experience with differing modes operative within social work (as represented in the social work scholarship) - the products of this practice, the pedagogy that drives the practice or the practice itself; And second, to position Ranciere’s insights as a plausible sightline for re-thinking the operatives of aesthetic governance techniques emerging within policy fields that I document in the following chapters.

A Rancierian Frame: Technical language guiding a “poetics of knowledge”

**The distribution (partage) of the sensible** is Ranciere’s technical term for a “system of self-evident facts of sense perceptions” (Ranciere, 2007a, p. 12) that enunciates how spaces are configured, what modes of being people occupy, who is deemed worthy of participation in the social body (the polis), who is deemed “a speaking being”, the occupations they inhabit, how time is perceived, the defining of the visible, the thinkable, the sayable, the hearable, of what is shared and what is to be excluded. For Ranciere then, the distribution of the sensible “reveals” what is perceptible or more precisely, what can legitimately present itself to sense experience, and thus, consequently what can be deemed comprehensible to the system itself (Ranciere, 2007a, p. 13). While the term maintains the primacy of the signifier as a marker for limiting what necessarily would be an endless relational play of signified meanings, it is important to keep in mind that his notion of signification emphasizes the performative quality of the divisioning rather than its communicative or representational functioning (Phillips, 2010).

**The police**, according to Ranciere’s poetical framing, involves a systematic, “polemical” production of the distribution of the sensible into “groups, social positions and functions” (Ranciere,
Ranciere’s understanding of “political interlocution” as disagreement or “dissensus” stands in direct contrast to a Habermasian or Rawlsian conception of communication/politics that emphasize a rationalist mode of communication between competing interests (Zizek, 2007). Quoting Ranciere: “...what radically distinguishes my thinking from a communicative rationality model is that I do not accept the premise that there is a specific form of political rationality that may be directly deduced from the essence of language or from the activity of communication. The Habermasian schema presupposes, in the very logic of argumentative exchange, the existence of a priori pragmatic constraints that compel interlocutors to enter into a relation of inter-comprehension, if they wish to be self-coherent. This presupposes further that both the interlocutors and the objects about which they speak are preconstituted; whereas from my perspective, there can be political exchange only when there isn’t such a pre-established agreement – not only, that regarding the objects of debate but also regarding the status of the speakers themselves. It is this phenomenon that I call disagreement’ (Ranciere, 2000, p. 116).

For Ranciere, consensual models of governance presume “a natural functional order of relations in the social body” (Zizek, 2007, p. 70), a structuring, he refers to as “the police” (1999, p.31) and the rigid reiteration and protection of this system in the name of its “naturalness”, its pre-ordainedness. The police is thus understood as a normativising system of fluid exchange and erection of boundaries operating through the managerial channels of the “state” (see Chapter 2) and market. Given a tendency within social work writings on social justice to passively assume or actively rely on Rawlsian or Habermasian theoretical foundations for their analysis (Banerjee, 2005), it is important to pay heed to Ranciere’s critical assessment of these adopted frames in relation to this concept of the police. For Ranciere, a Rawlsian or Habermasian conceptualization of consensual governance assumes the movement towards agreement or understanding between pre-scripted social groups (Ranciere, 2007a, p.5, Ranciere, 1999). The practice of accommodating difference is thus understood as representative of “a functionalist affirmation of the status quo of objective givens” (Ranciere, 2007a, p.5) which discounts the role that the “discounted” (or unaccounted for) can play in the reformulation of community. As Zizek notes in reference to Ranciere’s critique, Rawlsian and Habermasian ethics’ affirmations of pre-established rules of engagement in the name of consensus, reorients the conflictual praxis of politics into the practice of competition between designated parties. As such, this formulation of “politics” is, for Ranciere (via Zizek, 2007) nothing but an attempt to defuse agonistic expression in order to prevent it from erupting into representational space. (cf Ranciere, 1999).

Similarly, equality, for Ranciere, must not be taken in its Rawlsian liberal democratic sense - manifested in approaches that presume (and indeed posture) that all are accounted for and heard, and properly so in the negotiation of democratic governance. In effect, liberal governance claims equality as a mechanism for the (re)production of social and political elements that serve to dis-
stance certain individuals from their own capabilities (Power, 2009; Ranciere, 1991). Similarly, equality must not be understood as an “ontological priority” nor as the practice of “equivalence” operative in “biopolitical democratic models of the human” that count as equal only those subjectivities which have been rendered visible and reducible to “single, homogenous and representational measures” for the purposes of intervention upon collective life (Power, 2009, p. 67; cf Rabinow & Rose, 2006; see chapter 2). Rather, equality, in Ranciere’s poetics, is a presupposition that only materializes or functions when put into action. To quote Ranciere, “equality is the condition required for being able to think politics” (Ranciere, 2004, p. 52) and yet the presence of equality does not assume that politics is also present. Politics is only generated from equality when there is an active expression of “dissensus”.

There is an attempt throughout Ranciere’s writings to trace poetic moments of dissensual subjectivization in which the people speak for themselves (Ranciere, 1999, p. 35) and where the presupposed equality of the discounted is proclaimed. Dissensus, put simply, effects a change in the “global perception of social space” (Zizek, 2007, p. 69). To desire, to demand a right to express and exercise a political right of power and entrance into dialogue, suggests an agonistically positioned mode of interaction that speaks of legitimacy of expression and an equality of presence. “The protest of the wrong” (Zizeck, 2007, p.69), made by the people who count for nothing, is simultaneously their standing in the place of the whole, in its universality against those power brokering interests that attempt to represent the universal as the exclusive claim of the privileged (Ranciere, 2004).

Politics, as a comparatively rare event, is a sustained proclamation and a destabilizing force...
that rationally and poetically calls into question the naturalized ordering of the social body where every part has been accorded its ascribed place, including the rules by which one is permitted to speak and be heard, including the “objects of reference and the place of the speaking subjects” (Ranciere, 2000, p. 116). We must remember that when Ranciere speaks of politics interrupting with a logic “heterogeneous to that of the police”, that this logic is at once “bound up with” what is presently configured, and sits at the limit of its possibility. (Ranciere, 2007a, pp. 52; 1999, pp. 33). This is because politics is contentless; it lacks specifiable objectives or a reified subject. It simply cannot be conceived of in advance. Driven by the principle of equality, politics, as a form of expression, confirms equality by instantiating a dispute, by highlighting the operative of divisiveness in the heart of police logic (Ranciere, 1999). Thought in this way, politics is not about a struggle for power, nor is it principally about the expression of experiences of victimization and pain. It is foremost about the declaration of equality to effect a redistribution of the sense of the common. As Ranciere so persuasively argues, “Politics occurs when those who have no time necessary to front up as inhabitants of a common space and demonstrate that their mouths really do emit speech capable of making pronouncements on the common which cannot be reduced to voices signaling pain” (2009b, p. 24).

How then to think about, to imagine this politics that asserts the surplus or the invisible as the embodiment of the whole of the social body? It is in The Politics of the Aesthetic that Ranciere (2004) problematises the relationship between politics and aesthetics as parallel processes implicated in the realm of the distribution of the sensible. Aesthetics can be thought of as both a system of a priori forms for articulating the “delimitation of spaces and times, of the visible and the invis-
able” (Ranciere, 2007a, p.13) and simultaneously, as that which can inform the spatial properties, temporal possibilities and situational form of what the police order and politics might be (Ranciere, 2007a). Seen in this light, political conflict is understood as an aesthetic concern and as an “aesthetic intervention on the distribution of the sensible” (Ranciere, 2009a, p. 121). In other words, the articulation and instantiation of equality is at its core both a rational statement about the legitimacy of the current configuration of the distribution of the sensible (place, order, its subjects), and a poetic proposition of a virtual community, or mode of existence of the sensible that eludes the norms of representation based on litigious divisioning (Ranciere, 1999). There is thus, as Ranciere will argue an aesthetics that resides alongside the core of politics.

Aesthetic practices, for Ranciere, may also be seen as having “at its core a politics” (to re-word Ranciere, 2007a, p. 13), but as he insists, this does not imply an instrumentalist “commandeering of politics by a will to art” (Ranciere, 2007a, p. 12). Rather, Ranciere begins with a set of precise definitions of the aesthetic, aesthetic practices, art, and artistic forms, a conceptual system that has parallel operations with politics in enacting the imaging of the distribution and sharing of the common (Hardt, 2008). Aesthetics, in its broadest sense, is to be understood “as a system of a priori forms determining what presents itself to sense experience” (Ranciere, 1999, p. 58). It is a mode of the distribution of the sensible that links perception, action, and ways of thinking and forms/relations of production. In Ranciere’s words, aesthetics are the “forms of visibility that disclose artistic practices, the place they occupy, what they do or make from the standpoint of what is common to the community” (2004, 13).

The ways in which a certain distribution of the sensible articulate different modalities of im-

07__

Ranciere’s use of the word people represents a significant departure from sociological categorizations of “marginalization” (class, race, etc.) and in its stead, posits an “imagined” assemblage of those who are representative of a presupposed equality, whose very presence signals a fundamental inequality at work in the polis and thus conditions the possibility for the activation of ‘politics’ (see below). Similarly, in another context, where he actively refutes the categorization of “class” as an inscribable identity of the proletariat, Ranciere argues the following: “The class that is not a class thus becomes an operator of declassification. The proletariat is no longer a part of society but is, rather, the symbolic inscription of ‘the part of those who have no part’, a supplement which separates the political community from any count of the parts of a society” (Ranciere, 2005, p. 287).

08__

This reference to the wrong is a play on the title/content of the text Philosophy of Right in which Hegel asserted that the common, or what is commonly shared, is not man’s (in its specific gendered sense) rationality or feelings, but ownership of property and the social relations that manifest because of these monetarist/materialist relationships (Power, 2009).
This quote makes reference to an example, often cited in Ranciere’s writings (2007a, 2007b, 1999), in which Plato’s declaration that artisans have no time but to practice their craft, becomes a “naturalized prohibition” against the artisan from participating in the assembly of men. Here, the prohibition, as Ranciere notes, is figured into a form of “sensory experience” itself (2009b, p. 24).

age production (and correspondingly, the symbolic and sensible experiences of social life including the polis) can be understood further in relationship to his tri-partite scheme of epochal shifts within the Western tradition of image/artistic production. Important to note here, is Ranciere’s referencing of the importance of Foucault’s ‘genealogical’ method (Foucault, 1975) in articulating his own mapping of regime shifts at work in the creating and understanding of image production. Ranciere does note however, that whereas Foucault’s term evokes a ‘schema of historical necessity’ (2004, p. 50) which suggests a rupture within a system of expression, a moment where something is no longer thinkable, no longer formidable, Ranciere’s conceptualization allows for the historically constituted emergence of a new sensibility/visibility at work (e.g. the Aesthetic regime), the continued presence of a pre-existing, once dominant regime (e.g., the regime of representation) and/or the emergence of hybrid schematic forms (Ranciere, 2007; 2010).

The first “regime” or epoch is what Ranciere refers to as the **ethical regime of images** and is understood to be characteristic of Platonism. Here, two questions dictate the sensible: what is the origin or truth content of the image (i.e. does the image transpose what is essential to the original, its truth value); and to what ends will these images be put (how will they be used and to what effect in shaping the moral showing of the community)? As Ranciere suggests, it is within this regime that concern is with “knowing in what way images’ mode of being affects the ethos, the mode of being of individuals and communities” (Ranciere, 2007a, p. 21) and in what ways can artistic expression lend its conviction of semblance to a truth already prescribed by external systems of thought (Phillips, 2009).

“Breaking away” from the ethical regime is a regime that Ranciere refers to as the “**poetic**
or representative regime of the arts. This regime establishes a regulated system of identification that concerns itself less with questions of authenticity or truth value of the artistic expression than with a vigilance assuring agreement between the assumed inherent quality of the subject matter, whose value is hierarchically positioned, and the “genres of representation” (Ranciere, 2007a, p. 33). Forms of normativity (a logic) are established “at a distance” to dictate the proper ways of doing and making, means to recognize “good” from “bad” art, and a strict partitioning of what is representable and unrepresentable and what form/genres corresponded to what specific content. Mimesis or a system of representation along Aristotelian lines that understands imitation as a mirroring back of a more perfected reality than reality itself, is employed as a pragmatic principle to isolate out specific art forms that can most properly rearticulate, as global analogy, the socially orchestrated and hierarchicalized positioning of the political and social world. It is in this regime, via a reworking of the Aristotelian proposition of catharsis, that art is ascribed a therapeutic function; art, as a public act and as an assumed assemblage of representational forms that mimesetically perform existing power structures, and harness the desires of the audience to effect a transference of that affective charge towards socially prescribed ends (Badiou, 2004). Entrenched in the mimetic tradition is a presumed linkage between artistic intention, what the art speaks or signifies, the audience’s reception of that message and actions that result. This assumed relation between cause and effect, intention and consequence suggests that what the viewer sees is entwined with the signs accorded to the resolve of the artist, a form of enmeshed recognition that induces three critical moments of spectator reflexive action: an examination of the world surrounding the audience as subject; a subjective reflexivity as to the nearness or distance of the subject’s own lived experience
to this revelation; and ultimately, the spectator’s intervention based on reflections as staged by the artist (Ranciere, 2010).

The “aesthetic regime of the arts”, in contrast to the representative regime, repositions artistic expression as both defining its own ‘sensorium’ - the separation of form from concept or context (the regime’s self understanding of its own mode of production) and a generator of its own truth forms - and simultaneously as a “co-presence” of heterogeneous temporalities in which artistic expression is implicated in and capable of expressing life’s process of self/social formation and a myriad of associated meanings (Ranciere, 2009a). In Ranciere’s schema, it is within the aesthetic regime that the aesthetic’s very ability to effect an indifferent production of meanings, images, and words, allows for a more egalitarian reconfiguration of the contours of the livable, the affable, the relational and the perceptual.

And yet, Ranciere (2004) admonishes the making of an easy connection between artistic form/production and politics, and specifically, a rendering of a simplistic equivalence between an equality operating within a “politicized piece of art” (p. 57) and a moment of political expression, in which disruption transpires. In effect, what Ranciere is careful to articulate in the Politics of Aesthetics and the Aesthetics and its Discontents is an important distinction between “the politics of art” or the form of politicization at work in a piece of art, and the act of constructing political disensus. To be precise, what art constitutes is both a “space of presentation” such that things gathered/made are identified as art (their ‘space of resistance’) and a form that resembles other life processes where art bleeds into life – ‘the becoming life of art’ (Ranciere, 2009b, p. 116-118). These two nascent forms of politicized aesthetics exist, for Ranciere, in irreconcilable and paradoxical tension.
with one another. Accordingly, it is not principally the content or message that art conveys about
the current state of world affairs that signifies a politics at work, nor is it the mode of expression
(formalist concerns) as representative of sociological categorizations of identity, tensions, conflict;
rather, art can be understood as bearing upon the political because of its ability to reframe or sus-
pend what is understood as the common (a common that has been traced, tracked and configured
by police logic). In other words, art as politics is the declaration of a “way of bringing about” a
redistribution of a space/time - material/object - places/identities configuration such that differ-
ent modes of the sensible are brought into tension with one another, and that which was rendered
un-sayable, un-thinkable, and those who were rendered speechless, invisible are introduced to be
heard, to be seen (Ranciere, 2009b, p. 24). To quote Ranciere at length:

“The dream of a suitable political work of art is in fact the dream of disrupting the
relationship between the visible, the sayable, and the thinkable without having to
use the terms of a message as a vehicle. It is the dream of an art that would transmit
meanings in the form of a rupture with the very logic of meaningful situations...poli-
tical art cannot work in the simple form of a meaningful spectacle that would lead
to an awareness of the state of the world. Suitable political art would ensure, at one in
the same time, the production of a double effect: the readability of a political signifi-
cation and a sensible or perceptual shock caused, conversely, by the uncanny, by that
which resists signification. In fact, this ideal effect is always the object of negotiation
between opposites, between the readability of the message that threatens to destroy
the sensible form of art and the radical uncanniness that threatens to destroy all
meaning” (Ranciere, 2007a: 63).

Mapping the literature: a Rancerian intervention

Social work literature, I contend, articulates “art’s” relationship to the work of the social
according to two principle poetic assemblages: A first assemblage, articulates what I would argue to be, via Ranciere’s tri-partite schema, an ethico-aesthetic sensibility for perceiving art, in which the traces of a logic of “ethical immediacy” (the revelation of a truth of the common) and the logic of an “aesthetic separation’ embodied in practices of the aesthetic regime (Ranciere, 2010) are to varying degrees, knotted with one another. A second assemblage of social work writings similarly embraces the basic tenets operative within the generalized logic environment of the aesthetic regime - that meaning inheres within the image itself, a radical questioning of the divisioning between life forms and art, an indifference of content with regards to style. And yet, there is a confounding of this poetics with a secondary logics thread in which modes of representation (through genre, through language) align socially prescribed traits and behaviours, pathos and plotlines with certain subjective positions (organized along class, gendered, racialised, etc lines). The effect of this codifying of normative conditions as viewed through “a grid of expressive convention” (Ranciere, as cited in Davis, 2010, p. 134) is, for Ranciere, nothing short of an intrinsically hierarchical ordering of human subjects. Typical of this poetics is its usage of fabulation, a tracing or unfolding of a story of human endeavour that is replete with stock characterizations and normative truisms. This assemblage, I would argue also bears the weight of an ethical dimension, a testimony to the lingering legacy of social work as a moralizing enterprise. Thus, reflected in certain social work writings adhering to a hybridised aesthetic-representational (ethical) schema is a belief in the mediational or declarative efficacy of images produced by clients, or about clients’ lives, to incite catharsis or a goodness of change in the viewer (and here, the audience can be constitutive of both a client herself reflexively engaging with her own visual, performative, audio or poetic work, or as some other
viewing/participating subject reading images produced by or about clients/client’s lives - social work students in pedagogical settings, policy makers and community audiences reading the visual evidence produced through research initiatives or arts based projects). To be clear, these assemblages that I have constructed for heuristic purposes are, provisional, porous, at times weakly articulated, and importantly constituted by poetics that are in “productive tension” with one another (Ranciere, as cited in Davis, 2010, p. 128). The utility of viewing social work scholarship through these schematic lenses I contend, is that they afford an insight into the following proposition: how social work scholarship positions the work of art, the poetics that are drawn upon, and the different tensions operative within these knowledge pieces, are expressive of the different governance strategies that are favoured in tending to social work’s ongoing project of imagining and projecting towards, regulating, and caring for, an assumed social.

**Assemblage 1 - Social Work as Ethico-Romantic/Aesthetic Practice:** One strand within this assemblage, borrowing from the Romantic tradition, forges a metaphorical linkage between the “intuitive”, “creative” and “self-expressive” qualities of the artist and ‘artistic’ sensibility at work in the provisioning of “help” (where help is understood not so much as the provisioning of material objects, as assisting with the client’s ability to forge a more truthful or contented existence). Thus, like an artist, the practitioner, for Berlin (1996), England (1986), Goldstein (1992; 1997; 1999), and Okitikpi & Aymer (2008), is said to draw from her/his own inner pool of perceptive and creative resources to intuit meaning from the social and affective experiences of clients. Creativity, or more specifically, the cultivation of an “aesthetic sensibility” in this mode, is the vehicle that allows for the social worker to translate between their own experiences as a grounding truth and
their impressionistic/ affective sense of the client’s world. Indeed, for this collection of authors, it is the expressed aesthetic ability to intuit, to imagine that is believed to enable the “intellectual and emotional complexity of a moment in time” to be represented in a form (the painting for an artist, feedback and supportive counsel for the social worker) that has inherent value for others (England, 1986, p. 107-08). As Goldstein states: “It is the artist’s, social worker’s ability to transform the depths and layers of human experience, magically into a single, exceptional work…that leaves its audience in wonder” (1998, cited in Gray, 2002, p. 422).

A second vein of this assemblage, also emanating from the “social work as art” literature tends towards the positing of what Gray and Webb (2008) refer to as an “aestheticized” model of care which draws attention to moments of “beauty”, “joy”, and “resolution” and redemption operating within the client-worker dynamic. Again, what is referenced in this perspective, are the agentic and psychological facilities of the artist as practitioner to enliven the “art of playfulness” and “creativity” in the service of mediating and resolving tensions inherent to the client’s life (and presumably, also, within the client-worker dynamic). Wiegand (1979), for example, suggests that the social worker is like the sculptor, who, intuiting the essence and capabilities of the material (the client’s potential, her “true spirit”) is capable of sculpting a beautiful form from the raw material of the marble. Mendelson (1973) suggests that like art, social work is able to accommodate, to hold the world of emotions, and to use them as a basis for guidance. And in Goldstein’s writing (1999) artistic practice “preserves the quality of humanism” in that moment when client and practitioner conjoin “to locate lost virtues, strengths and expectations” (p. 388). Moreover, in his influential book, Social Work as Art: making Sense for Good practice, Hugh England (1985) likened the social worker to
Shelly’s understanding of the poet who must “strive for the most meaningful understanding, the ‘highest form’ of harmony in making sense of the troubled world of the client” (p. 72). In another place, England paraphrases Shelly in the following way: social workers work to “withdraw life’s dark veil from before the scene of things” (p. 67). Operative within both of these understandings of social practice as artistic endeavor is an assumption about the power of the artist, and subsequently the “art” created - its ability to assert a presence of “truth”, “beauty”, “wonder”, “caring” that is, in some senses decontextualised from the client’s life and from the institutional setting/knowledges that have informed the very performance and staging of the “artistic event”. In other words, practice’s claims of its revelatory abilities, its “luminous” power, are made possible because of a seeming indifference to, or disregard for, the discursive contexts in which the art is said to emerge (Ranciere, 2009, p. 27).

I would suggest that this particular cluster of qualities ascribed to the work of art/social work - an understanding of the importance of the artistic signature (the power of the “artist/social worker” to inscribe its creative originality onto the work of art), and the disinterestedness ascribed to both the process of art production and art “reception” (the social worker as both maker and reader of the image) - can be understood as an attempt to assert a social distinction between worker and client if we follow a line of argument forwarded in Bourdieu’s sociological framing of how Kantian aesthetic judgment served as a productive ground for establishing/sustaining European capitalist social hierarchy (Jain, 2007; cf., Bourdieu, 1984). Two things are of note in what Jain (and others - cf Mattick, 1993; Schusterman, 1993; Woodmansee, 1994) argues amounts to this bourgeois reformulation of Kantian aesthetic concepts: First, the conceptualization of “aesthetic

10 In the Kantian schema, a distinction is made between “pleasures” that are taken in the virtuous, a judgment that implicates the subject (i.e., a form of self-investment) in bringing the pronounced moral goodness into existence, and the judgment of taste which is divorced of such ego investments. I use disinterestedness in two inter-related ways - to signal the decontextualization of the client’s subjective realities from the pronouncement of an aesthetic sensibility, and what appears to be an inciting of a Kantian formulation in which there is a temporary bracketing of moral concerns during those moments in which art is being conceived and perceived. See argument above for a discussion of this tension between morality and aesthetic play.
value” as both product of authorial inscription, and reflexive judgment by a subject attuned to art’s proper value, is predicated on a particular formulation of the “free, productive individual” who possessed the propriety rights to script himself in the public realm and to claim authorship (Jain, 2007). Second, this aesthetic formulation, resting as it is on liberal/classed and gendered notions of subjectivity (Batterby, 1989; Korsmeyer, 2004), was initially aligned with the specific interests of an emergent European bourgeoisie in which the ability to engage in “judgments of taste” was deemed to be the sole purview of that socio-economic class. In other words, as Pierre Bourdieu makes clear, social distinction, as (re)inscription of class hierarchy, was (and arguably, continues to be to varying degrees) predicated on the performance of aesthetic judgment: the working class were thought of as inhabiting base or more vulgar forms of taste (more corporeal, less intellectually mediated) and to be missing the requisite skills to be able to pronounce valid aesthetic judgments; the bourgeoisie, on the other hand possessed this acculturated ability to be reflective and to be possessive of more cultivated sensibilities to art. Is it possible to argue, then, via Bourdieu, that this very re-reading of Kantian aesthetic formulations in social work writings inadvertently enunciates a social/class/gendered/racialised distinction between the professional social worker (educated, informed, cultivated) and the client (more corporeal, uneducated to reflective sensibilities and inhabiting an unmediated intellect) such that not only is the authorial presence of the social worker reinforced, but that the tenets of a shared professionalism (an aligning of a collectivized subject/class and requisite skills of taste and judgment) is re-inscribed through its performance? Read through a sociological lens, this strain of scholarship might very well be implicated in the discursive policing of social services practice in which an aesthetic sensibility is harnessed to a professionalized social
work identity resulting in a shoring up of professional power and regulatory authority over clients as a classed subjectivity. This professional assertion of aesthetic judgment and authorial presence necessitates, however, a certain bracketing of it’s own subjective investments in the realizing of an “ethics of care” - and the accommodation of these very “artistic” expressions/sensibilities into an acclaimed nurturing/affective economy post creation-judgment.

Another cluster of thought within this ethico-aesthetic assemblage, positions literature and visual art in terms of their ethical-pedagogic function - as an heuristic tool, or as an untapped knowledge base in which to rethink questions of practice, research and policy. Earlier writings within this sub-genre tended to focus on art works as either complementing or expanding the epistemological frames already operating within social work practice. Irvine (1974), Millard (1979), O’Hagan (1981) and Valk (1979) for example, proposed that the reading of literature be included in social work education curriculum because of literature’s attention to interactions between “whole people”, and because of its insights into the full nature of humanity in their “natural habitat” and in all “of its dignity”. Moreover, for these authors, reading “literature” was thought to enhance our sensitivity, our scope of sensibility, for gaining access to the sensible world, and because it engendered hope.

For England (1985), as for Whan (1979) and Berlin (1996), however, the utility of reading literature was not so much to learn from its non-representational content but from its form. Here, literature’s formal qualities are understood as the “imaginative process of selection and synthesis” (Berlin, 1996, p. 27) at play and as a means for procuring an interpretive temporal and composite account of scattered events. By studying literature’s form, social work can learn the skill of giving
shape to meaning and producing a narrative of hope from the shards of reality, experiences and emotion that the client presents. These parallel structures in which elaborate connections between the form of literature, the form of social work practice, and the skills inherent in the subjective make-up of the writer/social worker are forged, are operative in the following quote by Berlin:

“[Social workers] possess a capacity for integrating a vast amalgam of constantly changing, multi-coloured, evanescent, perpetually overlapping data, too many, too swift, too intermingled to be caught and pinned down and labeled like so many individual butterflies…a gift akin to that of some novelists, that…convey a sense of direct acquaintance with the texture of life…of what matters from the rest…it is what is called natural wisdom, imaginative understanding, insight, perceptiveness…” (Berlin, 1996, p. 28).

Similarly, England appropriates T.S Eliot’s description of the formal properties at work in the poem to draw reference to the ways in which perceptions coalesce in the form of a structure within the poetics of practice (England, 1985).

More recent social work writings within this assemblage (Knowles and Cole, 2007; Moffat, 2000) in contrast to earlier writings, not only make explicit reflexive reference to the operative epistemological frames at work in their writings, but see art as providing the impetus for disrupting or displacing current modes of expression functioning within social work knowledge/practice. Chambon (2010), for example, in her construction of a critical dialogue between the possibilities for social work practice and the works of two Canadian artists, Stan Douglas and Jamelie Hassan, suggests that art historian and critic Claire Bishop’s theoretical writing on art installation allows us to think differently about the “open-ended nature of participatory, embodied art” (Chambon, personal correspondence, 2010) and by application, social work practices. According to this read-
ing, art installations share two important sets of features: first, they are ‘theatrical and immersive’; the work surrounds the participant/visitor in an experiential immediate manner. And, secondly, such work through its very forms invites interaction from the viewers; it is relational and embodied in a very deliberate, activist sense. Chambon calls for an embracement of this spirit of ‘installation’ when considering the modalities through which social work might possibly stage its evidence and knowledges (in classrooms, and in other realms of practice), and importantly, when considering how social work stages its interactions in cultural spaces (Chambon, 2010; Trevelyan, Crath & Chambon, 2012).

This attention to using “arts based” sources to elicit affective, intuitive, embodied, and expansive responses (Butler-Kisber, 2008; Chambon, 2008; Stzo, Furman, & Langer (2009), lends itself, these authors suggest, not to “mastery” and the production of singular, reductive truths, but to processes of “uncovering and expressing alternate …interpretations of the phenomena under scrutiny” (Barone, 2001, p. 24). Barone, in addition, argues that several “aesthetic design features” borrowed from performing, plastic and literary arts are operative in texts that emerge from arts based research: the language employed is stripped bare, and represents in one sense, a more fundamental mode of expression; metaphor and rhetoric are employed as devices to “suggest rather than state” the truth of life experiences, and to move the reader into realms of other possibilities, what Barone calls an “as if world” of research (p. 26-27); and finally, noting the parallels between “good art” and good arts based research, Barone evokes the following words from James Baldwin, “Good art, he says, is ‘capable of lay[ing] bare questions that have been hidden by the answers” (Baldwin, cited in Barone, 2001, p. 26).
This understanding of art’s ability to lay bare essential traces of a humanity beyond the play of signification, manifests in arts based projects that involve individual clients facing life-threatening illness (Irving, 2009; Luzatto, Sereno, & Capps, 2003) or clients for whom their subjective experiences of poverty, mental health illness, aging, have led them to being ostracized from wider social communities (Potash & Ho, 2011). Specifically, art here, functions as a mode of healing a fractured social bond by evoking a sentiment of “mutuality”, “inter-subjective empathy”, and a shared longing for “spiritual connectedness” (p. 77-78).

What draws these disparate scholarship strands together into one assemblage, I contend, is the enactment of a two-fold epistemological operation. First, these writings make use of what Ranciere (2010) refers to as the “aesthetic stage” (p. 127) to enunciate an unfettered exchange of properties between ‘art and life’ such that the boundaries between the two realms are rendered permeable. In other words, social work practice as Romantic or pedagogical poetics (Ranciere, 2010) in a first operation, makes the materials of life accessible for aesthetic engagement, such that through exercise of his/her poetic sensibility, the raw (ordinary) material of the client’s experience (as interaction, as artistic translation) becomes the ground for poetic transformation. And yet, this very positioning of life’s materials within the aesthetic realm, suggests paradoxically (and here I am reading this strand of scholarship literally/metaphorically in its own terms) that the revelatory forms that will emerge are to be constituted as “art” (Ranciere, 2009) – forms understood to be distinctive and particular because of their status as “art” (ie., in this literature, a form rendered distinctive from numerically calculated prescriptives of social categories). This paradoxical sensibility is confounded or inflected (to varying degrees), I would argue, with imperatives that derive
from the ethical regime. A first strand of this hybrid form holds a particular aesthetic sensibility
- that what inheres within the aesthetic material is a truth immanent within the art/social work
practice itself – in tension with a pedagogical function serving specific humanist ends - the ethi-
cal imperative for the worker to become a “symptomologist” (Ranciere, 2010, 127) of the image, to
discern in its depths, its dark underbelly, its hidden functions, fantasies and potentials, its origins
if you will (Ranciere, 2010). If this poetics frames life as encrypted, then the image (of the “client”,
or their art work, of their art practice) deciphered with an attentiveness to origins, is mobilized for
its pedagogical utility to reveal the ethical instruction or truth inhering (pace Ranciere, 2009) in
its form. Alternatively, a second operating mode within the “archi-ethic” paradigm, as suggested
above, positions artistic expression/social work interaction for its potential to enliven an embod-
ied sense of the common, a primal communalism of sorts that circumnavigates the problematic of
a separation between doing and seeing that models of representation assume (Ranciere, 2010). In
other words, what is implied in some social work writings of this genre, is that more intuitive, non-
representational practices of the social, as/like artistic expressions, can evoke an experience where
“art” in the immediacy of being experienced becomes “real life” in all of its fundamental, ethical
potential (Ranciere, 2009). Art as the work of the social, here, takes on the immediacy of its truth
potential; it is, as Ranciere would argue, a potentially troubled conjoining of art and politics such
that the potential of dissensus is dissuaded or short-circuited (Ranciere, 2010).

Assemblage 2 - Social Work as Aesthetic-Representational (Ethical) Practice:

A first strand of social sciences/social work writers that might be housed within this assem-
blage - (e.g., Carniol, 2005; Gordon, 1994; Hillier, 2007; Margolin, 1997; Odem, 1995; Tomko, 1996)
- have, through archival research, attended to the ways in which various visual practices - cultivated ways of looking at spaces, body posture and comportment and facial expression; the use of photographs as documentary evidence; community and social geographic mapping and the use of other visual technologies like statistical charts and graphs - have been employed in social services to scrutinize, diagnose and assess the bodies, subjectivities, “lifestyles” and living conditions of its clients. As Philips (2007) notes, representational practices of visualizing and exhibiting the boundaries between normalcy and pathology have been at the core of social work knowledge production and have resulted, she argues, in social work’s complicity in reproducing systems of racialization, and class and gender discrimination. In these analyses of historical trends within social work policy and clinical practice to deploy the visual as technologies of governance, what is, to varying degrees attested to is the declarative quality of visual images (whether reinscribed or not by the language of practice) to effect specific actions (here, the reproduction of oppression).

Apart from both producing, and critically reflecting upon, its own in-house production of documentary/ representational evidence to shape policy/practice directives, social work has relied on the use of popular media depicting the subjectivities of social services governance to further its knowledge/practice base. This stream of writing, while relying on an intrinsic hierarchilaising of its subject matter according to a grid of sociologically ascribed conventions nevertheless is tempered heavily by an ethical poetics that poses questions about truth and moral value. Goldstein (1999), for example, suggests that social workers should turn to the documentary photographs of Walker Evans or to recent images of children as victims of famine and war as a means of cultivating a “sentient sense” of the “dismal lives of people living on the jagged edges of society” (pp.
And Evelina A. Pangalangan (2008), in her use of creative literature in social work education, argues that the use of culturally rich narrative teaches students to be culturally receptive and knowledgeable to the needs of their own country. As she writes,

“Creative writers in almost every country have described and entered into the minds, hearts, emotions, behavior and social processes of people, of every race, ethnic group, class, caste, age groups, etc., who are struggling, overcome by and overcoming all sorts of personal and social problems in themselves and in their environment. It has been said that the creative writer also often anticipates social changes occurring in a society, goes along with and exposes the personal crisis of individuals, as well as the social crisis of a period even before the people themselves, the social scientists and the leaders are fully aware of the implications of these crises” (pp. 2–3).

Other writers like Anderson, Langer, Furman & Bender (2005), Bhugra (2003), and Weiss-Gal (2010) note that popular social fiction films or documentary films (produced for television or film screening) can be employed productively to cultivate a critical awareness of the gendered, classed lives led by clients, and to facilitate student learning about contemporary social issues. Finally, writers like Andrew Irving (2009) and Tim Stainton (2004) have engaged in a close reading of selected (historical) literary works and art works to trouble easy readings and conceptual formulations of clients’ oppression. In his paper, “Reason’s Other: the emergence of the Disabled Subject in the Northern Renaissance”, Stanton interrogates writings and drawings associated with the Northern Renaissance to provide a necessary corrective to tendencies within Disability Studies to focus myopically on materialist or functionalist explanations of the inequalities experienced by people with disabilities. What he discovers in the reading of these works, is the beginning formations of “the discursive nexus of reason/unreason” (p.226) – the very formulation that lies at the heart of current
oppressive constructions of the disabled other.

A second strand of social work researchers have written about image production at the hands of clients. In this sub-genre, arts programming is read as a mode of therapeutic intervention in which clients’ manipulation and creation of representative images of their subjective experiences, are understood, variously, as a means to assist them in their abilities to self-express and self-transform (Conway and Winkler, 2006; Delgado (2000); Grassau, 2010; Schutzman and Cody-Cruz, 1994; Spence, 1998; Ungar & Teram, 2000), to cultivate civic and pro-social values (Dolan, 1995; Stern, 2000), and to “optimize their development” as youth (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczack &Hawkins, 2002; Lawrence, 1998; Wright, Lindsay, Ellenbogen, Offord, Duku, & Rowe, 2006). Much of this programming has been oriented around “risk management”, the building of “resiliency” (Prescott, Sekendur, Bailley, 2008), or has focused on the effectiveness of arts practice for cathetering a diagnosed pathology or defect within the individual. That issues are often (although not exclusively) individuated, rather than contextualized in these programmes, is rarely addressed.

As an extension of this sub-genre that assumes the mediational properties of client-produced images (its ethical valence) together with an ascriptive logic that grafts the instrumentality of production to the social needs of specified subjects, various authors point to the use of arts based research and arts related programming for their ability to offer a bridge between individuals’ and communities’ lived interactions within local/globalised spaces, the translation of these experiences into images, the exhibition of these images, and the resulting affective responses to these representative forms that are deemed necessary to effect practice, policy, and subjective change. Social work writings that address programming that facilitates both the production of client art, and the
subjection of that art to peer/self scrutiny and discursive translation and reformulation, presume a linkage between arts production/exhibition and the effect of mobilized community activism and empowerment amongst affected client groups (Bhimani, 2003; Cohen & Ainley, 2000; Moffat, 2001; Spence, 1998; Wang, 1997, 2000; 2004; Sakamoto, 2007). Other writers point to the social, ethical and political utility of exhibiting client’s artistic creations in public/civic spaces, the subject matter of which is thought to elicit either a universal sympathy for the subjects, to invoke rage targeted at the perpetrators of the injustice, or to demonstrate the resilience of the lives lead by the clients. Apart from reinscribing the paternalistic, expert role of the social worker to stage such exhibitions in the first instance, the exhibitions tend to be sites in which an audience itself (a public) is staged to anticipate the witnessing, according to a representational logic, a fabalisation of clients’ journeys -graphically rendered and arranged stories replete with pathos, empowerment typical to the subjective identity portrayed, and perhaps heroism (again within the limits procured by socially indexed representations of hierarchically placed subjects).

Another set within a wider sub-genre of client produced ethico-representational art, houses theorists and researchers in Social Work, Health and Education that propound the use of photo and video based methodologies (photo voice, photo staging) in conjunction with community groups to explore social problems, question conventional practices and assumptions, and to effect change either at a local or policy level (Bhimani, 2003; Brown & Strega (2005); Nelson, Gould, & Keller-Oldman, 2009; Sakamoto, 2007; Wang, 1997, 2000; 2004). Within these writings, questions of representation and power are made central to socio-political expressions and enactments and borrow to varying degrees (implicitly, or explicitly so) from strategies that first emerged in anti-racist, feminist,
queer and new social movements of the 1960’s in Britain and North America. Some social services’
arts programming continues to be based on what Stuart Hall (1996, 2001) has referred to as a polit-
ics of visibility – a strategy oriented towards shifting away from a social positionality occupying
the shadows of invisibility caste by hegemonic colonialist/ racialised, misogynistic, heterosexist
imagery towards a politics that re-claims a recognition of the “diacritical difference” embodied by
its proponents. Within this representational politics, visual displays of empowerment employ two
related strategies: the production of ‘positive’ images which are understood to offer privilege to
the subordinated term not in its singularity but in its range of complexity; or the creation of images
of subversion in which stereotypical representations of blackness, for example, are reversed and
the newly emerging character, imbued with heroic, glamorous, or at times “bad-ass” qualities, are
transformed into a normative figure equivalent to that which has been painted for whiteness (Mer-
cer and Julien, 1994; Hall, 2001).

These strategies of representation, grounded as they are in identarian politics, have been
challenged from within the camps of the new social movements themselves and from within/
without by those writers influenced by post-structuralist thought. (It should be noted, however,
that this critique has been slow to emerge in social work writings – see below). Post-colonial writer
Jose Estaban Munoz, for example, critiques counter-identification as a dangerous practice given
that counterdeterminations necessarily rely on the language and symbols of the dominant ideol-
ogy to stake their counter claim (Munoz, 1999). By this claim of opposition, dominant modes can
be reinscribed as an inescapable field of reference and identification. Other authors writing from
both within a larger feminist scholarship (hooks, 1992; Irigary, 1985) and critical race theory (e.g.
Fernando, 1992; Mercer and Julien, 1994) suggest that images of inversion often replicate or resurrect well circulated stereotypes and fail to decouple “the complex dialectics of power and subordination” through which non-normativised subjectivities have been culturally and historically constructed (Mercer and Julien, 1994, p. 137). Moreover, a politics of visibility based on the production of these “positive images” fails to account for, or reckon with, the harsh violences of racial (or other forms of) exclusion, and as a number of critics voice, transforms difference into a spectacle that can be easily traded within the space of liberalism’s politics of pluralism or commoditized and exchanged in globalised circuits of capital (see chapters 3 through 5 for a detailing of this problematic). In other words, as Mercer (1988) suggests, the aspiration to strike equivalence between visibility and radical empowerment through counter-identification has been torn asunder in the era of neo-liberal democracy. Building on these sentiments, Nicole Fleetwood (2005), in her essay, *Mediating Youth: Community Based Video Production and the Politics of Race and Authenticity* calls attention to what she refers to as a “troubling tendency” (p.83) within some visual research and arts based community initiatives to interpret visual products as a more “authentic” transcription of experience of the participants (whether it is that of youth, trans women, refugees, etc.) than what stereotypical representations portray. Reflecting on her own participation in a youth based media collaboration, Fleetwood suggests that the process of motivations for channeling funding for youth based arts initiatives, the process of art making, motivations for participation, and the resulting product are enmeshed in struggles over the politics of representation of the real and authentic (see chapters 4 and 5 for a playing out of these tensions). In short, what Fleetwood rallies against is an unproblematised presentation of “experience”, an accounting, she argues, that fails to address both
the discursive and potentially commoditized nature of representational politics and the performative articulation of subjectivity within institutional spaces that support representationally mediated displays of difference.

While Fleetwood, as a lone voice problematizing the epistemologies that drive arts based programming, stops short of articulating what a more critically engaged youth facilitated artistic practice might look like, we might follow a most recent trend in social work literature (Chambon, Johnstone, & Winkler, 2010; Grassau, 2010; Moffat, 2010, Phillips, 2007) that makes cautious forays into terrains opened up by cultural studies, as an exercise in thinking through a renewed understanding of social work as dissonant cultural practice. As illustration, we may take note of writings within visual studies and cultural studies that have pointed to more complex representational strategies for disrupting hegemonic conceptualizations of nation, identity and ethnicity that they see as emerging within art making spaces since the1970’s (Vorhees, 2005). These strategies, fueled by critiques being cultivated within the spaces of Black Cultural Studies (writers such as Stewart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Kobena Mercer) and its related space, Post-Colonial Studies (as exemplified, theoretically, in the work of Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, etc.) and deemed essential to the formation of “imagined, collective identities”, have located their logic of questioning “within the complexities and ambivalences of representation itself “ (Hall, 1997, p. 274). At one level, analysis (and practice) continues to be focused on the constitutive role of the scopic in producing meanings, fixing and maintaining aesthetic values, stereotypes, and certain knowledge power configurations (and here we may consider the scopic as a way of seeing and representing that insinuates itself, and often violently so, materially, systemically, discursively, inter and intra-psychically). And yet, at another

Different cultural critics have considered the various visual practices employed by diasporic and racialised artists to re-orient “popular identifications” about nationhood and the otherness of racialised ethnicities towards “radical democratic values” (Mercer, 1998, p. 117). Citing the work of different Black filmmakers and visual artists (Steve McQueen, Chris Ofili, Yinka Shonibare, Isaac Julien, Zarina Bhimji, etc.), Mercer notes that their explorations of what a post-national subject position might feel-like in within a British context, “has not only cleared the space for the recognition of diversity and difference within the ethnic identities that make up the imagined unity of the nation, but has offered an alternative to the resurgence of ‘neonationalism’ and an art based on the visibility of cultural difference” (Mercer, 1996, p. 118). In other words, diasporic art, in this reading, refuses monolithic
level, new theoretical insights imported from post-structuralist and Lacanian psychoanalysis have troubled these analytic desires to seek coherency and fixity in the place of the visual signifier; the visual field has been rethought as an imagined site where an “endless displacement of meaning” transpires (Rogoff, 1999, p. 29). Thus, if meanings are deemed to be fragile and prone to instability in their very acts of instantiation, then disruption and resistance can happen, these Cultural Studies proponents argue, within the fault-lines of meaning production itself (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2001).

A critical visual/cultural studies has thus explored sites of artistic disruption, exposing the ways in which visual modalities are employed to both “open up” “the unresolved discrepancies” operative within stated practices of multiculturalism and racialised processes of subjectivation and nationalist sentimentalities/ projection/enactments, and to “engrave” their own significance” onto the cultural landscape (Hesse, 2000, p. 15-18). As Stuart Hall suggests for example, in relation to works by Black artists featured in the British Institute of Contemporary Art’s 1996 programme "Mirage: Enigmas of Race, Difference and Desire:"

The principal counter strategy here has been to bring to the surface – into representation – that which has sustained the regimes of representation unacknowledged: to subvert the structures of ‘othering’ in language and representation, image, sound, discourse, and thus to turn the mechanisms of fixed racial signification against themselves, in order to constitute new subjectivities, new positions of enunciation and identification, without which the most ‘revolutionary’ moments of national liberation quickly slide into their post-colonial reverse gear” (Hall, 1996, p. 19).

In a similar move towards revisualising the project of a politicized subjectivity, visual studies/performance studies writer Jose Estaban Munoz’s (1998) introduced the concept of “disidentification” for articulating how “queers of colour” performatively negotiate through music, lan-
guage, and style the race/homo phobic spaces of queerness and ethnos in which they are formulated, interpellated and to which they necessarily claim a sense of belonging. Borrowing from the work of Michel Pecheux, Munoz suggests that there are three modes in which a subject is constructed within a given ideological/visual field (or hailed/interpellated into its subjectivity). The first mode is categorised as “identification” where the subject performs the subjective attributes that are expected by the ideology. The second mode is understood as “counteridentification” – a turning away from the symbolic system, a rejection if you will, of the subjectivity that has been demanded (see Munoz’s critique above). The third mode, “disidentification” 12 navigates between the spaces of the first two modes. It allows for “the working on and against” (p. 11); it is both local and extra-local in its visioning of the ways in which structural fields can be changed or radically altered. Moreover, what a disidentification mode refuses is the outright rejection of elements of subjectivity that have been deemed “shameful”, “disgusting” (p. 12). Rather, these elements are purposively embraced, played with, and injected with new vigour, the effect of which is the creation of subjectivities that recognize context and at the same time refute its restrictiveness (Munoz, 1998) 13.

Despite these efforts to re-examine politicized and critical strategies for disrupting hegemonic representational systems that inform how subjectivity is experienced and performed, we may nevertheless pause to reflect on these authors’ lingering belief in the inherent determinative power of the sign to enact the work of politics. In this regard we may pay heed to the critique offered by art historian John Tagg (1993), political theorists, Miller and Rose (2008) and indeed, Ranciere (and we may recall, tangentially, Fleetwood’s critique as well in this instance) that caution against such readings. According to these authors, it is particular formations of the discursive - and for Ranciere, the sensible

12_ Judith Butler, in her book, the Psychic Life of Power, makes a parallel plea for these types of interpellative moments in the subjectivation process in which the subjects fails to properly comply (a dissidentification) as a type of cross-wiring in the signifying process (Butler, 1999).

13_ Munoz’s marking of (dis)identification as foundational for thinking a politicized subjectivity can, I suggest be held in analytic tension with a Rancerian understanding of the political subject. For Ranciere, disidentification suggests a re-imaging of equality, the ‘count of the uncounted’ as a structural/sensible reconfiguration of the political community away from a politics based on identitarian difference (or perhaps even a subjectivity grounded in the politics of ambivalence and hybridity). Although there is not the space in this dissertation for such an exploration, a fruitful line of inquiry would be to explore the importance of this conceptual tension for a social work practice of social justice.
- and the various supporting institutional practices and regime logics including operative modes of “policing” the sensible (in Ranciere’s parlance) that accord the sign its authority to instantiate the veracity or validity of meanings imputed to objects, subjects and experience (as reflected in the representational form). In other words, a more critical and complex cultural studies reformulation of representational practices, like other reading and practice strategies that I have reviewed within the familial assemblage of writings within an aesthetic-representational (ethical) tradition, adhere to, to varying degrees, I would argue, a two-fold circulating logic: The first assumes that the political efficacy or verisimilitude of the artistic practice/product lies in its communicative moment; art, in its public expression and in its ability to “dramatize” new truths, or unspeakable truths, is understood to cathect the desire of the audience/subject and shapes its transference to productive, individually manifested transformative ends. In one sense, art here is understood as a medium through which the audience can summons the courage to register an assemblage of an affective truth associated with commoditized life under capitalism (for example) or subject-other alienation and separation within (neo-colonialist) regimes so as to modify its behaviour. Specifically, what tends to be rendered is an equivalence between what is deemed a politicized piece of art and a moment of political expression, in which the affective response incites action motivated towards disrupting the existing political fabric. Conversely, this reading might comprehend the praxis of art as a declarative experience in which the cathexis that is assumed to be enacted through art’s display might very well be understood as sufficient enough, as a substitutive experience, to relieve the viewing/participating subject from doing the agentic work of politics herself. Regardless of where the playing out of agency is understood to transpire, these inflections of a mimetic-aesthetic tradi-
tion presume a certain indexical quality to the representational moment. This is the second operative principle of the mimetic order at work. Mimesis, as Ranciere (2009) argues, does not conform to a practice of resemblance but rather re-enacts divisions within human activities - their objects, subjects, actions - through the signifying capacities of categories, classes and concepts. Thus, while the effect of the image’s self enunciation is a presumed audience cathexis affording a power to comprehend that which was once incomprehensible, what is pronounced are a set of qualities that adhere nevertheless (regardless of how obliquely) to hierarchicalised domains (and we might consider, for example, the prescripted quality of notations like “survivor art”, “art from the diaspora”, “outsider art” – actions and practices that are harnessed, despite their “disidentifications”, to a (re)semblance of identarian politics). The effect of such reordering is a seeming foreclosure of the possibility of the experience of the art as the impossible/productive relation between an exposition of disruptive signification at work in accordance with a practice of aesthetic separateness, and the marking of a representational strangeness that threatens to undo any meaning that this politics of art might confer - and in Ranciere’s schema, a foreclosure that circumvents the very possibilities of the aesthetic regime, and thus of a democratic impulse itself.

**Social work as “ethico-ontological” practice:** A third turn in social work writings that forge a connection between social work, art, and the work of the “political” can be found in the two essays by Mel Gray and Stephen Webb (2008, 2009) introduced at the beginning of this chapter. The scope of their address can be summarized thus: to draw inspiration from European continental philosophy’s reflections on art (namely in the writings of Martin Heidegger and Alain Badiou) that, in their words “understand the nature of art” (its “ontology”) to be “agonistically” positioned...
against rationalist, instrumental discourse; to re-attune the domain of social work to the truth of its own nature (as disruptive, radical force); to align our thinking about the subjectivity of the client/worker in accordance with this emergent ontology; and to fashion an ethics that actively seeks to put social work in the “service of those whom we seek to free from oppression” (Gray and Webb, 2008a: 184; 2009:11-12). While a focused critique of this exploratory yet curious merging of Heidegger’s ontological/anthropological formulation of Dasein in “the work of art” and Badiou’s ontology of the event and the place of an “artistic truth” (Gray & Webb, 2008) as a grounding for a renewed politics of the social far exceeds the limits drawn for this chapter 14, I nevertheless present some preliminary working notes as to why I think this turn is misplaced. While my intention in this concluding section is to set the stage for a repositioning of Ranciere’s key propositions as a poetics for thinking the next few chapters, I do this tangentially, by briefly exploring possible points of disjunction (and departure) between Badiou’s and Ranciere’s positionings of equality, subjectivization and the “event”/politics. I consider these sketches as exploratory methodological working points for the writing that follows.

First working point - on equality: Badiou’s formulations of equality and the calling forth of the subject within the space of an artistic or political “event”, are heralded as orienting markers for Gray and Webb’s (2009) own desire to instantiate a disruptive social work politics and imagine a new operating logic “outside of” (p. 112) neo-liberal regimes of practice. While I am sympathetic to this attention to imagining the emergence of new forms of subjectivity and the positing of equality as being immanent within the work of the “art of the social” (p. 111) as a productive turn in the social work imaginary 15, I would also suggest that the gravitational pull towards Badiou is mis-

14 For Badiou’s own critique of Heidegger’s philosophical reading of the event of art see for example, Inaesthetics (2004), and Being and Event (2005). For a secondary analysis of Badiou’s relationship to Heidegger’s work, see (Barker, 2002; Hallward, 2003; Hewlett, 2007; and Hyldgaard, 2001). See also Ranciere’s three-pronged objection to Badiou’s proposed modality of “inaesthetics” (Ranciere, 2009) and Shaw’s (2010) analysis of that debate.
placed especially given the possibilities that Ranciere’s own conceptions open up for rethinking of the aesthetic functioning within social work’s practice/knowledge systems. Nina Power (2009) suggests that the differences in Badiou’s and Ranciere’s conceptualization of equality rests on the place of “continuity and strategy” in their respective philosophies: for Badiou, equality is “axiomatically/rationally” positioned within an unquestioned anthropomorphism, for as he writes, “thought is the one and only uniquely human capacity and thought, strictly speaking, is simply that through which the human animal is seized and traversed by the trajectory of truth” (Badiou, 2005, cited in Powers, p. 97). Thought, in this sense, is foundational to not only all truth claims, but specifically in animating, and being operative within politics and art (actions which speaks the truth about a situation).

For Ranciere, equality is more “sensuously or materially” positioned in smaller, more intimate everyday moments of history that are too unique to be abstracted by the workings of conventional philosophy or history (Power, 2009, p. 65-66). In other words, equality has to be practiced through a reconfiguration of one’s body-sense projection and of one’s sensible world – where one lives, plays, works (and indeed, writes!). As philosopher, Peter Hallward comments, “Equality [in Ranciere’s work] is not the result of a fairer distribution of social functions or places so much as the immediate disruption of any such disruption; it refers not to place, but the placeless or out-of-place, not to class but to the unclassifiable or out-of-class” (Hallward, quoted in Power, 2009, p. 66). If for Ranciere (as well as for Badiou), equality operates as both an “undetermined” and yet vital “presupposition in his reflections” (Power, p. 66), equality is also always disruptive, divisive, unruly – a deployment of a fundamental wrong or of a fundamental dispute.
Second Working Point - on Politics: But the main point of disagreement flows from the strategies that the two authors embrace for their respective understanding of “politics” and for their positioning of “art” (for Badiou) or the “the aesthetic” in Ranciere (as an organization of the sensible and as a specific logic). For Badiou, the occurrence of the event (as politics, as art) necessitates a commencement of the “the rigorous pursuit of consequences”, a sequence that leads, through fidelity to a cause in formation, to the naming of new forms of subjectivity and organization as coordinated through the insight of a select group of “political militants” (Power, 2009: 77-8) (and here, Badiou retains the figure of the avant-garde – presumably the placeholder of the social worker in Gray and Webb’s model) 17.

Moreover, rather than conceiving of politics or the event of art as radical break (the goal of which is the realization of Truth), Ranciere assumes a non teleological oriented, non-liberationist, heterological modality of ‘emancipation’ (Rockhill, 2004) such that what unfolds are “breaks in the present” – those moments of aesthetic displacement where an “overturning of the symbolic space of the community, of the sensuous orientations of spaces of production” is effected (Ranciere, 2006, p. 293). Although for Ranciere, these initial moments of contention, where a reframing of experience (of space, of identity, of work, of culture) transpires, rarely translate into “stable expressions of egalitarianism”, they nevertheless, in their inevitable sedimentation into forms of police logic (like laws, institutional practices – and here we can think of a myriad of social work examples), provide “a living memory of politics” on which “new inscriptions of equality” can arise. Thus, rather than being seen as a failure of the “great dynamic” (as would necessarily be seen in Gray and Webb’s model), enunciative expressions of equality, in their propensity towards dissolution, can be under-

---

16_ This reference to the wrong is a play on the title/content of the text Philosophy of Right in which Hegel asserted that the common, or what is commonly shared, is not man’s (in its specific gendered sense) rationality or feelings, but ownership of property and the social relations that manifest because of these monetarist/materialist relationships (Power, 2009).

17_ Ranciere rails against the place of the expert, which assumes certain subjects’ deficiency of thought or insight, the superiority of an enculturated knowing reserved for certain subjects, and that learning contains a thematic thread of salvation in which the learner is shepherded towards a preconceived end. In its stead, Ranciere posits the pivotal role of equality and the “teacher’s” ascribed “ignorance” (a reflective staging of the commonality of knowledge rather than as an a priori form) to position a non-hierarchalised, anarchic conception of knowledge formulation. I explore the implications of embracing a practice of “innocence” tangentially in chapter 6 and then more fully in the concluding chapter (cf Ranciere, 1991; 1994).
stood as unfolding processes of dissensus, sedimentation, renewal.

To dismiss these site as non-eventful and as not “political” enough (pace Gray and Webb, 2009) would fail to register processes of disruption in the following ways: First, Ranciere’s conception of dissensus (and ultimately, politics), and his understanding of the moment of aesthetic experience (of its “sensorium”) can attune us to an expression of thinking and affect that articulates that something else, something different is possible (Holmes, 2010; Power, 2009; Ranciere, 1999) regardless of how temporary or provisional these expressions might be. Of course, how social work practitioners can intervene in situ (at the moment of disagreement) from a required place of “ignorance” (i.e., from a place of equality rather than as a regulatory force based on sociological suppositions) that such a Rancerien poetics demands, is the paradoxical challenge that confronts us here. I explore this proposition more fully in the concluding chapter.

Second, where Ranciere’s method is most instructive, I would argue, is his insistence on the importance of thinking knowledge formations as an exercise in “rethinking” and rewriting. If the very act of knowledge creation, for Ranciere, is understood as “common capacity to invent stories and arguments” (Ranciere, 2006b, p. 6), then by extension, his pedagogical method of writing/thinking through knowledge imagines that what we understand as knowledge formation is infinitely pliable (and thus equitably available) and yet simultaneously conditioned (policed) and conditioning. That is, it is this very spirit of “equality” and ignorance, of our acknowledgement of unlikely disruptions, which positions the writer differently to re-think/re-write how something might be/ could have been otherwise (Mechoulan, 2004). According to the lessons of Ranciere, the writing space as analytical space can provide an opportunity in which to reflexively acknowledge
and recognise dissensus within the configurations of social work knowledge formulation. As Ranciere would suggest, thinking alongside strange encounters allows not only an ability to “underscore” the modulations of policing the sensible, but to compose “a proposition on what it is that is given to see to us” (2010, p. 149).

Of course, the danger of staging or underscoring these principles of politics and equality in the process of rethinking social work practice, is that to do so, may very well disrupt the very propensity of social work knowledge to gear itself towards a management of passions and the construction of the social; in short, the affirmation of equality dares social work to reflexively consider its collaboration towards the production of consensus as occurring simultaneously, in response to these unexpected, tumultuous reconfigurations occurring alongside its policed sensorium. For Ranciere, the possibilities for learning/unlearning happens as we move reflexively between one “as if”, and another “as if”, as we think about what it would mean to “practice another way of considering” (Ranciere, cited in Mechelon, 2004, p. 9). While this type of reflexive accounting might not be a satisfactory form of “politics” for Gray and Webb, it seems more in line with the type of ethics of care/social justice aspirations that social work remembers of itself.

**Working point three – on subjectification.** Finally, Ranciere’s point of departure from Badiou rests on how forms of subjectification are understood in the moments of dissensus. Badiou’s articulation of a disembodied process of subjectification fails to consider the tension that Ranciere argues is at play between a naturalized status accorded by police logic and the political function of dissolution during the “disidentifying moment”. In other words, Ranciere’s method of tracing the political holds in tandem a plea towards a transcendental subjectivity as it becomes

---

18 Peter Hallward reads Badiou’s Subject as a beingness brought forth that emerges in the unfolding of four modes “revolution, passion, invention, and creation” (which articulate with the four domains of truth – politics, love, science, and art). The subject is a subject of truth, and is conceptualized as radically singular (in terms of its occurrence and origins) and “universal” (in its scope) (Hallward, 2003, p. xxvii). As Badiou insists “The subject is absolutely non-existent in the situation before the event. We might say that the process of truth induces him” (Badiou, cited in Hallward, 2004, p. 17). Thus any understanding of the individual’s embodied experiences, the sensibilities that propel the individual to take on/embrace / perform the actions of engagement leading to its subjectivation is curtailed or eclipsed by Badiou’s proclivities towards what Hallward calls an axiomatic and fundamentally “disembodied” accounting of the subject’s formulation in the site of the event (Hallward, 2004).
manifest within and in relationship to a specific field of (material, aesthetic) experience. To quote Ranciere: “By subjectification I mean the production through a series of actions of a body and a capacity for enunciation not previously identifiable within a given field of experience, whose identification is thus part of the field of experience” (Ranciere, 1999:35). In another place, Ranciere insists on a very particular reading of “class dissolution” (and class here, implies both its Marxist sense and as a sociological classification) such that dissolution signals an opening up of the equal, a shifting between possibilities of subjective placement.

This is the importance of the idea of the proletariat for me. It can at one and the same time be the name of a class and the open name of the uncounted. What is important is the disidentifying moment that shifts from an identity or an entity as a worker, as a woman, as a black, to a space of subjectification of the uncounted that is open to anyone. This means making the same words mean different things, so that it can refer to closed groups or to open subjects (Ranciere, 2005, p. 290)

It is precisely at moments when a disidentification is declared, that a claim on the right to stand in for the whole (the universal) is signaled, a volatility in the sensual field in which the subject of the wrong as the subject of disidentification, stands in contrast to an identitarian politics (informed, for example in alignment with nationalist aspirations or liberal multiculturalism – see chapter 2) that pin subjectivities down to their place and ascribed habitus (Ranciere, 1989).

Ranciere’s understanding of disidentification stages a temporality for processes of subjectification not as an unfolding in linear time (a becoming that abides by an ordering of what is possible/impossible), but as one that occurs simultaneously alongside the temporality of a given distribution of the sensible. It is this positing of the social order as contingent and allowing for the unexpected staging of simultaneous lines of temporality (Ranciere, 2009b, pp. 30-32) that allows
Ranciere to reopen established frameworks of identification and classification.

Taken as a bundle, these three working points orient one line of analysis for considering evidence generated through ethnographic fieldwork. As method of intervention, Ranciere’s proposed practice of/for writing challenges a critical attentiveness to the aesthetic dimensions of social policy governance as a terrain in which consensual practices and other policing strategies condense and displace divisions onto the body politic, and the ways in which these very (social) practices might be held in dispute. Pointedly, we may recall Ranciere’s reminder that the aesthetic is increasingly being invited to play a role in the formation of the social, whether as a mode of governance to reinstantiate what is already sensibly arranged (see chapter 2 for a theoretical exploration, and chapters 3 and 5 for an ethnographic fleshing out of this proposition) and/or as a substitutive politics in those consensually driven environments stained by a deficit (or an evacuation of) political action (Ranciere, 2010) (see chapter 5). The question of whether this register of writing through the ethnographic evidence might also possibly stage a different practice of “considering” within policy practice itself will be explored in the final chapter.
Reading aesthetic technologies at the crossroads of neoliberal and racialised logics
This chapter brings together selected analytical trajectories’ in the mapping of globalised neo-liberalism and its manifestations and gesticulations at a local scale. The different trajectories will be assembled as a set of orienting markers positioning techniques of aesthetic governance within overlapping social, economic, cultural, moral, judicial and political domains. In line with this objective, I first situate my research within a body of scholarship forged by social policy scholars employing a reworking of Foucault’s concept of “governmentality” to problematise policy making as a social practice (McKee, 2009; Daly, 2003). Emphasis is placed on “the horizontal and relational” nature of policy processes (Fairbanks, 2004, p. 19). Thus, rather than thinking about policy solely in terms of its instrumentality (as a technical, rational, targeted instrument deployed by bureaucracies and states to effect social change and solve problems (Shore & Wright, 2005), this scholarship (albeit in different ways) considers policy as both an imposed mode of regulating social behaviour as well as a form that acts through and is enlivened by people and communities (Fairbanks, 2004). Following from this poststructuralist accounting of policy, I next examine the contours of different modalities of liberal governance, with a specific emphasis on the ways in which shifts from welfare to neoliberal forms of political rule have effected Toronto’s urban policy visioning and practice. In the next section, I compliment these articulations with post-structuralist and anti-racist/post-colonial discussions on securitization, moralism and multiculturalism. These additional and final conceptual frames allow for a more precise elucidation of the material/discursive domains in which I understand the socio-political lives of images and aesthetic techniques of governance investigated in the case studies to be operating within.

Governmentality as a strategy of liberal democratic governance.
According to Foucault’s reading (Foucault, 2003, 2007), “governmentality” was first introduced as a mode of rule designed to cordon off concerns for the preservation of the sovereign from the activity of governing the social body. Governance structures (or technologies) were oriented to maximize the well being of the state and its preferred inhabitants (keeping in mind the hierarchisation of subjects according to a burgeoning colonialist/racialised logic – see below) through the creation of a compliant and productive citizenry. Instrumental to this formulation, was a mode of power that Foucault introduced as “biopolitics”, a state sanctioned, administrative fixation on the “existence of life” of the social body (and for Foucault, this “body” was understood as the wider body politic – what would become the nation state and its domains of governance in articulation with the body of the individual). Biopolitics as a set of targeted strategies (or as a parallel, more abstracted construct - Ranciere’s reading of a policed order), sought to harness what had become understood as life’s characteristics and processes - from health, sanitation, reproduction, physical and mental capabilities, sexuality, etc – towards nationalist/colonialist aspirations. European and colonized subjects together with the different forms of the social that were manifesting, had by the mid 18th century become sites of epistemological focus and targets for social intervention/regulation (Rabinow & Rose, 2006). The “art of governance” is this dissipation of rationalized state strategies targeting individual behaviour and conduct into the recesses of social living – an articulation and displacement, really, of micro-processes of power across the social field (McKee, 2009; Foucault, 2003). As Graham Burchell elaborates, “governance is a more or less methodical and rationally reflected way of “doing things…for acting on the actions of individuals, taken either singly or collectively, so as to shape, guide, correct and modify the ways in which they conduct themselves”
Governance scholarship thus concerns itself with both an analysis of the discursive fields in which problems of governance are introduced and articulated as sites for intervention, and the material practices of intervention that are implemented and taken up by practitioners, groups and individuals. Emphasis is placed on “intention” of policy makers, but also on how modes of governance are practiced “in situ” (McKee, 2009), and as such, provides the methodological and conceptual tools for thinking through how micro and macro levels articulate in a single field of inquiry (Shore & Wright, 2005). Moreover, a governmentality perspective in social welfare/policy studies introduces a more complex understanding of the machinations of power by allowing the researcher to think beyond simplistic binaries that position systemic, macro manifestations of control (as exterior to the local polity and individual subjects) in contradistinction to microforms of resistance (every day tactics that draw from reserves of residual freedoms) (Shore & Wright, 2005). In other words, researchers are positioned to investigate not only the contradictory, fragmented, conflicting and intersecting structures of power, but how these practices are tied to more globalised processes yet re-(as)signed at local levels (Shore & Wright, 2005; McKee, 2009).

In summary, these re-workings of Foucault’s understanding of governance permit an exploration of the intersection between the operations of sovereign or expert knowledge, the investments of social institutions charged with implementing practices in alignment with an ethics of care, justice, and paradoxically, social regulation (Park, 2008) and individual expressions of conduct and attitudes. From this perspective, an examination of social policy also implies a shift away from a sole focus on the languages of policy (eg., what different words like “freedom” or democracy” signify),
towards an analysis of the “work” of policies; how they function in relationship to informal assemblages mobilized in other domains; the possibilities and impossibilities that they generate; and the means by which they acquire affective attention and moralized attachment, and gain traction as believable truths (Rose, 1999). Further, a governance reading of policy domains render analytically inseparable the domains of the economic, the political, the private, the public, the social, the personal and interpersonal. Governmentality as a mode of thinking and as an analytical strategy (Dean, 1997), thus displaces the centrality of the state as the privileged site for thinking through issues of politics and policy, and allows for a complex mapping of the discussion of power (its enactments, its generativity, its resistances) at multiple sites of calculation and authority including the disciplinary/caring actions of the self on the self (Miller and Rose, 2008).

For the purposes of this dissertation, five inter-related, Foucault inspired, conceptual/ methodological working points derived from political theorists Nicholas Rose and Peter Miller’s (2008) collection of essays entitled Governing the Present, are considered axiomatic for dissecting the workings of image production in the three case studies, although they will be repositioned, at times, in light of Ranciere’s thoughts on aesthetics and politics. These axioms may be summarized as follows:

Axiom 1. How does the norm become operationalised? And how can the domain of the normative impress upon individuals/collectivities its standards for behaviour without dictating the specificities of daily living? For Miller and Rose, liberal democracies organize the social authority to dictate the spatiality and practices of the normative along three axes: systems for “the production of truth”; “regimes of authority or sovereignty”, and “practices of subjectification” (pp. 5-7).
These relations and practices exist in a type of matrix, are organized differently across space and time, and function as a means of governance and for shaping conduct.

Axiom 2. Miller and Rose are critical of what they refer to as “structuralist metaphysical approaches to ontology”, approaches, they argue, that while de-centering “a priori humanisms” nevertheless mark the subject as an effect of relations of production, and reduce it to the places and functions that are themselves economic spin offs. To ask how subjects are informed by social processes is to disavow the multiplicity/variability of subjective formations, “and the relations to the self engendered and enjoined in specific practices” (p. 4). The historicizing approach to subjectivity and processes of subjectivation that Rose and Miller posit in its stead, aims to comprehend how the liberal subject came to be characterised by the psychological interiority that it was thought to possess, an object that was deemed both passive in its receptivity to the inscriptions of culture and society and agentic in its distinctive personality or character. Correlatively, the authors query how concepts of the person, different subjectivities, are problematised, rendered knowable, analyzable, and ultimately realizable. Echoing Foucault, Miller and Rose suggest that techniques and methods of knowing and acting are employed such that a process of subjectivation is enacted - a mode of action in which a subjectivity is hailed into being and begins the disciplinary measures of self-monitoring, self-regulating, and self-evaluation. In Foucault’s words, what is enacted “is an action upon an action” (Foucault, quoted in Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 8).

Axiom 3. Further, their analysis inquires into how expertise is formulated, and subsequently, how social authorities tied to different (and often competing) disciplinary knowledges are positioned in such a way that they become verifiers of the truth about the objects under study. Impor-
tant to consider are the ways in which experts’ own subjectivity together with that of the objects/subjects of study, are inculcated simultaneously through the logics and mechanisms employed to survey deviance and normalcy, and to exercise care (Chambon, 1999).

Axiom 4. Relatedly, a historicized reckoning of governance inquires into how conducts and other social phenomena are problematised and made suitable as objects for inquiry. Thus, once an issue has been identified for analysis by an assemblage of experts wielding rationalized technologies and modes of evaluation, the behaviour, according to Miller and Rose, is rendered “amenable to intervention” and targeted for transformation. The processes function in such a way that reinvigorates the normative standard that was employed initially as a standard of evaluation.

Axiom 5. Again, following Foucault, the authors distinguish between “two indissociable dimensions” of the “art of governing” – political rationalities and technologies (p. 15). Political rationalities are the ever transforming forms of idealized, “styles of thinking”, and “intrinsic” moralities and knowledges (p. 16) that are mobilised as a means of rendering subject matter thinkable and responsive to different calculations for intervention. In other words, according to Rose and Miller (1992), they are a domain for the formulation and justification of “idealised schemata for representing reality, analyzing it and rectifying it” (p. 178). A whole set of “idioms and rhetorics” are convened in the process of identification, operationalised by experts, and become agentic in the daily disciplinary practices of the self (albeit differently, according to the types of liberal rationality in place). Miller and Rose (2008) and Brown (2006) are careful to note that political rationalities are non homogenous and constantly shifting in form. Finally, technologies, according to this analytical lexicon, are what allow for rationalities to become instrumental and operable; “they are the assem-
blages of persons, techniques, institutions, and instruments for the conducting of conduct” that allow for what Foucault identified as “governance at a distance” (Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 16).

A central fixation of this broader governmentality scholarship has been to historize liberalism as an ever shifting, inventing political rationality manifesting in three different “familial assemblages”: (1) classical liberalism; (2) welfare or social welfarism; and (3) advanced or neo-liberalism (Stenson and Watt, 1999; Rose, 1996, 2008; Powell, 2007, Morgan, 2001; Parton, 1999, 2003; and Lorrenze, 2001). In each assemblage, the spatial and interactional dynamics between the exercise of authority and sovereignty, systems for the production of truths and knowledge, and processes of subjectification are configured differently, the result of which is the appearance of new modes of coupling the state’s regulation of public conduct with individually and socially regulated affective, ethical and aesthetic economies, new understandings of the relationships between public and private, and new formations of the economic, the social and the political. In what follows, I outline a brief sketch of these assemblages, first as productive typologies for reading case study evidence that follows in the next three chapters, and then as they currently manifest at an urban scale, with Toronto as a sightline for the analysis. Caution will be exercised in thinking of these different assemblages as ideal forms that articulate generically, uniformly, exclusively, and without contradiction within specified contexts. Part of the work of this chapter more specifically and then in the 3 case chapters, will be to think through the operatives of globalised liberalism(s), and its “contextual embeddedness”, which in Brenner and Theodore’s terms (2002) accounts for the legacies of inherited institutional frameworks, policy regimes, regulatory practices, and political struggles” (p. 351) in shaping how neoliberalism (and other political rationalities) configure in, for example, the newly
incorporated city of Toronto. Adapting Brenner and Theodore’s sharp observation to our own purposes, then, is a reminder of the need to consider how environmentally contingent these articulations of governance that traffic in the aesthetic domain are, and that regardless of their formal rationalizations and calculations, in the space of assemblage other value systems come into play (Collier & Ong, 2005).

**Liberal governance, risk management and the rise of moralized security practices:**
As frequently argued in the literature on governmentality (Burchell, 1996; Rose, 1996, 1999; Peck & Tickle, 2002) it is within classical liberalism that the state first limited its domains of control by demarcating zones of difference external to the limits understood and exercised for itself. These zones - the newly industrializing capitalist market, family/private life, civil society – were configured analytically and practically as having their own intensities and rationalities, their own desires and modes of expression. Central to this configuration was the construction and cultivation of the subject as an invested/motivated, rational, and economic self engaged in privatised, “atomistic and egoistic” exchange relations within a particular historical and material environment (Burchell, 1996, p. 24). In this sense, a classical liberal rationality of government, in Burchell’s words, took as its orienting object, “the natural private-interest-motivated conduct of free, market exchanging individuals.” By an interesting twist in logic, the presumed behaviors and dispositions of homo economicus were deemed foundational to the market’s ability to operate optimally in accordance with this procured nature (Burchell, 1996). The political apparatus of the state was complemented by a host of arm’s length institutions – benevolent societies, philanthropic organizations, trade unions, although as Miller and Rose note, by the late 19th, early 20th centuries numerous government in-
terventions had been made into these privatized zones. Complementing various site-initiated projects like sanitation, public health, planning, and educational provisioning, was a burgeoning state bureaucracy to regulate behaviors and practices associated with these initiatives. What transpired was a shift from a liberalism that understood the sanctity of individuated zones of responsiveness and control to what Rose has termed governing from the point of view of “the social” (Rose, 1996). As I will argue in Chapter 3, the social reformers connected to the work of the Chicago settlement movement deployed an assemblage of aesthetic techniques to mobilize a nascent sensibility of welfare governance in which the state, together with localized experts would be responsible for intervening in domains connected to urban poverty.

Governing from the point of the social, as a shift in political governance sensibility beginning from the early 20th century onwards (depending on national context), instituted a reinvention of the state as the guarantor of the welfare and general liberties of the individual. This shift in political governance sensibility was designed to exorcise the twin evils of communist revolt and unfettered market individualism from the midst of the social (Miller and Rose, 2008). In an abstracted sense, welfare liberalism was thus conceived of as a middle way to foster the flourishing of private enterprise, and yet allow for the vagaries of the market and other environmental externalities to be mediated by way of the social – “social protection”, social justice, social rights and responsibilities, and “social solidarity” (Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 86).

Canada’s welfare system, as an emergent form of governance from the late teens onwards (and particularly, as it developed stride by the early 1950’s) was bifurcated along three lines of social provisioning: The first, as a preferred modality, held belief in the functioning of market
In the welfare regime that emerged in the post-war era (circa 1945), numerous disciplinary knowledges were involved in the reordering of the life-course into distinct stages aligned to productive capacity—education, work, retirement. As a modernist invention and intervention, youth became an operative principle in the reconceptualisation of the civic as a space of caring and shared responsibility. State support of youth (and here we may pause to consider the various apparatuses that were mobilised—education, social welfare, health) allowed for a collective forgetting of the ravages of pre-war poverty, and permitted a society to look to an imagined future. Youth, in other words, became emblematic of both modernist possibilities and the social ills that could threaten their realization (Sharland, 2006), and were read as indicators of the effectiveness of state social intervention (Powell, 2003). Also represented in the figure of the subjectivity of youth was the ability of the family to inculcate bourgeois values and civic sensibilities (Powell, 2003). Transgressive behaviours were diagnosed as evidence of a wider moral decline, signaling the need for increasing levels of state funding to mediate the effects of disruption (Kelly & Callahan, 2009; Sharland, 2006). All juvenile criminals and transgressors of codes of normalcy were, in this way, deemed possible candidates for rehabilitation.
and Rose, 2008, p. 88). Here we can anticipate Asad (2003) and Thobani’s (2007) critique (see next section) of the lactifying impulse, and the Christian basis, of this imagined and materially realised space of the Canadian social where different state and socially sanctioned policies effectively disavowed the presence of the foreign other from accessing or partaking fully in its “matrix of solidarity” (Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 89).

Numerous studies have traced the effects of the transformation of the welfare state from its establishment, to its devolution, to its transformation into neo-liberal and risk management governance (Stenson and Watt, 1999; Rose, 1996; Powell, 2007). Neo-liberalism, according to Wendy Brown, is ‘contoured by global capital” and yet, like previous forms of liberal assemblage, takes on local expression. As a political rationality that is grounded in the logic of the market, neo-liberalism requires a fundamental reorientation of the domains of the social, the subject, the private, and the state according to principles of productivity and profitability (Brown, 2006).

Bracketing the multi-dimensionality and variability of neoliberalism governance for a moment, four generalized and interconnected trends have been observed in the literature: First, as understood from a more macro-political economy perspective (Harvey, 2003, 2005; Jessop, 2001; Lipietz, 2001), there has been a pronounced global restructuring of capitalist economies. For North American markets, a shift towards the globalization of financial markets and dismantling of trade tariffs has resulted in the decline and displacement of an industrial based economy, the diminishing power of organized labour, the stagnation of real wages, and increase in part-time, contracted labour and labour insecurity (Fairbanks, 2004). As well, there has been a concomitant rise of high tech industries, artisanal manufacturing (culminating possibly, in the branding of a specific locale),
The term “broken widows” first introduced in an essay by James Wilson and George Kaiting (1982) entitled Broken Windows: The police and neighbourhood safety, and then embraced in criminology as a workable (and highly contested) concept and practice, suggests that public tolerance or the normalization of everyday “incivilities” – breaking windows (and their indexical trace – the “broken window”) other forms of property vandalism including tagging and the “putting up” of graffiti, “aggressive panhandling”, loitering, drunkenness, and other such so called publically disruptive behaviours effects the escalation of respective fears, encourages a spiral of community decline, and in the longer run increases the risk of more serious crimes” (Johnston & Shearing, 2003, p. 102). Read in a different way, the indexical traces of urban disorder are understood to both mark community apathy and decline, and applying the logic of actuarialised risk, are understood to precipitate an increase in more socially egregious offence (Johnston & Shearing (2003).

In their book, the Creative City, Charles Laudry and Franco Bianccini (1995) forwarded the idea that as a result of global economic restructuring, urban centres have been enticed by necessity into a game of “inter-urban competition”. Being a hub of and financial and banking services and “cultural innovations” industries (including media) in select major urban centres (Scott, 2007, Fairbanks, 2010).

Second, there has been a generalized rescaling of national state responsibilities (Miller, 2006; Peck & Tickell, 2002), with a downloading of the functions and decision making associated with welfare (health, education, housing) and social services provisioning to the municipal and sub-municipal scales – regions, cities, neighbourhoods, etc – while simultaneously foreclosing their fiscal capacity to meet additional resource needs. The result has been a competitive trafficking of cities in regional and global markets to secure capital investment necessary to float municipal expenditures (Miller, 2007). This ascending primacy of the urban, and specifically, the rise of globalised cities as important sites for the facilitation of capital flow, investment and reproduction has been productive of a set of what Fairbanks (2010) refers to as the “doxic assumptions of urbanized neoliberal discourses” – “broken windows”, creative cities, mixed income cities, and de-concentration of poverty” (2010, p. 5). As bundles of knowledge production, shared sensibilities and explanatory logics, these self-evident truths are in turn productive of a de-territorialising and re-territorialising of urban social relations and spaces (Miller, 2007).

A third trend suggests that the nature of the praxis of resource allocation has shifted with the privatization of state functions and the emergence of hybridized state-private-voluntary-not for profit sector alliances. According to Rose (1999, 2008), these emergent forms have fundamentally altered the way in which decisions are being made resulting in both a reorientation away from democratic deliberation (Miller, 2007; Peck & Tickell, 2002) to modes of social action rooted in instrumental and strategic logics and a subsequent (or sequentially related) redirection of flows of
resources towards the promotion of economic growth and corporate support. Thus, with this reorientation of the nature of welfare production, the boundaries between previously demarcated policy practice arenas – employment, social assistance, security, and economic development – have been significantly blurred (Eik, 2007).

Finally, this trend towards neo-liberal governance and its near blinding embrace of market logic has effected a tempering of the democratic impulse. As Wendy Brown (2006) suggests, what previously held sway as preferred modalities of social and political functioning - an emphasis on public debate, collective social functioning and an orientation to the common – has withered at the hands of a more virulent, economically rationalized political culture. Citizenship is now aligned to individual self care and responsivization (see below); social space has become depoliticized and reoriented towards a moralism that allows for social exclusion, and practices of “tacticalised or instrumentalised” law have justified the abrogation of rights legitimised under what Agamben refers to as permanent “states of exception” (Brown, 2010). Given the centrality of this observation to an understanding of the epistemological imperatives driving the three aesthetic projects under investigation in this dissertation, allow me to tease out in more precise detail an accounting of this knotting that has seemingly occurred between behaviouralism, responsivization and the moral imperative.

Reorienting the social: According to Gordon, (1991), Brown (2006), and Rose (2008) it is precisely under the auspices of this emerging neoliberal assemblage that there has been a reactivation and inversion of the logic of classical liberalism, a process that is fundamentally altering the governance structure of laissez faire approaches to the cultivation of an assumed, naturally disposi-
tioned, homo economicus, (and this as foundational to optimal market functioning) (Gordon, 1991). As Colin Gordon succinctly quips, “homo-economicus becomes manipulatable man” (1991, p. 42). Thus, rather than the “motivations of the subject” being cordoned off from government sanctioning, the subject of neo-liberalism, according to this literature, must become forever “responsive to environmental modifications” (p. 43) so that his/her behaviour can be properly aligned to the logics of advanced capital. Economic governance coupled with behaviouralism constructs a subjectivity that is not only oriented as an “individual producer-consumer” and as an individually functioning enterprise oriented around self-sufficiency and maximum profitability, but as “an entrepreneur of its own subjective worth” (Gordon, 1991, p. 44; Rose (1991, 2008).

This saturation of market logic into the most intimate places of life, has resulted, Brown (2006) argues, in the formation of a productive citizenry, who, in its divestment from a sense of belonging to the assemblage of the “common good”, has been reduced to the practices of self care. Self-care in this sense, is reconfigured as a moral compulsion, an economic necessity, and a personal responsibility. Further, civility, no longer understood in terms of social affiliation, has been realigned and coupled with consumptive and productive capabilities. As Miller and Rose note, “in the new prudential regimes, individuals created through the mechanisms of marketing and pedagogies of consumption and lifestyle are to gain access to previously ‘social benefits’ such as educational advantage, health status and contentment in old age through purchase in competitive market” (2008, p. 101). Concomitantly, given that market logic simultaneously personalizes and depoliticizes the impediments to achieving entrepreneurial aspirations, inequality as an economic manifestation becomes generalized and equalized across the population (see critique below). In
other words, the doxa of (self-serving) profit, pleasure and entrepreneurialism excludes how the experiences of gender and race (as systemically and interpersonally interpellated) might very well re-articulate the conditions in which responsivization can be enacted.

The challenge of these theoretical overtures is to displace a scholarly and popularly informed doxa that “society” has become “individualized” which assumes an autonomization of self-regulatory practices (whether this lament for the decline of the social is parlayed via an emphasis on ideas of self empowerment, responsivization, self regulation, or obsessing over the care of self). Rather, as Miller and Rose (2008) so clearly articulate, and as I will flesh out ethnographically in Chapters 3 and 5, these shifts must be understood as techniques of governance that are being promulgated and invested in with vigour at different scales - from state, to institutional, to informal sector, to community and individual (Fairbanks, 2004, Miller and Rose, 2008).

What we are witnessing then, according to this literature, is a profound reshaping of the practices of governance (Foucault, 2004) such that the social, as an artifact of welfare governmental-ity, is given what Burchell claims as “the capacity to function autonomously by reshaping its characteristic model of action” (Burchell, 1996, p. 27). While there is considerable movement towards “rolling back” the role of the state in this new configuration (Peck, 2004), a new axial formulation of state – social - individual has been gestated (Fairbanks, 2004). As Burchell (1996) suggests,

There is a clear sense in which neoliberalism is anti-society just as it is opposed to government. However, there is another sense in which one could describe neoliberalism as promoting what might be called an autonomization of society through the invention and proliferation of quasi-regulatory models of action for the independent conduct of its activities” (Burchell, cited in Fairbanks, 2004, p. 59).
This keen observation repositions the sightlines of social welfare scholarship to a more focused analysis of the activation of techniques of governance that consolidate a level of autonomy for entities outside of the purview of the state by reinvigorating and re-inscribing the power of various sector experts and agencies to carry out this decoupling — but a decoupling that nevertheless, as we are reminded, ties these entities to the state through a complex weave of “alignments and translations” according to the dictates of market logic (Barry, Rose & Osbourne, 1996, p.12).

Numerous authors writing within the Canadian context (e.g., Lightman, 2008; Fanelli, 2009; Greg & Evans, 2009) have pointed to waves of “neoliberal” austerity and monetary policies and state restructuring practices — as both “roll back” social provisioning and aggressive strategic interventions - contributing to the different types of municipal and regional socio-economic reports attested to by the Cities Centre and the United Way of Toronto (see Chapter 3). Several key lines from this by now familiar and well-rehearsed script bear repeating here. By most accounts (cf Lightman, 2003; Graham, Swift & Delaney, 2009), it was in the mid 1980’s that the federal Progressive Conservative Party under the stewardship of Brian Mulroney implemented a series of strategies and practices that would more finely attune Canada’s political and economic landscape in accordance with globalizing late capitalist trends; equalization payments to the provinces were gradually reduced, federal responsibility in key social programs was withdrawn, and the North American Free Trade Association was enacted which sought to progressively dismantle protective barriers and regulatory standards. The federal Liberal Party continued these practices of sawing away at the limbs of Canada’s social welfare provisioning with changes to the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST) and Employment Insurance programmes. Under the current reign of the
newly formulated Conservative party, several tax restructuring policies have been introduced that have fundamentally undermined the state’s fiscal capacity and serve as a marker of its disinterest in state sponsored social assistance provisioning (Fanelli, 2009; Graham, Swift & Delaney, 2009).

At a provincial scale, Ontario’s first neo-conservative party came to power in the mid 1990’s under the formidable banner of “the Common Sense Revolution”. Apart from consolidating the core city of Toronto and post war suburbs - an aggressive re-engineering of local state governance inspired by Thatcherite/Reaganite policies (Desfor et. al. 2006), substantive changes were made to provincial-municipal financing, including the making of deep cuts in provincial transfer payment, a re-working of the property tax system, and a downloading of costs associated with social housing, public transportation and other social welfare/social assistance programming. Other re-structuring under the common-sense banner included the deregulation of urban planning, development controls and rent controls, privatization of municipal utilities, the ceasing of all social housing construction, the enactment of workfare, the centralization of control over public education, and the whittling away of an already eroded civilian regulation of policing (Desfor, 2006; Fanelli, 2009).

The revolution that the Conservative parties began has been “quietly consolidated” (Boudreau, Keil and Young, 2006, p.12) by the current provincial Liberals, paving the way for a realignment of Toronto city governance towards what Desfor et al. (2006) call “competitive city politics” (p. 138) - a re-jigging of fiscal and structural policies geared towards facilitating Toronto’s competitive and “creative” advantage on the globalised financial stage. One of the key sites of the marketing strategies being trafficked by Toronto, as an incorporated body, is the aesthetization of the city’s ethnic/globalised diversity (Boudreau, Keil and Young, 2006) and its standard of living - so
smartly packaged under its “beautiful streets campaign” (City of Toronto, 2011).

As a result of these interventions promulgated at different scales, Toronto’s socio-spatial landscape is gradually being demarcated along the lines of state-sanctioned and supported zones of life-style privilege, creativity and innovation, privatised public spaces, and what Wacquant (2001) has referred to as “hyperghettos” – spaces marked by limited wage opportunities, punitive and indifferent state welfare provisioning, and the emergence of patchwork, informal, and para legal economies.

While this strategy of focusing on life-style and innovation as a global competitive asset is, by its rationality, design and ultimately effect, exclusionary of different civic sectors (i.e., drawn along the lines of ideological politics and income accessibility), what is perhaps most remarkable about the neoliberal urbanism that has emerged since the mid 1990’s is its ability to co-opt the critical language of its dissenters. Key words, like “sustainability”, “local democracy”, “quality of life” are deployed frequently and generously to re-harness the types of energies that have been cultivated through dissensual processes (Boudreau, Keil & Young, 2006, p. 208-209). Indeed, what has emerged, as we shall see in chapters 3 and 5, is a form of consensual governance that has successfully managed to draw together various designated parties – global and local capital, social services and philanthropic organizations, community groups, neighbourhood and business associations, policy and planning alliances, labour and politicians, the police - in a practice of accommodationist competitiveness that is grounded in the operative logic of markets, risk, and securitization. This formulation of “politics” is, if we recall Ranciere’s critique, nothing but an attempt to defuse agonistic expression from erupting into representational space.
Risk, securitization and the knotting of neoliberal and neoconservative political rationalities.

Several strands within the governmentality literature make reference to other social management techniques that function in conjunction with these configured chains of “responsible and empowerment”. A first strand (Doyle, 2003; Muncie, 2006; O’Malley, 2003; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2001) has explored the complementarity between the logics of neo-liberal rationality and a recoding of the strategies, practices and systems of risk management that emerged during the 19th century. According to this literature, central to the conceptualization of risk prediction and risk management is the mobilization of probabilistic thinking in constructing idealized or normativised futures that can then be used as markers for assessing behaviours and dispositions of targeted populations in the present (Stenson and Watt, 1999; Muncie, 2006). Time space continuums are thus collapsed or at least made more certain in the face of risk modeling (Muncie, 2006; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2001).

Risk as a technique of liberal governance had become ensconced in Europe and North America by the 19th century. In this modality, the “prudence” of the “working-man” to manage risks associated with the individual’s household economy was complemented by voluntary relations (organized through kinship, filial or geographical proximity) to collectivise risk. Rose argues that risk became “socialized” in the 20th century with the implementation of national schemes of compulsory social insurance designed to mediate risk at a collective level (O’Malley, 2003). Instrumental to socialized risk logic was the impulse to inculcate amongst the citizenry “a moral effect of responsibility, and a regularity of habits of labour and social obligation” (Miller and Rose, 2008, p. 88).
According to this reading of an encroaching moralism, it was this very logic of “moral responvisvalism”, coupled with a realignment of a state-social-individual governance nexus under the guise of hyper market rationality that ushered in a new era in the politics of security (O’Malley, 2003). Risk, in one sense, has become individualised, where individual subjects, as was explored above, are now morally compelled (Doyle, 2003) to make private provisions and exercise an acute level of prudence (O’Malley, 1996) in the control and management of resources. O’Malley (2003) suggests that actuarialism and economic sovereignty are imbricated in such a way that taking care of one’s self (the moral imperative) has become synonymous with the economic, rational impulse to manipulate the environment for productive ends and as a protective factor against risk independence rather than risk dependency. Failure to regulate one’s actions, transform unhealthy perceptions and attitudes, reduce risk behaviours and to acknowledge the rights of others to secure futures (whether to their person or property) has come to imply a failure of the self, a self “out of control”, a self willing to violate the rights of others (O’Malley, 1996). As Miller and Rose (2008) note, in this revitalized discourse of risk, individual choice, individual morality, private profit, and public good are configured as a moral-economic bundle relied upon to inform the coordinates of “empowerment” and “freedom”, and concomitantly, the behaviours or conducts that violate these principles.

Lyon Callo (2004) and Kelly (2006) argue that social work practitioners and researchers have been instrumental in implementing the rationalities of risk and personalized responsivisation. Importantly, for our purposes, it is necessary to consider that the subjectivities of youth, as an identity
and as a set of conducts and behaviours in particular, have become a central social work problematic in the operationalisation of risk regulation and mediation. Social work technologies and disciplinary practices are thus not only harnessed to help in the assessing of the markers of risk, but are utilized in assisting the individual’s learning of tools of self governance through programs like job readiness, remedial education, control of substance use and mental health issues, and indeed, arts programming (France, 2008; Jensen & Fraser, 2006; Yndigen 2007). Indeed, as Sharland (2006) argues for the British context, the mobilization of risk rhetoric by the profession has resulted in an unfortunate elision between the agendas of care and control that had previously been in tension in social work practices. (And as Foucault noted, it was within this tension that a re-articulation of, or a resistance to, discursive practices were made possible (Chambon, 1999)).

Numerous authors argue that this heightened sensitivity to personalized risk management, as a zone of hyper personal surveillance and behaviour modification, exacerbates the perceived level of risk in non-monitored zones. Thus, once forms of risk discourses are in circulation, they are readily available for application to newly diagnosed risks. For Hacking (2003) and Hunt (2003), the problematisation of risk mobilises a highly selective and contingent set of discursive practices and formations that call forth the past (a remembrance of violation or past acts of transgression however unrelated) and the future (a perception of possible defilement against property or person) into the present and are assembled in such a way as to map some anxiety or fear induced quality on a future action. It is this temporal movement and slippage between past, present, future, the projection of past harm into the future, and potential threat as immanent threat in the present that procures risk discourse its power not just to cultivate anxiety or fear but to “stimulate personal action
in the present” and to necessitate, as moral imperative, a call for sanctioning and punitive interven-
tion (Hunt, 2003, p. 173). Targeted via this affective/ethical economy are spatialised sights where
transgressions, or more properly, threats of transgression to “property”, might possibly transpire
- ghettoized areas, inner city and inner-suburban spaces and conversely, in gentrified neighbour-
hoods, tourist zones, public spaces (including sidewalks, alleyways and parks) and shopping cen-
tres.

These zones of intensity and plausible excess, are mapped (un)wittingly in accordance to
the orienting markers of racialised, gendered, and classed difference (Wacquant, 2009) - legacies
that were inherent to previous liberal regimes, but according to a different organizational logic. In
a previous welfare modality, spaces of (racialised/gendered) poverty and the subjects inhabiting
them, as behavioural or situational markers of a perceived threat to the order of the social, were
understood as being emblematic of the structural fault-lines that gave rise to these behaviours or
situations in the first instance. As such, because they posed a presumed threat to the realization
of modernist aspirations, they were comprehended as sites of modernist possibility and renewal
(Sharland, 2006; Wacquant, 2009). In other words, these zones were read as indicators of the ef-
fectiveness of state social intervention (Powell, 2003) to rebuild the capacity of the social state. It
is important to note, however, that these “socialization strategies” that emphasized an address of
the mechanisms and structures of social dislocations (Wacquant, 2009) were operative in dynamic
tension with more medicalised modalities, that shifted analytical sightlines towards the psycho-
pathologies or deficiencies of the individual (or family).

In this current era marked by economic and social risk and insecurity (Wacquant, 2009)
coupled with an elision of subjective responsivisation with civic right, techniques for the regulation of racialised, gendered poverty, have been redirected away from “rehabilitative” and deterrence based models of social provisioning and we might add, securitization, towards more punitive strategies that are grounded in what Wacquant has labeled a “penalization” modality. According to this line of argument, penal sanction, modes of securitization, and welfare supervision via social service provisioning and other voluntary sector agency practices (Fairbanks, 2004; Power, 2007) are articulated in a way that is first aligned with practices etched out by neoliberalism logic, and then faced over with a neo-conservative moralism (Brown, 2006). Built into its operative modality is a two-fold calculation exercised at multiple scales (the state, community, individual, social services): (i) an erasure of structural or institutional fault-lines that are incised with gender and racial antagonisms and inequalities (together with other “social antagonisms” (Amin, 2009) like ability, health, religion, age, and sexuality); and a recoding of divisions and exclusions, previously enumerated along quantitative lines (the haves/have nots) into qualitative distinctions (“depravity”, dependency, incapacity, dangerous) where certain zones and identities are problematised for their amoral non-compliance to the dictates of responsible productivity, and targeted for specific reformatory or punitive attention (Swift & Callahan, 2009; Fairbanks, 2010; Miller and Rose, 2008; Sharland, 2007).

Following Wacquant’s analysis, the new “penal system” functions according to three interconnected registers. On the lowest rung, incarceration and surveillance (of social assistance recipients, of public life in targeted zones, and of the movements and behaviours of marked/suspected “offenders”) serve to “physically manage, neutralize and warehouse” the excess of the labour market - subjects (documented and not) who remain unabsorbed by unionised or flexible labour

While Wacquant’s address is focused on American modes of statecraft and governance, I would argue that given the groundwork laid by the Harris regime in Ontario for social assistance provisioning, together with more recent strategies deployed by the Conservative majority in areas of securitization and penal reform (see chapter 3 and 4), the provincial liberals in their hyper-vigilisation and retraction of social assistance programming, and at a city level, the Ford (Toronto’s Mayor since 2011) regime’s recalcitrant moves towards marrying securitization and social security, that this generalized model can very well serve as a theoretically orienting device for understanding the mechanics at work in the two aesthetic projects.
markets and those stigmatized factions who persist in a type of market-centric transgression by engaging in extra or shadow economic, para legal productivity. Zero tolerance policing or “community policing” have emerged as preferred techniques of securitization. Marrying instrumental risk based assessment strategies (crime pattern analysis, geo-tracking systems to trace crime hot spots, (racialised) profiling based on future projection and past offence of petty acts of disruption, and an unprecedented scale of information gathering including the use of stop search tactics to interrogate individuals) with an unapologetic use of excessive, pain (death) inducing force, these techniques are reliant for their effectivity and implementation on a complex weave of partnerships between the judiciary, private and public security forces, neighbourhood and business associations and local politicians, non-profits and individuals (Shearing, 2003).

A middle level of the penal modality functions by collapsing a moral and economic imperative such that the “discipline of de-socialised wage labour” (complacency with a de-unionization of work, the freezing of real wages) and hyper modes of self governance are foisted on more established working class and middle class subjects. The effect, argues Wacquant, is to raise the cost of resistance by making this stratum a morally complicit actor in the de-democratization of civic life and de-socialization of the political economy. A number of critical race scholars reference a lactifying impulse of this disciplining function, a cultivated desire that fosters what Dillard (2001) terms a “conservative multiculturalism”. In media studies scholar Rosalie Mukherjee’s words, there is a growing trend amongst “middle class Blacks, Asians, Latinos [First Nations individuals] to distance ourselves from the subversive and disruptive critical race impulses of the civil rights era”, the effect of which, she argues, has been to provide “a racially correct voice-over for neo-liberal claims
to individual responsivization” (Mukherjee, 2006, p. 21). Of course, as has already been noted, this sociological reading of personalized responses can be further placed within the context of a neoliberal/risk based apparatus that dismisses the concept of institutional racism (or sexism, etc) as meritless in favour of a system propounding the virtues of a particularised and punitive meritocracy (Giroux, 2008; Davis, 2007).

Finally, for the upper classes, and for society in general, the penal apparatus, according to this reading, ritualizes and exhibits the authorial power of the state by re-inscribing material and symbolic boundaries between the deserving and the unde(r)serving, the normative and the deviant, and the “commendable citizen”, and the abject subject. Important for our purposes, is a consideration of Wacquant’s keen observation that control of zones of delinquency is not only organised as practical arrangements for behavioural regulation and containment, but are articulated along emotional and aesthetic lines. In what he refers to as a “pornographic display of securitization”, the managing of deviance through different strategies of force and containment is carried out not for its own purposes but for its exhibitionary qualities - as spectacle of state vigilance to regulate insecurity and manage urban social (dis)order. According to Wacquant, all is splayed out, dramatized, and ritualized for public consumption – delinquent behaviours as symptom of personal irresponsibility, immorality, incivility; and the parading of targeted and assorted “social detritus” – youth, illegal immigrants, refugees, repeat criminals - in contradistinction to the behaviours of “law abiding, and compliant citizens” (Wacquant, 2009, p. xiii). Visuality is thus understood as a technology of governance that articulates a certain production, circulation and exhibition of images oriented towards interpellating a social reality demarcated by (productive) propriety and acceptability.
This renewed strategy of coupling the materiality of targeted judiciary and securitization practices - from surveillance to profiling to incarceration - with emotionally and ethically charged, technically enhanced visual imagery, is geared towards making believable the claim (as was forwarded by the French government post the banlieue rebellions, 2005, for example) that it “is possible to make real delinquency and the feeling of subjective insecurity recede” (p. xiv).

If what we are witnessing under this new aesthetic-penalty is a profound targeting and rebuking (as defective, as already failed entities or as abject) of certain subjects and spaces – racialised women and men, (racialised) youth, and criminals (Giroux, 2008; Davis, 2007; Lyon-Callo, 2004; Lundy, 2004; Rudick, 2006) – and a concomitant “racialised culture of fear” (Wacquant, xvii), then we might pause to consider more precisely how race, gender and age configure analytically with these emergent modalities of late capitalism. In the interest of broadening an analytical frame that considers how racialised logics configure in the promulgation of targeted social policy geared aesthetic strategies, I turn now to a consideration of what Ash Amin refers to as the “conjunctural tightness” (Amin, 2010) between the perniciousness of racist legacies (practices of racial coding and judgment; the coupling of racialised subjectivity to pathos or abnormalcy) and the technologies of risk and neo-liberal governance.

**Contending with the logics of race:** As Robert Mahanti (2010) argues, while much of the neoliberal governance literature in general (Theodore, 2007” Fairbanks, 2004, 2010; Wilson, 2006) acknowledges the disproportionate and differential effects that neoliberalization has on racialised (and gendered) subjects, it nevertheless treats the racialization of poverty and penalization of racialised subjects as effects of neoliberalization. In other words, neoliberalism (together with its couplings to
risk and securitization logics and practices) is understood as a socio-economic process that generates racialised/racist implications. Given that race in these calculations is conceptualized as a fixed category, racialised subjects are thus configured as distinctive entities that are then remapped onto the neoliberal policy terrain.

Taking an oblique turn away from more economistic ways of explaining these racialising trends, political theorists Peck and Tickell (2002) suggest the need for governance and policy related scholarship to grapple with the ways “in which ideologies of neoliberalism are themselves produced and reproduced through institutional forms and political action, since actually existing neoliberalisms are always (in some way or another), hybrid of composite structures” (p. 383). Critical race theorists (Eng, 2008; Goldberg, 2002, Mahtani, 2010; Mukherjee, 2006) have pushed this observation further by according race its own operational logic, (Gilmore, 2006; McKittrick, 2006; Pilido, 2006) suggesting that a “conjunctural tightness” (Amin, 2009) or a “co-extensivity” (Mahtani, 2010) exists between racist legacies, other modes of exploitation and exclusion (like historically configured patriarchy and heterosexism), and the normalizing technologies of liberal governance and securitization. According to this formulation, race, as a hierarchically ordering rationality and set of practices arose in the interstices of (or in Mukherjee’s reading, “amongside” the seeming disjunction between (2006, p. 34)) liberal humanist aspirations for the universality of freedoms and the requirements of mercantile and colonialist enterprise to organize the productive and social labour of the colonies (and colonized) (Lowe, 2006; Eng, 2008). In fact, for Lowe, and Goldberg, the sublation of slave and coolie labour (and the ideological mechanisms that allowed for that suppression in the first instance) are foundational to European economic and political ascendancy and essen-

---

07. According to Goldberg’s analytical thinking, racism and race are afforded their own logic in contradistinction to the dominant paradigms that currently govern race discussions – discourses that reify race as biologically determined or given (neurologically or otherwise), and race as a type of by-product of other putative forces (Olson & Worsham (2011). And yet as Goldberg elaborates, whilst having its own operating logic, it nevertheless functions in accord with other rationalities and as such can be understood as always emergent and contingent:

“Race undertakes at once to furnish specific identity to otherwise abstract and alienated subjectivities. Sufficiently broad, indeed, almost conceptually empty, race offers itself as a category capable of providing a semblance of social cohesion, of historical particularity, of given meanings and motivations to agents otherwise mechanically conceived as conduits of market forces and moral laws. Like the conception of the nation that emerges more or less co-terminously, race proceeds at its inception by arming social subjects with a cohesive identity. It is an identity that proves capable of being stretched across time and space, that itself assumes transforming specificity and legitimacy by taking on as its own the connotations of prevailing scientific and social discourses. In colonizing these prevailing connotations, race in turn has been able to set scientific and political agendas, to contain the content and
applicability of Reason, to define who may be excluded and to confine the terms of social inclusion and cohesion.” (The Racial State, p. 4)

As will be discussed in the following section, it is precisely in those moments where it becomes impossible to deny the materialized presence of racialised logic or relatedly, where difference as an operating logic becomes impossible to deny, that liberalism deploys the strategies of “tolerance and inclusion” to quell differences’ disruptive possibilities (Goldberg, 2002).

Thus, rather than being seen as modernism’s “aberrant offshoot” (Stoler, 1995, p. 23), the logics of race - as an ongoing, productively assigning, organizing apparatus and in its disappearance - need to be considered, according to this scholarship, as “internal” to the machinations of the bio-political state itself (Mukherjee, 2006, 36)(Foucault); they are, as this scholarship suggests, woven throughout the social body’s “exclusionary practices of freedom and democracy” (Stoller, 1995, p. 24), are made manifest in the articulations of its cultural production, are part of its psychical structure (Mbembe, 2006) and “its inclusionary myths” (Stoller, 1995, p. 25), and are implicated
in the interpellation of individual subjectivities (Mukherjee, 2006).

**Governing racialised difference – a final analytical/contextual thread.**

In the final section of this chapter, the tenets of these theoretical concerns, which, as I have suggested, permit us to think through the intricacies of a race-liberal governance nexus in a more analytically rigorous, and non-economically reductive way, will be drawn upon to briefly examine shifts in Canada’s governance practices of managing racialised difference and regulating the rights of citizenship. This dissection stages an analytical/contextual frame in which to historicise both the different racialised legacies that I argue haunt the United Way’s recent forays into social policy governance of economically and socially disenfranchised communities (Chapters 3 through 5) and the efforts by youth artists and youth workers to navigate spaces of rights and senses of belonging (see chapter 5).

Part of the analytical work of the section will be to trouble an official Canadian narrative of origins that suggests that multiculturalism, as a consensual negotiation of (racial) difference, is integral to the nation’s birthing and maturation process (Mackey, 2002). By way of introduction, and as an illustration of this claim, I point to Canada’s recently reissued Federal study (2010) guide for those seeking Canadian citizenship (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010). The officially sanctioned document reads like a historical drama, positioning colonial and settler acts of courage, heroism, adventure, war, and exploration against an unfolding historical backdrop generously peppered with instances detailing a country’s unflinching commitment to its founding principles of democratic liberalism, accommodation and openness, tolerance and multiculturalism. (Citizenship and Immigration, Canada, 2011). While a critique of this document is outside of the purview of this
dissertation, I read this rendering of multiculturalism as a preeminent life pulse within the national body in light of a post-colonial and anti-racist scholarship that sees Canada’s efforts to govern racialised difference in less generous terms. Following Grillo’s lead, I suggest that policies targeting citizenship and immigration have unfolded in four phases, with each phase mobilizing different techniques and political rationalities towards preferred and at times, contradictory, ends (Grillo, 2007). Caution will be exercised, however, in reading these shifts as discrete practices of governance; as will be argued below, each modality adapts liberal humanist values and principles to the vagaries of global/nationalist capital (its logics, aspirations, desires and relations of production), while simultaneously negotiating and expressing inherent colonialist/racist thinking in reinvigorated ways.

**Nation building tactics of assimilation and exclusion:** During the first phase of governing difference, corresponding roughly from the mid 19th century to the mid 1960’s (Grillo, 2007; Hiebert, Collins & Spoonley, 2003), immigration flows were adjusted in accordance with the state of the fledgling Canadian economy – in times of pronounced economic growth, where labour shortages in all sectors were acute (principally, agriculture, manufacturing and resource based) aggressive recruiting transpired targeting those with Anglo-Celtic, Christian/Protestant heritage. Only reluctantly were those with other European backgrounds recruited, with Northern Europeans receiving more favourable treatment (Hiebert, Collins & Spoonley, 2003).

Canada’s relationship with racialised subjects from colonized countries rested uneasily in a space of contention between racialised ideologies of the preferred citizen and the need for an expendable and cheap labour force. Thus, while differently marked colonized subjects (Blacks, First
Nations) were first deployed as slaves (prior to 1831) and then eventually as contracted or indentured labour (South-East, and East Asian) to build an infrastructure sufficient to the needs of nation building, most official recruitment strategies and practices during this period actively and simultaneously curtailed or denied immigration from Non-European countries (United States excepted). (Henry & Tator, 2009). And yet, despite these best efforts of the state, Eastern European Jews together with racialised individuals (and at times families) from the United States, and East Asia and South Asia persisted in marking their presence in an unwelcoming nationalist environment.

This system, with its preference for Anglo Celtic (European) sameness to the desired exclusion of those marked with an indelible, unimaginable difference, paralleled Canada’s persistence in maintaining techniques of containment or forced assimilation towards First Nations peoples as enshrined in the Indian Act of 1876 (Henry & Tator, 2009). Both modalities of governance rested firmly on the dualistic practice of exclusion/erasure of linguistic, religious, and national difference and assimilation as an expressed desire that all subjects adhere to - if not wholly embody - a set of presumed national sensibilities. As sociologist Sunera Thobani (2007) explains, a certain persistent Canadian nationalist subjectivity has been created based on a prescribed set of Protestant, liberal ethics, values and characteristics. In the initial phase of settler expansion and state formation, technologies were employed to call forth certain subjects - those of Anglo-Celtic heritage (and later other northern/eastern Europeans marked by whiteness) - to embody these traits. By a discursive slight of hand, these traits and values were then deemed to be intrinsic to these subjects’ moral and physical constitution and simultaneously declared to be an essential component of the spirit and identity of the emerging national body politic. The ability to claim Canadian (and thus “exalted”)
subjectivity - as “law abiding, enterprising, polite, compassionate, caring” - thus hinges on the right to embody these national characteristics, dispositions and moral beliefs and values (Thobani, 2007, p. 9). And yet, as Thobani further clarifies, to garner a sense of belonging in this ever-evolving Canadian nationalist project implies not only the right to express a proper nationalist ontology, but also the freedom to identify these characteristics in others. As subjects are interpellated, their consequent human worthiness and entitlement to specific rights and resources are affirmed through their sense of belonging. In other words, privileged subjects recognize themselves in, and are affirmed by, “the cultivation of such shared nationality” (Thobani, 2007:9) to the exclusion of those who are deemed outside of the colonising/nationalising process.

Phase Two – “Integration Plus. A second phase of governing difference, commencing in the mid 1960’s and ending in the mid-80’s - what political theorist Paul Grillo labels “integration plus” (2007, p. 980) - marked a gradual (though, by no means complete) shift away from a more explicit, cultural, national and race based immigration system towards a point system for independent immigrants that privileged, to varying degrees, class and educational status (Henry & Tator, 2009). Greater precision was also procured in defining the mechanism that governed refugee and family reunification systems. The previous explicit strategies of containment and preservation were becoming impossible to maintain both in the face of international pressure (specifically reflecting the rising political voice of ex-colonies in the United Nations calling for the dismantling of colonialist and neo-colonialist nationalist practices) and because of a disjunction between labour supply and demand; Canadian manufacturing and service sectors’ continued appetite for increased labour supplies in targeted areas was out of sync with the contracting supplies of labour from preferred sources due to the dwindling
of interests of European immigrants and the closing off of Soviet/Soviet satellite national borders to emigration (Grillo, 2007; Hiebert, Collins & Spoonley, 2003). By the late 1970’s through until the mid 1980’s, however, Canada moved into a prolonged period of economic recession – a period that witnessed the beginning of what would become in subsequent years a normativised unemployment rate of 8% (up from 4% in previous periods). Immigration was once again curtailed echoing the practices prevalent during the depressed economic interim war period between 1930-1945.

Multiculturalism, as a national strategy and eventual policy arose during this 2nd phase of immigrant expansion and out of what could be referred to as a phase of nationalist introspection. Canadian aspirations on the international stage necessitated attention to the optics of its racialised practices. Moreover, reflective state governance innovation was ostensibly required to contain the perceived threat of disruption to national cohesion and prosperity posed by the emergence of a restless, discontented and collectivized Francophone subjectivity in Quebec and increasingly vocal, politicized non-anglo-celtic immigrant communities disenfranchised from the political process (Hiebert, Collins & Spoonley, 2003). Enacted in 1971, the policy of multiculturalism, was from the outset organized around liberal modernity’s guiding principles of inclusion and tolerance (Brown, 2006; Dhamoon, 2005; Goldberg, 2002) - mechanisms oriented towards containing the diversity of “ethnic cultures” within the existing frame of an “imagined” secularist nationalist community (Anderson, 1991; Brown, 2006) replete with its set understandings of what values and traditions should gird the social order (Dhamoon, 2005). As a liberal form of governance⁹ “striated” with a deliquesced Protestant ethic and other normativising understandings of kinship, race, gender, work, worship, faith, sexuality and leisure (Brown, 2006, p. 23) the policy framed the management

09_ And here, I follow Wendy Brown’s argument that the art of liberalism as a chimeric cultural form is its ability to perform a “two-fold ruse”: By projecting its principles of individualism, free will, responsivisation and rationality as universal, liberalism enunciates itself above the regressive and constructive practices of “culture” - a recurring contemporary trope that is understood to bind individuals to the reproduction of social relations, practices of religious rituals and beliefs, and embodied traits, and to do so “without their expressed choice or will”; and on the other by “juridically privatizing culture” leaving liberalism, by all appearances, unscathed and uninfluenced by culture’s imperialist imperatives. To quote Brown, “In its self representation as the sole political doctrine that can harbour culture and religion without being conquered by them, liberalism casts itself as uniquely tolerant of culture from its position above culture. But liberalism is no more above or outside culture than is any other political form, and culture is not always elsewhere from liberalism” (Brown, 2006, p. 23).
of difference in several inter-related ways: (i) First, the policy was in its intention and design accommodationist and “celebratory”: it officially acknowledged the historical founding of Canada on two national “cultures” (with the third – First Nations – shifting in and out of official sightlines depending on the instrumentality of its presence (Mackey, 2002); (ii) the policy allowed for the accommodation or “tolerance” of a diversity of ideas, identities, values and religious expressions practiced by individuals identifying with non-Anglo Celtic protestant ethnic communities – as long as these practices were for consumptive purposes (festivals, culinary contributions, etc) and contained safely within privatised realms of domestic spaces and “ethnic enclaves” (Banerjee, 2000; Brown, 2006; Thobani, 2007); (iii) and it recognized the contributions that diverse cultural expressions made to the economic well being of Canada (Grillo, 2007). A second arm of the policy recognized the role that the state needed to play in supporting “cultural retention” and fostering “immigrant integration” through the provisioning of settlement and supportive services.

Housed within this new multicultural sensibility was a generalized acknowledgment that overt displays of racism (from institutional, to ideological to interpersonal) were incommensurable (at least optically) to its grounding principles of inclusion and tolerance. The policy set the stage for a demand for an entrenchment of equal rights for all citizens; by 1982, political rights for citizens and civic rights for all residents had become codified in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and in 1988, the Multicultural Act came into play, formalizing the Charter into Canada’s legal system (Hiebert, Collins, Spoonley, 2003). These legal mechanisms set in place a liberal rights discourse based on an assumption of “shared core values, and rights and responsibilities” (Dhamoon, 2005, p.5) of the individual– a quasi collectivist vision of civic unity that comprehended
recourse to the courts together with the promotion of dialogue as preferred means to furthering democratic civic principles. Rights discourses, thus framed as an appeal to a consensual model (in the Rancerian sense) of civic participation has been productively deployed by “minority groups” to promote the individual’s right to self realization and active political inclusion in civic society (employment, its social benefits, and political structures), and to promote “activities and structures that enhance participation and representation” (Dhamoon, 2005, p. 7).

And yet despite these claims of multiculturalism’s ability to foster a functional, rights based pluralism, numerous critics (see for example, Banerjee, 2000; Razack, 2005, Thobani, 2007) point to the techniques of governance at work that enable multiculturalism, in practice, to carve out and hierarchalise distinctions between different classes of citizens (and non citizens specifically). Extending the convincing arguments made by sociologists Sara Ahmed, Avtar Brah, and literary theorist, E. San Juan, Jr., it can be argued that multiculturalist policy in Canada allows for the occlusion of a still functioning self-referential modality of racism (Brah, 2004) - operative as a chimerical form from the nation’s inception as a settler society (Thobani, 2007). In other words, multiculturalism allows for an optics of respectability by formally welcoming the ‘stranger’, the racialised other into its midst, while simultaneously fetishizing the other as an originary and exotic difference (Ahmed, 2000, pp 20-25). The effects of this positioning of racialised others in a web of desire and disavowal are twofold: it permits the “exalted” nationalist to claim a renewed propriety and superiority because of a willingness to embrace the cultural presence and indelible difference of the other; and it serves as license to cannibalize the exoticness of cultural/racial otherness, rendering difference not only subject to the whims of taste and the market, but also fossilized and hermetically sealed.
off from the political/historical realities of displacement that gave rise to “differences” present in Canada in the first instance (San Jauan, 2007). As Brah notes, multiculturalism becomes a mechanism for “valorizing aesthetic permanences” in a national way of life (Brah, 2000, p. 8).

As a parallel process, political theorists Dhamoon (2005) and Day (2000) argue that the politics of inclusion - one of two guiding “beacons of multiculturalism” (Brown, 2006) - can be thought of as a similarly constitutive and productive force in both furthering the project of ‘othering’ certain marked subjects and in “depoliticizing” citizenship. Accordingly, “inclusion” safeguards a more sustained critique of institutional forms of racialised and other integrated forms of oppression by simply readjusting the classificatory terms for negotiating difference (Dhamoon, 2005, Mukherjee, 2006). In other words, what transpires in this focus on inclusionary, culturalised politics is a realignment of disciplinary power such that the ideological and systemic mechanisms that manifest in differentiated and hierarchicalized subjects, exclusions and privileges remain effectively unaltered. Moreover, as Day (2000) makes clear, a politics of inclusion is conformist and highly “seductive”. Through the allure of material, civic and economic gain, subjects marked by difference are persuaded to embrace dominant values, norms, and structures at the expense of adopting a more critical politics oriented towards resignifying and restructuring “arenas of domination” (Dhamoon, 2005).

Finally, we may pay heed to Wendy Brown’s (2006) interrogation of the concept of tolerance as a primary governing support of multiculturalism’s efforts to regulate antagonisms within pluralist western democracies. For Brown, rather than being comprehended as a “transcendental virtue”, tolerance must be read as a “historically protean” element of liberal governance, a non-legal codi-
fied, infinitely plastic and malleable “principle” that is mobilized politically and socially to ensure the normativisation, regulation and differential marking of subjects within and beyond western liberal democracies’ borders. According to Brown, tolerance functions as a “vector of depoliticization” in which socio-economic inequality, marginalization, social unrest – marks of structural violence requiring political analysis and political solutions - are either naturalized onto the bodies, histories, spaces, and subjectivities of selected groups or deemed as problems more properly addressed at an individual or personal level. Thus, tolerance, as a parallel governance mechanism to inclusionary politics, dehistorizes and short-circuits any understanding of the configurations of power that shape and produce inequalities and disruptions.

Importantly though, tolerance can be seen as having two additional effects. First, it allows those claiming tolerance a position of neutrality outside the workings of the socio-historical, political, discursive and material constitution of difference. Difference, for the select, is what needs to be tolerated. Moreover, tolerance, as a technique borne out of the disjuncture between liberal humanism’s abstracted and universalist claims and its actual enactment in state governance, is mobilized to mediate conflicts that derive from within the contested space of cultural pluralism. According to this logic, the modernist western state confers onto its preferred citizens the abstracted qualities of rationality and will, a subjective construction that allows the subject to exceed or transcend its embodied, encultured location. For this subject, culture can be objectively positioned, as we have seen, as an exotic pleasure to be sampled, known, or experienced by choice within the confines of privatized space. Culture (as both abstract category and the purveyors of culture’s embodiedness – the mark of racialised otherness), poses an oppressive threat to the principles of liberal democ-
racy – universality, egalitarianism, individual autonomy and state secularism – if its performative/aesthetic expressions leak into or saturate public space. In other words, the conflict that has arisen over the presence of some Muslim women wearing the hijab (or niqab or burqa) in secular space (schools, etc) exposes, Brown argues, “the non-universal character of liberal legalism and public life; it exposes its cultural dimensions” (p. 173). This exposure of a faultline in liberalism’s self-presentation, of its presumed religious and cultural neutrality, is managed by an appeal to the discourse of tolerance: either difference is designated as a threat to “liberal” values (and thus repres-sible through state/military force – and here we witness the evocation of neo-conservative moral political rationality to shore up liberal logic) or dismissed as “cultural” or “religious” and thus delegitimized as a political claim to representability. To quote Brown, “Tolerance thus functions as the supplement to a liberal secularism that cannot sustain itself in moments of challenge and disruption” (p.174).

In this discussion of the varied technologies deployed under the guise of multiculturalist policy, I recall, Ranciere’s astute reflection on the practices of consensus as a mechanism for accommodating differences while simultaneously maintaining strict divisions within the pluralist polity. The effect of consensual governance, for Ranciere, is the foreclosure of a possibility of dissensus.

I would suggest that the problematics of managing difference through the deployment of mechanisms of inclusion and tolerance (as acts of governance and as site of disavowal) become further complicated in an era marked by the convergence of neoliberalization and neoconservatism (Brown, 2006). Although it will be the work of the case studies in chapters 3 through 5 to flesh out some of the complexities of this knotting of multiculturalism, neoliberalization, and neo-conservatism manifesting at a local municipal and community level, and specifically, in social services’ drive towards an aesthetic imperative, here I offer a brief and cursory sketch of shifts that have occurred in multicultural thinking and practice specifically, and in the governance of difference more generally at a national level over the past 25 years.
Neoliberal modes of governing difference: Rapid population growth in the post war period fueled by both increased immigration and high birth rates (encouraged in part by policy incentives to encourage women’s reproductive labour in the domestic sphere rather than productive labour in the public sphere) had tapered off by the early 1960’s. Although declining fertility was viewed as an index of the success of Canada’s modernization efforts, panic about the future ability of the nation to support an aging population had became part of a national discourse by the 1980’s (Hiebert, Collins, Spoonley, 2003). As a means of addressing these fears, the Progressive Conservatives, under the leadership of Brian Mulroney reconceptualised the immigration system as a panacea for the future projected demographic and economic malaise of the Canadian state (Hiebert, Collins, Spoonley, 2003), a rejigging that fit within a wider and gradual Canadian national and provincial recourse to aligning policies and techniques of governance to the logic of market capitalism. This unabashed, instrumentalist tying of difference to economic risk management, market logic, and securing a procured future set in motion the following four principle shifts in immigration policy: the selection of immigrants of child bearing years (in this sense the myth of the fertility of racialised people was viewed as a benefit); an aggressive courting of skilled and highly educated workers in targeted countries of the global south and eastern Europe; gradual increasing of barriers to entry through the family reunification and refugee streams; and the addition of a new mode of entry – the Business Class system. What resulted was a dramatic increase in selective immigration occurring in both a period of fervent economic activity, and unprecedentedly, during a recessionary period marked by excessively high unemployment, inflation and interest rates. Sustaining this flow of immigration was the belief that “immigration of the right sort” would act as a catalyst for
In 2005, a policy document entitled ‘A Canada for all: Canada’s Action Plan against Racism’ (CAPAR) appeared during the tail end of the Liberal reign over national politics, a policy platform that seemingly shifted the governance of difference away from a focus on culture (i.e., how to manage the effects of cultural diversity) to a focus on politics (managing the effects of racialised discrimination) (Dhamoon, 2005). This official attention to the realities of racism in Canada complemented Heritage Canada’s efforts (in which the Multiculturalism portfolio was then housed) from the mid 1990’s onwards to address the presence of a lingering societal racism alongside its promotion of multicultural sensibilities. CAPAR’s prescriptions for future action targeted the following areas for reflection and change: (i) promoting inclusion in the arenas of health, employment, approaches to criminal justice and crime, education, immigration integration through mechanisms of education (combating racism and promoting diversity); (ii) providing systems and tools of support to both allow “victims” of discrimination to voice and combat experiences of discrimination and to strengthen the capacity of immigrant communities to participate in civic society through their active engagement in political dialogue; (iii) countering hate and bias; (iv) and reinvigorating Canada’s commitment to regional and international forums that further the scope of human rights, including the promotion of inclusion of minority groups and confronting racism (CAPAR, 2005). Following Dhamoon’s lead (2005), we can think of this attempt to address the elimination of racism as being housed (and thus its ‘politics’, contained) within the same guiding principle of liberal multiculturalism - namely, the centrality of inclusion as an accommodation of cultural difference. This inadvertent slippage into the logic of a “culturalised politics” displaces a politicized reading of
oppression (Dhamoon, 2005) while simultaneously addressing the remediation of oppression as a problem of cultural address. (Brown, 2006). If culture is summoned as a base line for both explanation and outcome, then conversely, culturalised political solutions are heralded within this liberal logic as the means to achieve preferred ends. In this document, as in other state sponsored efforts, combating the effects of racism “through policies, programmes and services” is oriented towards the promotion of the “multicultural nature of Canadian society”, assisting in the realization of “the shared Canadian vision of an inclusive and equitable society” and helping to “build a more resilient, harmonious and creative society” (Heritage, 2005, iii, 2, 56, cited in Dhamoon, 2005 p. 2). Moreover, as Dhamoon persuasively argues, this recourse to a discourse of inclusion productively enables an alignment between multicultural programming and policy directives committed to combating racism within the logic of neoliberal political rationality. Put differently, the performative markers of “tolerance”, “creativity”, and “resource innovation” become essential to the optics of managing diversity and thus as valuable resources to truck in circuits of global capital and investment.

The limits of multiculturalism: post September 11 and the rise of neo-conservative logic. These renewed commitments to bolstering the institutional and community based apparatuses necessary for the instrumental functionings of multiculturalism (as strategies for political and cultural management, and as a mechanism to leverage economic futures) - already in tension with the paranoid nationalist and xenophobic/racist responses reflamed by the events of September 11 and the effects wrought by global neoliberalization (Gillroy, 2005) - have been significantly curtailed and paradoxically re-furbished with new vigor, with the ascendancy of the Conservative party to
first minority and then majority power in 2006. I would suggest that culturalised political solutions, as a neoliberal praxis, are being reconfigured by a political rationality aligned more explicitly in accordance with a putative moralism and authoritarian political practice, resulting in hybrid forms that (threaten to) further de-democratize the lives of racialised residents. Several examples suffice to illustrate this point. First, while CAPAR, as Dahmoon (2005) rightly points out, fails to explicitly name the sources of institutional racism (and the operative techniques) that conspire to perpetuate hierarchalised preferencing, exclusion and privileging of certain subjects, the report does make explicit or implicit reference to several para-state apparatuses that could have been poised to do the investigative work necessary to name systemic forms of oppression. Not surprisingly, given the Conservative party’s seeming indifference to veracity and accountability, their interest in self-regulation and market efficiency considerations, a preference for morally based rather than numerically generated “evidence”, and a desire for state parsimony in the provisioning of welfare and social services (as parlayed into justification of budget reductioning), these critical institutional mechanisms promoting state accountability have been gradually cut from the public financial rosters starting in 2006. Moreover, Multiculturalism has been recently shifted from the department of Heritage to Immigration and Citizenship, a departure that signals, at least semiotically, that racialised/cultural difference does not properly fit with a repositioned sense of Canadian “heritage” (its historical legacy, its current necessities). To be precise, I would suggest that this shift performs two functions: First, Canada’s history as a settler state that relied on racialised, non Anglo-Celtic/Franco labour to help build its infrastructural and economic capacity is seemingly expunged from an official reckoning of its national legacy or heritage (including values, sensibilities); Second,

11_ To name but a few of the commissions, para-institutional forums, and nationally funded not for profit bodies that have had funding partially or completely cut, or their activities regulated - The Status of Women Canada, Native Women’s Association of Canada’s Sisters in Spirit project, the Court Challenges Program, Canadian Human Rights commission, Canadian Council on International Cooperation; Statistics Canada, The national Film Board of Canada, Canadian Council for the Arts (Gergen, 2011).

12_ I wish to thank Chris Trevelyan for this valuable insight).
difference is semantically and institutionally repositioned as a problem inherent in the subjectivity of the immigrant herself/himself (“their ability to conform”) rather than germane and foundational to the ongoing transformation of the body politic itself.

These bi-modal trends are further expressed in changes that have been implemented to the state’s public enunciation of its understanding of multiculturalism (as registered in official sites and print material). In 2003, the following statement by Heritage Canada indexes the state’s public commitment to inclusionary (culturalised) politics replete with an acknowledgement of the need to address discriminatory practices, and the responsibility of the state in supporting cultural pluralism and fostering socio-economic integration.

Canadian Multiculturalism is fundamental to our belief that all citizens are equal. Multiculturalism ensures that all citizens can keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry, and have a sense of belonging. Acceptance gives Canadians a feeling of security and self-confidence, making them more open to, and accepting of, diverse cultures. The Canadian experience has shown that multiculturalism encourages racial and ethnic harmony and cross cultural understanding, and discourages ghettoization, hatred, discrimination and violence (cited in Hiebert, Collins, Spoonley, 2003).

Although this statement is preserved in its entirety on a secondary page in the subsection to the section “Multiculturalism” on Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s current website (accessed September, 30, 2011), another, more targeted statement appears on the primary page of the section. This statement is illustrative, I would suggest, of an elision of a liberal pluralist precedence by an emergent moralistic modality:

The Government of Canada is committed to reaching out to Canadians and newcomers and is developing lasting relationships with ethnic and religious communities in Canada. It encourages these communities to participate fully in society by enhancing
their level of economic, social, and cultural integration. CIC’s Multiculturalism Pro-
gram draws its mandate from the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988).

In a first textual move, an indelible distinction is made between the state (as representative body of a generic Canada) and “ethnic”/”religious” communities in which the word “these” serves as both an indexical trace of racialised/religious difference and suggests a distinction between those that can make legitimate claims to, and articulate, governance of the polity and those that cannot. Moreover, while the state promises to “reach out” to “Canadians and newcomers” alike, the rather vague declarative welcoming is contained by a more directive encouragement emphasizing integration and immigrant responsivization. This rhetorical elision of state commitment (as an expression of collective and universal responsibility) to sustaining immigrant integration” (Gergen, 2011) is mirrored in practice by the $53 million cuts to immigrant settlement programs that were announced at the end of 2010.

Consider, finally, two recent policy shifts in the regulation and curtailment of immigrant flows to the country that reflect a particular knotting of a neoliberal indifference to issues of democratic egalitarianism and social provisioning of care (Brown 2009) with a neo-conservative and xenophobic moralism that draws on the disciplinary power of the state to enforce boundaries between subjects, spaces and to defend a particular “imaginary of the West and its values” (Brown, 2006) devoid of “barbarism” and other undesirable characteristics (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2010 – Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship ). First, Canada’s decades long dependence on temporary foreign workers (first for domestic care, and then in the service and agricultural industries) has accelerated at an unprecedented pace post 2006, with now
more temporary workers residing in the country than immigrants processed as potential citizenship claimants (Gergin, 2011; Nakache & Kinoshita, 2010). This overt twining of citizenship eligibility (recalling the look and sensibility of the exalted citizen), immigration policy, and corporate labour needs has resulted in a labour system bifurcated along class, gendered, and racialised lines in which racialised countries of the global south are drawn upon as cheap sources of expendable labour while disavowing the rights of labouring subjects to citizenship, job security, safe working or living conditions, and the ability to exercise political rights as workers.

Second, amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act provide an opening for the state to formally privilege and target selective economic immigrants over family reunification and refugee claimants. As a result, acceptance rates of those already residing in Canada making refugee claims has decreased by 40% over the past two years, and the number of successful applicants on humanitarian and compassionate grounds has also decreased to 8,840 in 2010 from 11,000 a year previously accepted (Gergin, 2011). In addition, recently adopted legislative revisions to the refugee determination process (Bill C-31) on June 28, 2012, as a most recent display of the Conservative government’s racialised moral rectitude will authorize the government to designate certain groups of asylum seekers (those implicated in “a smuggling incident”) as suitable subjects for automatic, unreviewable incarceration for 12 months during their refugee review process. Those accepted as refugees from these targeted groups will be denied recourse to a host of freedoms and judicial rights for five years following their designation as “refugees” (Nerenberg, 2012). As well, C-31 extends the judiciary powers of immigration officers to include the ability “to arrest and detain any foreign national or permanent resident on suspicions of criminal activity without proof” (No One is
Illegal, 2012). Finally, the omnibus legislation allows the Minister of Immigration to signify a series of “safe countries”, a tactic designed to limit the number of what Jason Kenny (as current Minister of Immigration) referred to as “bogus” refugees from seeking asylum. Critics have charged that this was a thinly veiled, racist and homophobic/transphobic manoeuvring to curtail protection claims made by refugees coming from self-declared liberal democratic countries (in particular, Roma from Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, and queer/trans refugees escaping from transphobic/homophobic environments (Nerenberg, 2012; Xtra, 2012).

Wendy Brown’s astute observations of the complex machinations of power at work in the policies and practices of the Bush administration – what she labels as a short-circuiting of “liberal modes of democratic legitimacy” - provide a frame for viewing these two recent Canadian manifestations of the governance of difference, and as I will suggest in chapters 3 and 4, veins of sensibility that inadvertently, and contradictorily flow through United Way’s visual and textual addresses. For Brown, such an abdication of principles “anointing democratic states as universal, democratic, [egalitarian], and juridical” have been “replaced by a figure of a state that is openly partial, manoeuvring and political; openly invested in culture and the market; openly engaged in promoting a civic religion that links family form, consumer practices, [and] political passivity and patriotism” (Brown, 701). These various efforts to re-inscribe a history and civic structure with a de-democratised bundle of sensibilities and practices while affecting all Canadian residents, is particularly threatening, as we have seen, to those marked by a classed/racialised (religious) difference (where gender, sexuality and ability are promiscuously called upon and implicated in the reckoning or deferred depending on context).
What I have attempted to sketch in this chapter is a set of analytical coordinates that point to a positioning of targeted racialised/youthful subjects within a matrix of concerns about risk mediation and abatement, securitization, the limits of tolerance, and performativity/appearance of responsivisation, productivity and creativity. These ideas, mapping the economic, moral, social and racial imperatives inculcating contemporary notions of “effective” urban governance, will be worked through in the following three chapters of the dissertation. Based on reverberations from the field, it will be my intention to argue that different instrumentalist modalities and ways of framing the aesthetic are caught up in the logic of different circulating political logics, and as technologies of governance, have the capacity to reinforce certain distributions of the sensible and thus, reinvigorate regulatory rules policing the contours of compliant/non compliant subjectivities and urban social geographies. Different experts (like reformers, social scientists, researchers, and philanthropists) as I will demonstrate, have been instrumental in orchestrating functioning knowledge grids that disseminate these operative truths based on visually numericalised calculative logics and circulating aesthetic norms. As I examine however, these technologies have their own faultlines, and remain susceptible, regardless of how slightly, to disruptions that “ignorantly” eclipse rationalities of rule with other possibilities, and other aesthetic visions.
Chapter 03

Currency of the Map
In December, 2007, the University of Toronto based Centre for Urban and Community Studies (CUCS - Cities Centre) released the results of a study entitled *The Three Cities within Toronto: Income Polarization Among Toronto’s Neighbourhoods, 1970-2005* (Hulchanski, 2007). Statistically generated maps, graphs and charts were deployed as an epistemological grounding for the report’s central claim that income and “cultural” disparities had escalated in the city of Toronto over the past 30 years, resulting in the disappearance of mixed-income neighbourhoods in the inner-city and the gradual “vanishing of the average family” from Toronto’s suburbs (p. 10-11). Three years later, in January, 2011, The United Way of Toronto released a complementary study, *Vertical Poverty: Declining Income, Housing Quality and Community Life in Toronto’s Inner Suburban High-Rise Apartments*, exploring the relationship between spatialised poverty concentration, the condition of rental housing stock, and urban devolution. Both reports received wide media coverage, and were accompanied by follow-up press conferences, public addresses, a further inter-textual referencing of each other’s reports, and a spate of citations by state and voluntary sector agencies of political heft, including the City of Toronto, St Christopher House, and the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health.

Arguably, given their purported political traction and scope of circulation/citation, the reports can be understood as generative sites for the production of knowledge-truths about spatialised income disparity and its effect on Toronto’s reputation “as a city of good” and as a city of ‘vibrant neighbourhoods” (United Way, 2011a). As such they are beginning to serve as validated techniques through which governance agendas can be articulated and implemented. Sightlines of intelligibility that these reports have mapped are not only currently being drawn upon to orient
United Way flows of funding, donation drives and intervention strategies targeting selected geosocial zones and specified populations (United Way, 2011 Annual Report), but have become significant policy players in their own right, with numerous voluntary sector agencies, foundations and institutes selectively deploying truths generated through the reports to counter a withering of state provisioned social welfare governance in areas of wage supports, housing assistance and subsidy, and accessible public transportation. Conversely though, I would argue that the reports, taken as an articulated knowledge assemblage, also serve, in part, as rationalizing forces for cementing a certain “aesthetic normativity” (Ghertner, 2010) and social sensibility associated with multicultural neoliberal urbanism.

In this chapter, I attempt a threefold intervention in the politics of rendering knowable the socio-political and economic landscapes of the City of Toronto that I have casually introduced in the opening paragraphs. The first two levels of intervention serve as a case study to the central problematics of the dissertation. The third level intervention reorients sightlines of analysis for thinking through the next two cases. As a first step, I will offer a historical contextualization for social services deployment of mapping, as a technology of liberal governance, by introducing the precedent that was set by Jane Addams and the residents of Hull-House at the turn of the 20th century in Chicago. Taking a century leap and shifting the sightline of analysis to Toronto, the chapter will then explore calculative processes that City Centre and the United Way of Toronto have utilised for constructing certain urban issues as socio-spatial problematics, and how these techniques are drawn upon to assign validity to specified modes of intervention aligned with a political economy of globalised cities. This analytic attempt to trace lines of comprehension be-
tween instruments of knowledge production and frameworks for intervention that deem certain interventions normative and thus desirable, follows Foucault’s provocative claim that micro-level machinations of power ‘cannot function unless knowledge, or rather, knowledge apparatuses, are formed, organized, and put into circulation’ (Foucault, 2007; cited in Ghertner, 2010, 186). This methodological intervention attends to the diverse procedures and mechanisms for gathering information, including both aesthetic and more rational calculative practices as they exist in conjunction, or tension, with one another, and the differential truths about subjects and spaces that are produced as a result of an “expert” led consolidation of these generated knowledges into a verified “grid of intelligibility” (Ghertner, 2010). Important for our considerations, is Foucault’s astute observation that the epistemological knot that is informed through these condensing practices and the truths that it spins gains further traction - or unravels - through circulation and translation into programmes of governance (Foucault, 2007). In a third round of interventions - as a post-script to the first case - I attempt to counter the ‘rule of evidence’ (Foucault, 2007) as presented by the United Way and Cities Centre by generating a differently configured grid of intelligibility for seeing the city of Toronto. The reasons for engaging in this brief “counter-conduct”, a calculated interjection into the “processes implemented for conducting others” (Foucault, 2007, cited in Ghertner, 2010, p. 197) is twofold: The first is pragmatically driven - to render an alternative set of geo-social-political coordinates for reading the two case studies explored in the following chapters (Chapters 4 and 5), markers that account for the agentic behaviours of the state in fostering a specific formulation of urbanism, multiplicity of scale, and the conjunction of race and liberalism. The second objective can be read as a type of praxis that reminds us that the circulation and production of knowledge is...
constantly rendering limits of the sensible that can be contested and disrupted in productive and maybe even political ways. This will be the subject of Chapter 5.

**Historical Precedents:**

The use of statistically generated mapping and other numerically based graphic practices for marking as intelligible certain social problems and rendering them as objects of governance, are certainly not new to social work practice and policy jockeying. A growing body of social historical and feminist inspired literature has documented the role that Jane Addams, a founding mother of social work (Simon 1994), played in first introducing mapping practice together with the social survey as sociological techniques for governing the poor (Kemp & Park, 2012; Kish Sklar, 1991; Linin Schultz, 2007). Reportedly, in her travels to England in the late 1880’s, Addams became acquainted with sociologist Charles Booth’s use of the social survey together with the use of social mapping as a descriptive mechanism for charting the socio-political geography of London’s urban slums (figs. 1 & 2). The social survey had its grounding in what would be deemed 20 years later by the Chicago school of sociology as two incommensurable epistemological traditions: The survey was at once comprehended as a scientific mode of inquiry into the truth of the social/health conditions of the working class, borrowing from positivist classificatory techniques deployed in military ordinance surveying and geological/botanical surveying (Davison, 2003). It was also a vehicle for exercising pastoral, charitable sensibilities as well as a reflexive political practice in which protestant moralism, Fabian socialist values (Kemp and Park, 2012), Darwinian understandings of the impressionability of environments (Soderstrom, 1996), and a growing bourgeois anxiety about the potential of social tumult in the wake of rapid capitalist industrialisation could be assuaged (Davison, 2003;
Kish Sklar, 1991). In an important sense, the social survey marks the increasing investments by the upper/middle classes to both know about the “lives of others” (as a reflexive moment in defining the limits of bourgeois subjectivity and sensibility, and by extension, othered subjectivities) and to intervene in their conditions of living. As a technology of governance, the survey facilitated a desire to ameliorate the effects of industrialization (including poverty induced need and illness) through voluntary sector and state intervention, and to socially and morally mediate systemic induced fallout through the deployment of scientific expertise (Blumer, Bales, & Kish Sklar, 1991, p. 2). According to Robert Park, an American journalist turned sociologist affiliated with the University of Chicago, the work of the social survey was a pragmatic one; its utility was to “get and deliver the facts”. In Park’s skeptical assessment, “…Pragmatic would mean that a fact is never quite a fact merely because it is investigated and recorded. It only becomes a fact in the fullest sense of the term when it is delivered and delivered to the person to whom it makes a difference” (Park, the Survey Method”, cited in Bulmer, 1991, p. 303). For its Hull House proponents, the technique of the social survey was understood as a realist mode of inquiry suitable for imaging the social conditions of a place as “they existed” (Addams, cited in Davison, 2003, p. 145) but was nevertheless treated as a rhetorical bundle that needed to be marketed carefully in order to secure its verifiability.

In 1892, Jane Addams in her capacity as director of Hull House together with Florence Kelly, a special agent with the Federal Department of Labor (sic) conducted a social survey of an area largely inhabited by poor immigrants approximately 1/3 of a square mile to the east of Hull House in the 19th Ward, Chicago 6. A more comprehensive social survey of three sample districts on Chicago’s West side (including the section of Ward 19 near Hull House) was conducted in 1900.
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under the auspices of a newly formed lobbying group – the City Homes Association - organized by Adams and comprised largely of bourgeois women reformers and some residents of Hull House. These surveys were designed to “scientifically” index the endemic poverty and deleterious environmental conditions that “plagued” Chicago’s inner city neighbourhoods (Hollbrook, 2007, p. 46). The results of the 1892 household survey tracking weekly wage earnings, household income, ethnic origin of residents, living conditions, and gaps in waged employment were first collapsed into sociological categories and then painstakingly translated graphically onto street maps of the immigrant ward surrounding Hull-House (fig. 3). The development of lithographic techniques in the 1860’s had made it possible for the maps to be richly colour coded (Lunin Schultz, 2007), thus affording the cartographer the possibilities of rendering a visual display that was both aesthetically compelling and complex in the information that could be conveyed (fig. 4). According to chief illustrator and Hull House resident, Agnes Hollbrook, the indexical quality of the maps as a spatial and “systematic” representation of life in the ward, told a more realistic narrative than charts and tables ever could. Likened to a “photographic reproduction” because of their “greater minuteness”, Hollbrook surmised that the detailing of “…how members of various nationalities are grouped and disposed, and just what rates of wages are received in the different streets and sections, may have its real as well as its picturesque value” (Addams, 1895, 2007, p. 58). Further references to the maps’ ability (or at times inability because of the “inaccuracy of the data”, or the temporal nature of changing wage patterns) to procure “a Kodak view” (Hollbrook, 2007, p. 57) revealed as much about the assumed panoptic relation of the mapmaker/social researcher to their object of focus, as it did about the optic advantage that the maps would afford for the reader of the map.
fig. 04
The maps made their first public appearance in 1895 as a bounded collection entitled Hull-House Maps and Papers despite the publisher’s initial hesitations and questioning of their value in relationship to anticipated printing costs (Kish Sklar, 138). The report included not only the spatial social renderings of a targeted portion of the surrounding neighbourhood, but a few selected photographs documenting the work of Hull House, the survey questionnaire, and various statistical charts (fig. 5). An essential part of the collected volume were a series of essays written by settlement workers on various topics including child labour, wage poverty of residents, sweat-shop labour, and reflections on programming offered through the settlement (cf. Lunin Schultz, 2007). As suggested in the introduction, the graphic and textually based “recorded observations” were an authorial testimony to the residents’ “long acquaintance” with life in the immigrant Ward (Addams, 1895, 2007, p. 45). Although scholarly publications gave only passing notice to the text, public reviews of the book in more popular journals attested favourably to the scientific nature of the study’s research design and its ability to procure credible evidence. One reviewer, in a New York Newspaper, suggested that the report’s most laudable feature was its “precision”: “It is quantitative – it counts noses; in other words, it is scientific. Hence it gives a firm point of departure for study; discussion need not be in the air; there is a base-line, or a benchmark” (unidentified author, cited in Kish Sklar, 1991, p. 138). Another reviewer for The Atlantic Monthly argued that “the industrial conditions of city life” had been previously displayed for “the reading public” in the form of easily digestible works of fiction accompanied by graphic illustrations (cited in Kish Sklar, 138). The maps, for this author, represented an alternative epistemological assemblage procuring for the public a different way of envisioning poverty: “the maps render possible an easy apprehension of
the nature and condition of the community in which Hull-House is doing its work...the details of what they reveal must be seen upon the maps themselves” (cited in Kish Sklar, p. 138).

Maps, as a graphic calculative technique, made their appearance once again in the City Home’s Association (CHA) publication Tenement Conditions in Chicago published in 1901. CHA secured the scholarly expertise of Economics Professor Frank Fetter, Stanford University to conduct a more comprehensive social survey of physical conditions of the housing stock and the physical geography and infrastructure of these selected impoverished areas. The report, written by Hull House resident and social worker, Robert Hunter, was, like Hull-House Maps and Letters, replete with maps, diagrams, statistical tables, explanatory notes, and resident testimony (fig. 6 & 7). In addition, numerous photographs staging the “deplorable” physical conditions of the “immigrant slums” were included as testimony to help sway public opinion (Hunter, 1901, p. 12) (fig. 8).

Over the next few years, the reports were deployed frequently as evidence in the reformers ongoing political struggles to hold government, business and ward inhabitants alike responsible for the living/working conditions of the industrial slums. Maps allowed the reformers to graphically trace connections between incidents of poor sanitary conditions, slum congestion, and poverty, and the spillover health risks that these systemic faultlines and personal failures posed to spatially segregated bourgeois areas of the city (Mayer, 2003; Platt, 2000). And yet, like photographic images that were being introduced as documentary evidence for the first time during the same period (Tagg, 1993), the narrative and aesthetic function of these maps, and subsequently the political and moral work that they were expected to perform, had to evoke what very well might not, to an unpracticed observer, be immediately comprehended in the calculative evidence itself.
Those crafting the reports, including Addams, felt that meanings assigned to the graphically represented survey results needed to be “explained” and threaded with other kinds of evidence to render “intelligible” (Hollbrook, cited in Kish Sklar, 1992) the realism and evidential value of the maps. Personal testimonies, photographs of “urban squalor”, and reformers’ narrative descriptions of the aesthetics of the slums (its smells, noises, feeling, quality of air and light) were affixed to the maps and articulated as a single epistemological assemblage to caste a light of comprehensibility on the “root causes” of slum misery. In other words, as I will elaborate in more detail below, it was the collective body of evidence rendered from the knowledge assemblage itself, and not selectively from its constituent parts, that was drawn upon, as persuasive and verifiable proof of the various forms of systemic abuse occurring in the ward.

As social historians have duly noted (Deegan, 1988; Kish Sklar, 1992; Imogene & Moyer, 2003; Lunin Schultz, 2007; Platt, 2000), Addams’ (together with colleagues’) innovative use of graphically articulated calculative practices represents a first concerted effort within the traditions of American social work/sociology to use geo-centric social science research to effect regulatory technologies aligned with liberal welfare governance. In one very important sense, a number of precedents were established by these mostly female social reformers for the development of a more rationalist, a priori, ocular-centric, and materially based sociology (Lash, 2012), including the rudimentary use of abstracted numericity as evidence and the reliance on statistically generated graphic portrayals of social patterns. Reformers were also instrumental in aligning the focus on structural impediments to the realisation of a functioning civic society. Indeed, by propounding more materialist explanations of poverty, reformers were instrumental in shifting contemporary bureaucratic corruption, landlord exploitation, low wages and lack of civic response to urban “squalor” were named as root causes of immigrant disenfranchisement. Linkages were also forged between poor sanitation and an inevitable health risk for the spread of Typhoid fever (Platt, 2000).

Regulatory forms of governance sought by the reformers included state surveillance of labour practices and building practices, the enactment/policing of civic responsivization, and an orientation of the ‘conduct of conduct’ of slum dwellers, middle class inhabitants, landlords and politicians alike towards the building of a capitalist welfare nationalism.

According to Lash (2009), contemporary sociological thinking, as a rationalist science, begins with a presumed network of interconnected symbols (the “a priori” of the social) understood as constituting the soul or core of the social body – its elementary values. Without the presence of these core elements, society would cease to exist. What flows from this a priori thinking that starts from these “axioms that are self-evident” (p. 177)
public discourse away from a politics of nativism and colonialist rhetoric pointing to the inferior nature of targeted racialised groups (Davison, 2003; Kish Sklar, 1999).

It should be noted however, that despite this important precedent (and one that would reverberate years later as an unintended catalyst for the erasure of race from materialist analysis) reformers also reverted at times to a similar racialised logic in holding newly arrived immigrants’ paucity of “civic mindedness” accountable for the urban decay they were witnessing (Davison, 2003). Racialised/colonialist logic of a particular American stripe was also present in the mapping practices themselves. “Nationalities” were demarcated in accordance with contemporary geocultural representational mappings of “race-ethnicity” (Lunin Schultz, 2007, p. 20), and some were colour coded in alignment with phentotypical categorizations that assigned the colour black for “coloured” and white for English speaking or “white portions” (which excluded “the Irish”). Children over 10 years old born of immigrants were classified as white – a testimony to the belief in the power of assimilation governance practices and their ability to render clean the markings of difference. African Americans regardless of age, however, were marked by their racialised difference (Lunin Schultz, 2007) and colour coded in black as both the antithesis of whiteness, and perhaps unwittingly, as the colour used to demarcate the lowest wage category. And here we might recall Addams claim that the Map and Paper’s colour coding of income levels was adapted “faithfully” from Charles Booth’s coding strategies which assigned the colour black to “the lowest class; viscous, and semi-criminal” (Addams, 2007; Bulmer, Bales & Sklar, 1991) (fig. 9 & 10).

This lingering colonialist logic fused with significant scientific accomplishments and contributions notwithstanding, the settlement reformer’s calculative practices at this historical juncture
were also, still, unapologetically girded by moralistic and political sentiment (Platt, 2000). Rela-
tedly, as I will elaborate below, it was an aesthetic analysis of the slum appearing in both reports as
descriptive testimony that was drawn upon pedagogically as an orienting device and normative
grid for positioning the evidentiary value of the maps specifically and other evidence gathered
through social surveys. In her introduction to Hull-House, Maps and Papers, Agnes Holland for
example, offers a vivid, at times near lurid representation of the social/physical conditions of im-
migrant quarters alerting her assumed middle class readers to the aesthetic assault that confronts
the proper citizen upon entry to these zones of strangeness. Part political platform, part policing
of aesthetic sensibilities, the following excerpt serves as illustration of the reformers’ use of richly
descriptive narrative to inform public opinion:

Little idea can be given to the filthy and rotten tenements, the dingy courts, and the
tumble down sheds, the foul stables and dilapidated outhouses, and broken sewer
pipes, the piles of garbage fairly alive with diseased odors, and of the numbers of
children filling every nook, working and playing in every room, eating and sleep-
ing in every window sill and out of every door, and seeming literally to pave every
scrap of ’yard…In front of each house stand garbage receivers – wooden boxes repul-
sive to every sense, even when as clean as their office will permit, shocking to both
mind and instinct when rotten, overfilled, and broken as they often are. Fruit stands
help to fill up the streets, and ice-cream carts drive a thriving trade. One hears little
English spoken, and the faces and manners met with are very foreign.
(Adams, 2007, p. 54).

This staging of and trafficking in the doxa of bourgeois aesthetic normalcy 10 to accomplish
the moral/social work of reform was further complemented by the reliance on the photographic
image. Photography was gaining momentum in wider institutional settings (public health, polic-

---

10  For thoughtful reflections on the im-
age and practices of late 19th cen-
tury/early 20th century moral/social
reform as exercises in the purifi-
cation, cleansing and enlightenment of
the working class/racialised/colo-
nized subjects, and reforms’ ties to
projects of nation building, capitalist
production and expansion, and the
cultivation of distinctions between
bourgeois and working class/ra-
cialized other’s aesthetic sensibilities
see McClintock, 1995, and Valverde,
2008.

fig. 11  
Image of Ward 2 (Tenement Condi-
tions of Chicago.)
ing, psychiatry, colonialist anthropology, etc.) as a suitable visualising technology (Tagg, 1993) that could render comprehensible a complex weave of connections between the physicality of urban spaces (the “sunless, airless, and yardless double-deckers”, congested, living spaces), lack of proper state regulation and the “destruction of health and morals” witnessed in the inhabitants of the settlements (Hunter, 1901, p. 16) (fig. 11 & 12). In suggesting this propensity for a conjunctural tightness between imposed aesthetic judgment, moral value and the nascent deployment of visual calculative technologies, I am forwarding the following two tentative claims: First, I would argue that the reformers’ objective in overlaying a numerically based visual technique of calculation with an evocative description of the smells and sounds of the immigrant ‘slum’ was to permit the assumed public an opportunity to sense, through a wider aesthetic register, the imperative for legal and institutional change necessary for the imposition of urban welfare governance mechanisms and practices. If photographic images were deployed to suggest spatial congestion and lack of light (Tagg, 1993) (fig. 13), and maps to convey density, obstruction and spatial patterns of (pathological) social living, it was the narratives themselves referencing other aesthetic sensibilities beyond visuality and the physical materiality that they recalled, that were deployed to provide the affective hook necessary for interpellating a bourgeois public to action. Detailing of a full spectrum of the senses of the slum allowed the discourse to bear the weight of emotion (Tagg, 1993, p. 151). And it was this emotional appeal, via the aesthetic register, that interpellated an imagined public to affirm that the limits of a “shared” aesthetic sensibility - and by inference a social-moral sensibility – had been breached within the reaches of a social-spatial geography they called home. Indeed, what the epistemic bundle was expected to traffic were two interconnected images: First,
it cultivated a sense that the “slum” with its attendant “evils”, was no mere “spectre” perched on the horizon of Chicago’s future (Hunter, 1901, p. 178), but an indwelling presence, and threat of the present that could erupt if not attended to properly with appropriate governance strategies and the encouragement of public opinion. Second, the knowledge assemblage positioned the necessity for the cultivation of another civic space (Tagg, 1991), a space of light and silence, of cleanliness, orderliness, with unencumbered sightlines, bucolic pleasures afforded by the presence of trees, shrubbery and other greenery (Hunter, 1901), and fresh, uncluttered openness. This was a space that was represented in photographic images of Hull-House with its spacious, well lit interiors and pastoral garden spaces (Hunter, 1901; Addams, 1895, 2007), and one that was assumed to be conducive, following Foucault, to the cultivation of a compliant, orderly, and productive nationalist citizenry (fig. 14, 15). It also foreshadowed regulatory mechanisms that would be put in place by 1903 to control future tenement construction, and became an aesthetic template for guiding the slum clearings that would take place in future decades (Abbott, 1936; Hunter, 1901; Platt, 2000).

In positioning the relevance of aesthetic and affective registers in guiding reformer’s welfare governance efforts, I am certainly not suggesting that the reformers were no less implicated in a mounting enthusiasm for verifying and validating experience through calculative practices. And yet, it seems as if this appeal to aesthetic-experiential accounting might very well indicate that the reformers surmised that the technical conditions had not been sufficiently set (Tagg, 1993) at that particular socio-political juncture for maps’ representational validity and reliability to be self evident and self performing. To reiterate Hollbrook’s introductory words to the 1895 report, the reformers’ notes were included to render the maps “intelligible”, and helped to bring the condition the graphic and textual evidence as a grounding from which the swaying of public opinion could be leveraged. Unacknowledged of course, is the way in which the pleasures afforded by what Timothy Mitchell refers to as the exhibitionary order (Mitchell, 1991) were instrumental in helping to shore up imperialist and nationalist political-economic aspirations.
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**fig. 14**
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**fig. 15**
Recreation at Hull House (Tenement Conditions of Chicago).
tions of the quarters “within reach of the public” (Addams, 1895, 2007, p, 58). We might also recall that if it had not been for Florence Kelly’s explosive reaction and undeterred persistence, the maps might not have been included as an essential component of deliberations on “nationalities and wages in a congested District of Chicago” that was to appear in the published version, Hull-House Maps and Papers. The same can be said for the use of photographic images in the CHA report; extensive notes were attached to each image, giving instruction as to how the image should be read to discern the evidence that lied within (cf. Tagg, 1993). If neither representational form held sufficient public/political capital and infrastructural support to be trusted as a singular epistemological source, then a careful articulation of the realities of what the audience was seeing in the representational forms needed to be forwarded as a first step in persuading public opinion. In other words, the map, like the photograph, needed to be rehearsed and learned as a projective surface capable of mirroring a reality that the reformers were already seeing (Tagg, 1993). And here, seeing refers to the temporal present experienced by residents of Hull House and the statistical rendering of experience into calculated fact, and of an anticipated or projective future. Not only were relatively new representational technologies of governance being staged to help solidify their external efficacy, but the expertise of the reformers (and associated academics and state officials) together with social/health regulatory practices and the planning process itself were also being established as legitimate forces in the governance of urban social lives and spaces.

If a bourgeois public’s comprehension of, and voyeuristic/narcissistic pleasures in reading about, the degradations of urban squalor had been previously gleaned from fictionalised accounts and pictorial renderings, the reformers were instrumental in mediating an epistemological bridge
between these sensibilities of governance relying on “situational representations” and newly emerging technologies that procured a more abstracted means of visualising urban social-spatial life. The geometric plans that were devised by the residents of Hull House offered a “zenithal gaze” for the viewer of the map, an extraction from a material embeddedness in the intimate life patterns of the city (whether fantasized or not) to a position that enabled “the viewer to conceive in abstract terms the particular measurable characteristics of the city, such as the density of the city, their earning power, or their state of health” (Soderstrom, 1996, p. 261).

In one sense, the representations, based on “numerical calculations” adhering to a rigorously precise (and thus “scientific”) mode of data collection, were instrumental in facilitating an eventual shift from a social (and explicitly moralising) logic that attended to social and cultural nuance and complexity and allowed prejudice “to air freely”, to a perceived, morally neutral, detached and thus objective “spatial logic (Soderstrom, 1996, p. 264). Scientific cartography, like other forms of numerically based calculative visual mediations included in the reports, can be productively understood as nascent examples of “immutable mobiles”, French sociologist Bruno Latour’s term for representations that are detachable from the place or object that they represent, “whilst remaining immutable so that they can be moved in any direction without distortion, loss or additional corruption” (Latour, cited in Soderstrom, 1996, p. 255). According to Sonderstrom’s reading of Latour, it is the logic of immutability that established the grounding of visual technologies’ own calculative possibilities which included the rendering of readily comprehensible objects and spaces as components of a whole, collapsing material and discursive complexity into analysable categories, the manipulation and control of these subjects of inquiry, and an authorization of modes of interven-
tion based on these calculative practices (Soderstrom, 1996).

The deployment of social maps, as immutable mobiles, allowed the social reformers to reason about urban issues, and to target with precision, sites for therapeutic intervention. In this sense, numerically based visual calculative practices were instrumental in creating the conditions necessary for sustained state intervention in the spatial/subjective governance of the poor and racialised subjects living in Chicago and in other newly emerging industrialized centres throughout the United States and eventually Canada. And yet, as I have attempted to argue, the reformers’ inclusion of aesthetic-emotional based narratives in the reports signaled a reluctance - or a pragmatism - to forsake, at least at that historical juncture, what these rationalist calculative practices were designed to devalue – the epistemology of their lived experiences, and the ability of a policed aesthetic register to speak moral and social truths.

The Three Cities Narrative: Lament for withering welfare governance and the heralding of neoliberal urbanism:

If social/spatial mapping of urban pathology was just gaining momentum at the turn of the 20th century as a particularly useful technology for furthering the aims of liberal welfare governance, clearly a century later, with the Cities Centre launch of their report The Three Cities within Toronto: Income Polarization Among Toronto’s Neighbourhoods, 1970-2005 the reliance on a visualized, numerically based calculative practice as a valid and reliable epistemological source had become a perfectly commonplace practice for those jockeying in social policy arenas. When first released in 2007, the report appeared in the form of a conventional policy brief, a format that was deemed to be compatible with the report’s assumed and targeted audience - academics, students, politicians,
social service providers (D. Hulchanski, personal communication, 2012). Despite the report being text heavy, the generated maps and graphs “encapsulating and synthesising millions of pieces of data” (D. Hulchanski, personal communication, 2012) occupied a place of prominence within its pages. What were the evidentiary truths or the ‘rule of evidence’ that were revealed through the Three Cities of Toronto’s mapping practices? Generated from 3 decades worth of Statistics Canada data, the Cities Centre’s cartographic displays represented a trifurcated city divided into distinctive economic zones: City 1 - an inner city of concentrated wealth; City 3 - an increasingly impoverished suburban band circling the outer realm of Toronto’s seven amalgamated municipalities plagued by deteriorating housing stock, a high number of rental households in proportion to home ownership, and poorer access to efficient public transit; and City 2 - a “buffer zone” between the two other cities comprised of gradually shrinking, (or more “alarmingly” disappearing) middle and mixed income households (fig. 16).

This primarily visual rendering of Toronto into territorialised zones positioned the narrative of “three” cities over a more practiced representation of Toronto as a “city of neighbourhoods” (Hulchanski, 2010) – and here, city of neighbourhoods serves as reference to the well trafficked trope of Toronto’s multiculturalism and its place in promoting Toronto to the global economic stage (Hulchanski, 2007). While the report’s principal sight-line was on income disparity - and a resulting “undesirable urban landscape that has witnessed the flight of middle income people” - it did make reference to increasing polarisation based on “cultural-ethnic differences”\(^\text{12}\). And yet, when accounting for these shifts in income disparity, and tangentially “cultural” divisioning, the following economic explanations were forwarded as probable cause: “changes in the economy,
in the nature of employment (more part-time and temporary jobs), and in government taxes and income transfers” (Hulchanski, 2007, p. 2).

Complementing this narrative of an economically unraveling globalised city was policy analyst Richard Florida’s response to the Hulchanski report that appeared in Florida’s then weekly column in the *Globe and Mail*. The column, together with other similarly expressed print media coverage of that week, now appear on both the Centre for Urban and Community Study’s and St Christopher’s website as a type of testimonial bundle to the importance and relevance of the Cities Centre report and as an expanded sightline into the machinations of municipalities operating in globalised markets. In reference to the sentiments of Hulchanski’s report, Florida offered the following opening statement “Toronto may well be a thriving, multicultural ethnic mosaic of the sort that Michael Adam’s Unlikely Utopia proudly identifies, but it is one where ethnic diversity is overlaid by growing class division (Florida, 2007). This, Florida, asserted, is the paradox of globalised, creative cities; as hubs of creativity, innovation and intellectual production, they mine the potentials of endless transnational flows of people and economic capital. And yet, paradoxically, “left to their own devices” creative cities, as “globalisation’s winners” (Bradford, 2007) generate the types of social and economic inequalities that are witnessed by the three cities report, a cleavage, for Florida (as for Hulchanski) that threatens to unravel the potential of innovation itself and the promises held for urban prosperity.

To complete this narrative of polarisation and paradox, a further report from the Centre was released at the end of 2008. Garnering little public attention, it detailed shifting immigration and immigrant settlement patterns in Canada over a similar three-decade period (1971-2006) (Mur-
die, 2008). According to the report, there has been (i) an increased concentration of immigrants in Canada’s three metropolitan areas of Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver; (ii) a dramatic shift in immigrants’ national origins away from European countries to countries in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America, (iii) and a spatial redistribution of immigrant settlement, with a resettlement of earlier waves of immigrants (mostly white- including Jewish, and South/east Asian) from the inner-city to the inner suburbs and surrounding Greater Toronto suburban neighbourhoods, and an immediate settlement of new immigrants in these outer-lying areas. The report also makes descriptive note of the socio-economic differences between these two waves with African, Latin American, Caribbean and some Asian immigrants faring poorer than their Asian counterparts. The forces of gentrification in the inner city, displacement of lower paying waged employment to the suburbs, and location of social housing and more affordable high-rise rental accommodation in the inner-suburbs are cited as being probable causes of this disproportionate settlement concentration of “immigrants” in Toronto’s City 3. Like the “three cities” study, the text of this report is presented with an accompanying visual array of detailed maps, charts, and graphs (Murdie, 2008) (fig. 17).

I would argue that these three reports, read as an assemblage, are geared towards performing several calculative functions. First, and most obviously, race as an analytical marker and heuristic is bracketed from more economicist explanations of the re-territorialization of wealth across the cityscape. Indeed, all three reports’ focus on market shifts (and in Hulchanski’s report a tangential reference to the decreasing of transfer payments to provinces/municipalities) together with their deployment of “culture” as a generic marker for ethno-racialised difference make innocent the perniciousness of racialised legacies in informing the productivity of power (Park, 2005) and dis-

fig. 17
Diversity and concentration in Canadian immigration – Toronto (Merdie, Cities Centre, 2008)
Here in my reference to the “state”, I borrow from political theorist Barbara Cruickshank’s (1999) articulation of the state as the assemblage of “liberal, representative, electoral, judicial, legislative, and administrative institutions” and their adopted techniques of governance “articulated within the confines of a liberal constitution” (p. 4). In a Canadian context, state governance manifests in multiple sites ranging from the municipal to the regional or national.

Second, the reports present a rather passive portrayal of wealth and racialised concentration/displacement by pointing to either the ontological nature of creative cities and markets, or perhaps, more critically to the exilic strategies of states (e.g., their reduction of funding to redress social welfare concerns) and their failure to address the social protection of the middle class. While it is certainly not my contention to critique the reports’ efforts to call attention to the need for the state to harness its political capacity towards fostering social equality, this analytic purview nevertheless obfuscates the ways in which the state actively negotiates the fault-lines and forces at play in globalised economies by displacing the market’s regulatory stratagems onto the social body (Fairbanks, 2004, p. 42). In other words, what the narrative fails to address is the very agentic ways in which the state has continued to manifest its power through its promulgation of certain knowledge systems, its brokering of state-private alliances, and through the instituting of policies that facilitate the infusion of market logic into the interstices of civic life (Fairbanks, 2004; Gordon, 1991; Kipfer & Keil, 2002). Indeed, as I attempted to argue in Chapter Two, macro-level state policy intervention marked by both “roll back” social provisioning and aggressive strategic interventions to facilitate financial and capital markets have contributed to the different types of municipal and regional “crises” that these reports describe.

Finally, the overarching textual narrative of the “three cities” (as visualized in Map 1- see fig.
18) performs a statistically projected displacement of racialised and working poor people from City 1 as an already accomplished fact, while other maps (Maps 3 and 6 – see fig. 19 & 20), and from Murdi’s report (Map 2 – see fig. 21) visualize a high density presence of low and very low income (racialised and white) individuals in this very area. The solutions presented in the report, moreover, do nothing to assuage this inexorable evacuation of the (racialised along with other forms of social inequity) poor from City 1, but point instead to the introduction of laudable policies that permit residents of City 3 a more comfortable and productive life (better transit, repair of high-rise rental stock and an opportunity to purchase cheap housing). I would suggest this projected erasure of racialised/classed presence from an area of the city that is most visually evident to the gaze of global capital and its ideological coupling with proposed social welfare regulatory strategies effects a (unwitting?) twofold operation; it preserves the optics of a functioning multiculturalism suitable to the workings of a “creative city” while simultaneously attempting to shore up a potentially volatile though necessary labour pool through the promulgation of a social policy that effects social regulation through an ethics of social care (Miller and Rose, 2008). A more generous reading would place emphasis on social care rather than social regulation as a principal operating modality in this call for renewed state funding.

At least at a casual level, the Three Cities report can be read as both a lament for a period in Toronto’s history where a more concentrated state power buoyed the sustainability of a middle class presence throughout Toronto, including the inner suburbs, and a targeted response to the withering of liberal welfare governance in Canada in general. Couched in the logic of immutability, the maps, as calculative technologies have been deployed strategically to permit the viewer a
zenith glimpse into the social-spatial effects of the erosion of state involvement in the areas of wage support, regulation of rental markets, and provisioning of affordable housing units. Here, visualised practices based on rational statistics are drawn upon as scientific evidence and political justification to bolster the need for a reinvigorated state presence to ameliorate the undesirable effects of past income bifurcation, and to arrest a trend of erasure of the middle class as inevitable, projected reality for 2025.

Alternatively, one could argue that there is a tension at play in the Cities Centre’s technocultural conceptualization of spatialized poverty, one that marks a reorientation of welfare liberalism towards more neoliberal political sentiments. The report’s findings, for example, serve as a point of departure for the City Centre’s continued, unwavering and uncritical support of mixed income, private-public partnership funded urban renewal in two previous areas of concentrated low-income public housing located in City 1 (Regent Park and Alexander Park). Now in its 4th year of demolition and rebuilding activity, Regent Park “revitalisation” complements other gentrifying activity in the area, and by more critical accounts has resulted in dislocation of previous residents to other areas of Toronto, including City “3”, a displacement of low-income tenant political power, the appearance of “urban-creative” lifestyle amenities exclusive to lower income households, and an uncertain future for those receiving subsidised housing given that the renewal of housing stock is dependent on the flow of financial support leveraged by private developers (Johnson, 2011; Walks, 2011). Moreover, as I suggested above, many of the policy recommendations housed in the report shore up support for more livable conditions in “City 3”, a commendable policy directive that also fails to address how to sustain vibrant, low-income communities in areas of City 1 apart
from proposed urban renewal initiatives. In sum, it appears that despite the report’s overt plea for a renewed liberal welfare governance intervention, the maps together with policy recommendations gesture towards a governance modality that clears space, albeit in a mediated and contradictory way, for the realisation of creative-global-city aspirations and desires.

As a postscript to this section that has focused on the Three Cities’ strategic deployment of cartographic images as scientific depictions of “targets of rule”, I would like to comment on a re-released version of the report, published in 2010. Given the significant although entirely unanticipated traction that the report received upon its release, the Cities Centre made a strategic decision to launch a more “popular” version of the report (D. Hulchanski, personal communication, 2012). In addition to the inclusion of graphically represented data generated from the 2006 Census, the aesthetic re-presentation of visual and textual information, together with the report’s design layout and attention to production value were contracted to Spacing Magazine’s Publisher & Creative Director, Matthew Blackett. The result was a slick, 32-page document replete with maps and graphs coloured according to a 1970’s palette and stylized to coordinate with the carefully positioned text and chosen font.

I wish to draw attention to the rather curious addition of a photographic image - a long shot of Toronto’s Yonge Street looking south from Gerard Street - that occupies a place of prominence on the front cover of the re-stylised report. Important to mention however is the inclusion of three randomly placed photographic images that receive little attention in the text, apart from a subtext referencing a bibliographic citation. Two of the images are of housing stock (a cluster of dilapidated 1980’s high-rises and post war bungalows belonging more properly to City 3) and the third...

\[\text{fig. 22}\]
is a high angle shot taken in the early 1970’s of the Bathurst-Bloor subway station together with a cross-section of the surrounding streetscape (figs. 22 & 23). According to David Hulchanski, the photographs, with the exception of the front cover image, appeared in the report as an afterthought and as a pragmatic solution to filling in the blank spaces that were left because of technical requirements of magazine press printing. This sentiment of pragmatism carried over to the selection of the cover image. Chosen randomly amongst a number of archived photographs identified by Blackett, the decided upon image, for Hulchanski, simply captured the look of the 1970’s and helped to visually position the study as an “examination of economic trends” over the past 30 plus years (D. Hulchanski, personal communication, 2012). Notwithstanding Hulchanski’s claim that the images offer no “value” to the political message delivered through maps and texts (D. Hulchanski, personal communication, 2012), I forward the suggestion that the front cover image together, more secondarily, with the images in the text, are being asked to fulfill a supplementary work that the maps, as calculative practice can’t provide. As such, they can be thought of as a complementary yet alternative epistemological source for aligning generated targets of rule with a mediated neoliberal urbanism trafficking in a “creative cool” and multicultural sensibility.

The image deployed on the front cover (fig. 24) offers a glimpse onto a 1970’s downtown streetscape, evident as such given the vintage (and size) of the automobiles foregrounded in the image, together with the style of dress of pedestrians and perhaps more obscurely, by the presence of a water tower visible in the upper left hand corner of the image. Nostalgically recollected in the image is a period in Toronto’s history when the city’s burgeoning (white) middle class was beginning to reap the benefits of welfare governance’s promise of consumptive prosperity. The Multicultural-
ism Act had just been introduced to mediate a newly introduced racialised difference into Canada’s urban centres, and modernist economic fulfillment was evidenced by the appearance of skyscrapers built by finance capital. To paraphrase writer Anthony Astrachan’s famous 1974 description in Harpers, Toronto was, for some of its residents at least, ‘a city that worked’ (Harper’s Dec 14, 1974, p.14). Notable, are the number of racialised people who dot the front cover’s image, a chosen representation framing the introduction to the Three Cities, that, when repositioned within the context of Canada’s immigration history, Toronto’s problematic racialised history, and the report’s bracketing of the effects of racialised logic in securing income polarisation, disingenuously suggests the harmoniousness of multiculturalism’s presence in the urban fabric of Toronto.

As one reads across the bolded white graphics of the title of the report - The Three Cities of Toronto - the eye is drawn upwards to two features in the right corner of the image: a commercial sign, that features the word “Japan”; and another acerbic yellow commercial sign containing two crescent shaped graphics with the word “UNITED” displayed in orange coloured font as contrast to the blackened frame containing its letters. Both the word “UNITED” and “Japan”, have, I would suggest, hovers as an indelible presence on the city horizon, , a set of “signs” that tie the city’s multicultural investment and promise together with commoditised trade. I also draw attention to the relative emptiness of the street and the vibrancy of the coloured signs and dress of pedestrians as contrast to the grey-brown palate of the buildings. What I am suggesting is that the image might be working to harness an affective charge associated with nostalgic longing for a “simpler” collectivized experience (D. Hulchanski, personal correspondence, 2012) to the aspirations of, and possibilities afforded by, globalised neoliberal urbanism. In other words, and I ask this speculatively,
is their an unwitting anticipation that a photograph will act as interpellative force, to galvanize a
public around a politics that seeks to reclaim a moment of promise and entitlement of social mem-
bbership (as a recollected understanding of welfare liberalism) within the current flows of globalised
capital?

To be clear, what I am not suggesting is that there was clear intentionality or expectation by
the Cities Centre that the image would engage in a specified or targeted affective labour. Nor am
I suggesting, pace Ranciere, that the image effects a precise semiotic messaging that can be read
transparently by its targeted public. And yet, for Hulchanski, it was important for the Cities thesis
to traffic another type of visuality apart from those rendered through calculative logic. In this text a
photographic image bore a centrality of place in educating or reminding a wider readership of the
place of a simpler social within a proposed, highly mediated modality of neoliberal governance.

**Moral and aesthetic paths to globalised neo-liberal economic expansion: The United Way’s Vertical Poverty Report:**

In 1998 Chief Development Officer Susan McIsaac (now current Chief Operating Officer
as of 2010), re-positioned the United Way of Toronto’s (UWT) annual fund development to align
more properly with its “community impact agenda”, a targeted means of directing philanthropic
resources into carefully administered and orchestrated social services activities, including those
offered through sponsored agencies. This strategy not only knotted fund development with ser-
vice sector practice, but tangentially threaded the orientation of United Way’s social strategy with
the interests and investments of donors and “volunteers” (the estimated 22,000 individuals that
through their workplace participate - voluntarily or involuntarily - in various funding campaigns). As UWT marketing manager Kirby Green suggested, “they get to engage with how their donations are working” (Green, personal communication, 2011). Mclsaac’s interventions are attributed to an unprecedented growth in campaign revenues from $58-million in 1998 to $115-million in 2011 (UWT, 2012).

Other notable changes to UWT’s governance structure included recasting its role as a charitable donor to become a more aggressively present player in the social policy arena (UWT, 2011) and the addition of an in-house marketing team in 2008, replete with graphic designers and photographers, to coordinate and “rebrand” the publicly oriented face of the United Way. According to Green, all of UWT’s representational materials, from annual reports, to research publications, press presentations, public service announcements, to funding drive packages, are strategically image rich and are marked with the dual “sensibilities of the United Way – addressing the “root causes” of city dysfunction and “empowerment” (Green, personal communication, 2011 - see Chapter 4 for a targeted examination of this twining of projected city need/desire/dysfunction and the subjectivity of “at risk”/empowered youth):

It is easy to say these are our priorities [youth, families, newcomers], but the priority is really the city – that is where we make a difference right here locally in Toronto. We are ensuring that you as a donor, your money is going where it is needed most and making sure that we are making the biggest possible impact... How do we get around the causes of what is happening in our city that we continue to struggle with, so we are always looking for ways to represent that in our images. We also have a lens of empowerment so ours is a journey from one point a to point b…we are not showing the need as much as this is what happened in the progression in this person’s life.
So we go from what might have been need but that they have been given what they needed to succeed. So this is what success look like.
(Green, personal communication, 2011)

The reliance on a limited but bold colour palette (white, “United Way red, burnt orange, peri-winkle, pumpkin orange, violet and ocean blue”) for all publications together with the recurrent use of photographic images of “real people” (Green, personal communication, 2011) (fig. 25) that are understood to graphically embody the results of the tag “United we can”, allows for both a streamlining of the visual and thematic messaging across publications, and for inter-textual referencing to take place. Members of the marketing team are keenly aware that representational materials play an integral role in mediating this newly generated weave of political investment, corporate interests, charitable giving, and the political sensitivities of communities and individual receiving strategically targeted support.

Finally, the UWT’s shift in governance structuring has included a targeted focus on the production and dissemination of research. To quote CEO Susan McIsaac at the press conference release of the Vertical Poverty Report,

A significant part of the effort and ongoing evolution of The United Way is a focus on research to help us better understand our city and the trends that have impacted on the quality of peoples’ lives. Our research ensures the UW’s strategies for building a better city are evidence based and rooted in the facts. (McIsaac, 2012).

This stated commitment to the use of scientifically rational and statistically generated knowledge to substantiate and direct governance strategies – to orient “the conduct of conduct” (Foucault, 2007) - aligns formally, as we have seen, with the calculative practices deployed by the Cities Centre, and indeed the early efforts of settlement workers.
The Vertical Poverty Report, a sequel to the first report generated after the United Way’s rebranding, Poverty by Postal Code, makes use of Statistics Canada data from the long-form census together with new data generated through focus group discussion and interviews with high-rise tenants living in Toronto’s inner suburbs to chart concentrations of spatialised poverty both geographically and as it physically manifests in privately owned High-rise buildings. And yet, as I will argue, the epistemological assemblage drawn upon in the Executive Summary report and by McIsaac in her press release, relied both upon the instruments of calculative graphics (maps, charts and graphs) – and on what Ghertner (2010) refers to as ‘aesthetic technologies of governance” to forward their political claims for urban renewal. This was a hybrid schema, that, like the practices of early social reformers, and the unwitting efforts of the Cities Centre, re-positioned survey results according to a grid “of normalcy”. For the reformers, a preferred normal was aligned most properly with 19th century protestant morality and bourgeois aesthetic sensibilities attuned to the necessities of crafting spatial order, stability and a civic-minded, nationalist subjectivity (Park and Kemp, 2006, 2010). The Cities Centre inclusion of a photographic image nostalgically references back to a “calm and pleasant” era (Hulchanski, 2012) of welfare governance while simultaneously heralding the sensibilities of neoliberal creative economies. The United Way’s championing of “community improvement”, I suggest, takes an oblique turn away from these precedents by repositioning city revitalisation according to the doxa of neoliberal aesthetics and rationality. And yet this gravitational pull towards a remodeled normalcy is seemingly in tension with, or is mediated by other operating rationalities including liberal welfare sentiment and perhaps more contentiously, neo-conservative morality. Moreover, as I will argue below and in the next chapter, if the work of

---

14 My decision to focus more specifically on McIsaac’s press release of the Vertical Poverty Report and the Executive Summary Report is justified in the following two ways: first, these two modes of address were the public face of the report, and as such it was their knowledge assemblage that was trafficked in funding, media, and policy circles. Relatedly, it was in these forms of address that a neoliberal aesthetic spin on calculative results was most pronounced.
these United Way sponsored circulating media – reports, press conferences, annual reports, public service announcements - is geared towards interpellating a general public or “common mind” towards “socially and morally accountable” ends (Warner, 2002) to what I shall strategically refer to as the “United WE” that figures prominently in all campaigns - then it is the aesthetic that is drawn upon and mobilized to effect this affective exchange between strangers necessary for the “public” or “We” to coalesce.

When Susan McIsaac presented the findings of the United Way Toronto sponsored Vertical Poverty Report at a scheduled Press Conference in January, 2011, she was performing to a full house of assembled media representatives, municipal and provincial politicians and bureaucrats, corporate leaders, and directors of major not for profit agencies in the city of Toronto (fig. 26). Drawing reference to both the Executive Summary and to the first (of several) colourful map(s) of the City of Toronto (fig.27) all housed within her graphically slick presentation, McIsaac introduced the talk by first suggesting that while poverty is being “geographically concentrated in specific areas” a “closer examination of the evidence” (2012) revealed, “...that the former city of Toronto is faring better
than many of the inner suburbs where poverty is growing at an alarming rate” (McIssac, 2012).

This positivist reference rhetorically re-caste in hyperbolic terms, allowed for emphasis to shift away from the inner city where gentrification, and the effects of neoliberal urbanism are transpiring at a heightened pace, to the inner suburbs where the United Way is currently focusing its energies. To emphasise this point, numerically based evidence was drawn upon to note the “explosion of the number of high poverty neighbourhoods in Toronto’s inner suburbs” (2012). Reporting on results from qualitative interviews then allowed McIsaac to shift from a calculative realist to a more anecdotal register: “While we did hear many encouraging stories, some of what they told us was cause for great concern” (McIssac, 2012). McIsaac went on to note the following:

What we found in these high poverty neighbourhoods was that residents experienced social disorder, drug dealing, vandalism and rowdiness at a significantly higher rate than other Canadian communities” (McIssac, 2012).

Shifting back to calculative realism, McIsaac first highlighted a graph that synthesised in numerical terms, these incidents of “experiences of social disorder” by drawing attention to a graph displayed behind her (fig. 28), and then by making reference to the state of physical conditions of high-rise environments:

In high poverty neighbourhoods every indicator of physical conditions from pest and vermin, to the number of repairs needed in the unit is worse than in areas with low poverty (McIssac, 2012).

Drawing the introduction to a close in the next sentence of her address, McIsaac bundled the social and physical indicators of neighbourhood pathology together in a single epistemological unit with these words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Social Disorder amongst Private-Sector Tenants Compared to Canadian High-Rise Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Dealing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-rise tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information on Canadians’ experience of social disorder is drawn from Statistics Canada’s General Social Survey, Cycle 23 on Victimization, 2009. Data on Canadian high-rise tenants are for buildings five storeys and more.

**fig. 28**
While indicators like problems with entry lock are only 6% higher in high poverty neighbourhoods, the more serious issues like infestation, trespassing, drug dealing are remarkably worse (McIssac, 2012).

As another chart flashed on the screen, McIsaac shored up her authoritative knowledge about how to see the presented evidence, with the following summary:

These measures of housing conditions are important not only to the building affected but the neighbouring community and the city around it because poor housing conditions can destabilize an entire neighbourhood... This propensity for local flight due to problems of social disorder causes serious erosion to that community leading to disinvestment in the neighbourhood and driving away local business. These trends threaten the long-term health and prosperity of the city of Toronto (McIsaac, 2012).

The Executive Summary Report reversed the order of presentation by first referencing the strong association between deteriorating physical conditions of private high-rise environments and incidents of poverty concentration. Further mention was made of a causal linkage between lack of recreational and social gathering space in most high-rise dwellings and a “deteriorating sense of community” (as indicated by “social isolation, distrust among neighbours, and anti-social behaviour”) (United Way, 2011a, p. 9). And unlike McIsaac’s address, the summary noted that “Most tenants feel safe in their buildings” and that there “are strong bonds of friendship and mutual support among high-rise tenants” (p. 11) (fig. 29). And yet, this evidence was overwritten immediately with the qualifying clause that despite these indicators of social satisfaction:

What is a major problem [for high-rise tenants’ in low income neighbourhoods] is the high incidence of social disorder that invades tenants desire for privacy and control over their living space” (p. 11).

This overarching description of socio-physical pathology invading the sanctity of individuated
space, provided the necessary segue into a more focused textual and graphically displayed description of social distress in low-income neighbourhoods.

Despite significant differences in their ordering of “evidence”, I suggest that both modes of address are oriented towards harnessing the various audiences’ disparate desires and investments into a normative grid for mobilizing interventions. In one sense, the United Way was citing calculative evidence and drawing from visually rendered graphs and maps to represent certain demarcated spatial zones of poverty – Toronto’s inner suburbs – as geographies of risk. The markers of “social disorder” – the presence of graffiti, vandalism, drug trafficking and use, loitering – are first presented not as symptoms of systemic failure but as having a near ontological presence within areas where poverty is concentrated. This realist rendering of risk behaviours then re-interprets disorder as a dangerous contagion that affects the ability of business to thrive in local neighbourhoods, and causes citizens in surrounding neighbourhoods to take flight.

Here, we might note that a first narrative layering of numerical evidence is taking place with the UWT’s collapsing of alluded to results of spatial disorder (business flight, good neighbour flight, violation as uncontainable, spatial contagion) with the symptomology of social disorder. Here, statistical data representing the incidents of targeted “uncivil” behaviour (loitering, drunkenness), minor crimes, misdemeanors and violations against property is deployed, despite residents themselves saying that they feel safe. Like one of the “doxic assumptions of urbanized neoliberal discourse” – broken windows, (Fairbanks, 2010), social disorder functions similarly to render surrounding “spaces and subjects insecure” for a targeted audience, thereby effecting an explanatory moralising, risk based logic to identify threat to Toronto’s projected and hoped for economic pros-
We can also recall in McIsaac’s address, that fear of the presence of social disorder and its capacious ability to infect an entire city, as witnessed in the rather hyperbolic descriptions associated with risk, is the motivational affect that is drawn upon to drive the analysis forward. That these areas of address are highly racialised (although never named as such given that race has been evacuated from the analysis), gives us pause to speculate on the racialised nature of this fear. In other words, I would also suggest that this generated fear aligns with the fear that has been inflamed over the past three decades by Toronto based print and television media in their representational accountings of alleged gang related violences in both inner city and suburban racialised communities, and the associated leakage of this violence into more prosperous areas of the city (cf Buffam, 2009).

As a direct consequence of these circulating narratives which became particularly vociferous after a spate of gun shootings in 2005 and then again in 2007, securitization increased in selected spatial zones (Buffam, 2009), and a host of programming (much of which has been sponsored through UWT funding) was introduced to cultivate individual and community responsivisation (Boudreau, Keil, & Young, 2009; see chapter 4). This dual injection of disciplinary surveillance/individual responsivisation and punitive mechanisms of controlling targeted populations, has been further complemented by calls for the “repositioning of spatial zones” to align with a current model of urbanism patterned after the image of globalised cities – a model that mixes “the cachet of gentrified” central neighbourhoods, the “shiny-newness” of exurban development, an expansion of mixed income housing, and private-public ventures for the supply of “affordable’ housing (Bou-
As I will argue below, both the Cities Centre support for mixed income housing renewal and the primary set of recommendations forwarded by the Vertical Poverty Report championing the need for Federally/Provincially sponsored strategies for achieving “greater income mix” in Toronto’s neighbourhoods (see below) enliven this contemporary urban geo-economic project.

To be precise, although the United Way doesn’t directly reference the punitive techniques of securitisation that are currently being drawn upon by Toronto police (and Canadian Security Intelligence Services - CSIS) in inner-city and inner suburban neighbourhoods, their positioning of “social disorder” as a threat to an assumed social identity for the subjects of the city – the projected and interpellated “United we” - signals a tacit compliance with these efforts (see Chapter 4 for a detailed analysis of this point). Obversely, the second part of the Vertical Poverty narrative as articulated by the Executive Summary and through McIsaac’s public address, presents a “grid of intelligibility” for assessing priority neighbourhood compliance and compatibility with a model of moral responsivisation. Referencing numericised calculative evidence, both modes of address concluded that “essential foundations” for “creating stronger neighbourhoods” had been found in areas of concentrated poverty:

There were some very good learnings from this report, news that gives us great hope for reversing the trends. Perhaps most promising is the strong connection that exists between people living in the high rise towers and the community that comes together to support one another. About half said that they have neighbours that they can rely on, to watch their apartment take care of their kids, lend them money. At the United Way we know that these connections among residents are the very foundation upon which neighbourhood revitalization is built. And so, we are encouraged to find these
foundations are strong (McIsaac, 2012).

At first blush, it appears as if this trucking of evidence of community connection is suggestive of the United Way’s investment in questioning discourses of market based responsivization that tie moral culpability together with rationality and individual responsibility. Indeed, all of the supports that McIsaac reported are those that evidence the forging of non-commoditised, or not wholly commoditised relationships - relations that seemingly displace a focus on individual responsivisation, deploy a non-contractual rationality for defining interactions, and introduce an ethics of mutual care that deviates from a rationality of self fulfillment and need. However, rather than interpreting these agentic behaviours as evidence of an ethos of communal, extra-market invested responsivisation, McIsaac in the concluding section appears to be recasting these connections as a bedrock for cultivating productive, entrepreneurial, and self caring individuals. In other words, there is an apparent textual slippage from visioning neighbourhood revitalisation as being forged in accordance with sensibilities that resist a seepage of neoliberal rationality into the recesses of intimate and communal life, towards a governance sightline that focuses on the responsivised individual as the essential building block of projected neighbourhood/city “prosperity”. In the recommendation section of both the Executive summary and in McIsaac’s address, the evidence of “connection” is drawn upon to shore up its already existing intervention strategy entitled “Building Strong Neighbourhoods” (United Way, 2011a). Cross referencing to the United Way’s web site, under the subsection devoted to this revitalisation initiative, the following quote - in bolded, italicised and enlarged font size (double that of other text on the page) - makes clear the positioning of this sense of preferred technique for regulating spatialised poverty:
By bringing people together and connecting them to services they themselves identified as a need, we believe the Hubs will build individual strength and empowerment, creating a sense of belonging and ownership in the community.”

This quote, together with the Strategy’s brilliantly crafted slogan “build up the individual, build up the Community” (The United Way’s newest public service campaign) (fig. 30), not only seemingly positions a functioning community as that which is comprised of self-determining, self choosing individuals, but situates these networks of empowered individuals as generative sites for articulating the normative boundaries of belonging and communal affinity. Connection, I would suggest, is oriented as a type of witness to an individual’s capacity (and as projection, the collectivity of individuals’ capacity) - if “given the right tools and resources” (United Way, 2011a, McIsaac, 2012) - to function morally (Rangel, 2012), and by implication comply with activities that arrest the spread of social disorder.

If, as was explored in Chapter 2, management of risk, as a moral imperative, hinges on the performance of subjects to govern their own behaviours through making appropriate risk averse choices, then the governing logic of neoliberal rationality as it entwines with the strictures of risk discourse, generates a hierarchy of morally viable or violating subjects (Rangel, 2012; Rose, 1996). Thus if I am correct in my assessment of the tensions at play in the moral lines being inscribed through these public addresses, there is a risk that prescribed interventions with their neo-conservative sheen, will result in people either being included as a commune of the morally elect because of their nascent forms of responsivised competency, or that they will be deemed abject in the face of imposed moral limits, and dealt with according to the morally charged politics of securitisation.

Moreover, despite the United Way’s claim that their research “seeks to get at the root causes
of poverty”, calculative functions together with this narrative overlay effectively align to bracket the structural faultlines and state policy interventions that give rise to both disorder and flight of business in the first instance. A more politically attuned analysis is eschewed for a line of inquiry that attempts to shore up “the internal dynamics of the neighbourhood” (Ghertner, 2010) - motivations for skills development and capacity building amongst tenants, practices oriented around tenant self-monitoring, surveillance and policing, awareness raising about desires and needs for healthy living, and engagement of tenants in residential tower renewal (through participation in committees), beautification projects sponsored through the municipality) (United Way, 2011b, p. 20-23). Once identified these targeted behaviours and interactions then become a procedural issue that can be fixed with an influx of donated funds and targeted state support. This alignment of individual improvement with neighbourhood/city renewal permits an intricate weaving of differently “affected” subjects – residents (the sightline of improvement), business and tower owners, neighbourhood associations, social services providers, city bureaucrats and politicians, and UWT volunteers - into the web of governance of prioritised neighbourhoods. Of course, as was discussed above, the imbrication of invested players is reinforced structurally and most importantly, economically, by the shift towards the knotting of philanthropic giving to target social service activity.

As a postscript to this reading, I wish to make note of an apparent tension at play in the concluding section’s conceptualisation of responsibility and its moral underpinnings. Indeed, the assemblage’s overt leaning towards neo-liberal governance, inflected as it is with a neo-conservative moralism, is seemingly tempered at times by an appeal to technologies of intervention that
are more clearly aligned with welfare models of governance – state guaranteed housing accessibility, housing benefit plans, funding for non-profit housing, and state sanctioned programming to ensure the inclusion of affordable housing in new housing developments. In one clear sense, the UWT champions the three levels of the state as stewards of governance strategies targeting neighbourhood revitalisation. This plea for a reinvigorated state presence in the management of poverty, however, is mediated at every turn by elements in the report that seemingly relieve the state of this very task of procuring protection based on the “rights of citizenship” (Rangel, 2012, Rose, 1996). The three pillars of intervention as specified in the conclusion of the report - restoring mixed income neighbourhoods, sustaining private high-rise stock, and building community, hinge on technologies that cultivate individual and community self-governance, donor and volunteer responsivisation to support necessary funding flows, and those that facilitate the continued privatisation of services, albeit in a more socially responsive way. It is here, in this tension between the subjectivity of responsibility and the politics of rights, that we witness how the very problem of “social disorder” becomes a key arena for negotiating the politics and economics of late capitalism. In one sense, social disorder incites the remnants of a social welfare imaginary, a place that justifies selective state intervention. But the re-inscription of the righting of social disorder as both a social and economic imperative not only cultivates the need for social provisioning geared towards capacity building in the areas of productivity, responsivisation and right moral choice making, but highlights the importance of leveraging privatised economic investment and socially responsible private-public development. It is in this way, that a claim can be made that the shadow of fear that seemed to pervade the first section of the report is the necessary affective hook for heralding a mar-
ket oriented response to the problem of “social disorder”, albeit mediated through a parsimonious set of state led interventions. By extension, we might also note that despite the report’s ostensible focus on interventions geared towards the “health and well-being of neighbourhoods” and residents within priority neighbourhoods, the report’s moralized calculative rationalities pave the way for “social disorder” to become a generative site for enhanced neo-liberal economic expansion – an orientation that might very well undermine the fragments of social-welfare oriented work provisioning propounded in the report. A more generous reading of this tension acknowledges what quite possibly could be the United Way’s operative pragmatism in reconciling the need to make allowances for a devoluting welfare model of governance.

**Creative City Urbanism’s calculative logic:**

Thus far, I have suggested that in the *Vertical Poverty Report*’s various guises, a numbers-based rationality provides one epistemological basis for justifying targeted modes of intervention. And yet, as I have tried to make clear, appeals to market oriented logics inflected with traces of a neo-conservative moralizing sentiment are key discursive elements through which the maps and graphs have been rendered salient for a “concerned” and invested public “WE”. In other words although visualised numerical calculations have been drawn upon as reliable enunciators of the truths of social dysfunction, these very numbers, in some sense, become a projective surface on which to air mounting anxieties and fears associated with the “structural” risks associated with late globalised capital or the effects (perhaps) of too much immigration of the wrong sort (Siciliano, 2007). While the rhetorical nature of the use of numbers to sway public opinion has been well documented, here I draw reference to the specific political rationalities at play in shaping these technolo-
gies, and the specific visual forms with which these numbers are articulated. In addition, I would argue that another complementary epistemological source is at work in these addresses - a calculative foundation based on the policing of the visuality of neo-liberal urban space (Ghertner, 2010). Borrowing from Ghertner’s rather provocative reading of newly emerging techniques deployed to support a current bout of urban slum clearing in Delhi as instances of “aesthetic governmentality” (2010, p. 187), I forward the following two claims about the United Way’s deployment of a set of aesthetic coordinates to validate certain technologies of intervention.

First, the reference to social disorder provides a “type of calculative shorthand” (Ghertner, 2010) inviting the interpellated public to translate numbers into a bundle of visibility (Deleuze, 1988) referencing public displays of incivility (loitering, drunkenness, “partying”), the indexical traces of “publicly disruptive behaviours and disregard for the sanctity of property (vandalism, graffiti, broken windows, tagging) and random appearances of rapacious racialised gang violence. What these outer appearances and iconic visually rendered references procure is a set of ready-made knowledges about the social geographies of the inner-suburbs and the threat that they pose to surrounding neighbourhoods. In other words, I contend that it is not merely numbers (albeit with moralistic overlay) but the very recall of visual references as spectacle of public security threat (and, conversely, a threat to public prosperity) that permits an orienting of the United We’s sightline towards the governance terrain of risk behaviour management. If this recollection of visible attributes renders comprehensible the behavioural pathologies that need to be realigned - communal normativisation (or a tacit toleration) of these pathologies (Johnston & Shearing, 2003), and the individual and familial pathologies that manifest immorality - such re-positioning also permits an
The "New Deal" for Canadian Cities, officially embraced by the federal government under Jean Chretien/ Paul Martin Liberal majority between 2002-2005, is an urban policy strategy framed by a not wholly reconcilable tension between two different liberal governance approaches to scale (community/municipal, provincial/federal) and mode of intervention (general or spatially focused) (Bradford, 2010). The first approach, couched in the logic of neo-liberal rationality, takes its inspiration from "the new localism" emphasizing "local knowledge, networks and assets of community organizations and municipal officials". Notable in this approach is the shift away from a focus on the use of state fiscal tools to address issues of poverty, and a failure to address macro-level social and economic measures that have little regard for how they impact distressed localities. A second approach, which acknowledges state investment in cultivating socio-economic infrastructure, draws attention to federal and provincial governments' abilities to address issues of income security, health, education and employment through the welding of different policy levers. The New Deal for cities, with its emphasis on "re-imagining and re-inventing how governments work together for the social, cultural, economic, and environmental sustainability of cities and communities across Canada" (Government of Canada, 2005) amalgamated these two approaches in its tri-fold approach of analytical bypassing of, and/or a pragmatic reckoning with, the complex histories, racialised policies, and economic fault-lines that have given rise to uneven development across Toronto in the first instance.

If an aesthetic knowledge about the pathologies at work within "tower communities" provides one necessary set of normative coordinates for coalescing support for targeted interventions, another aesthetic norm - the normative grid of global creative cities (Ghertner, 2010) - serves as its logical counterpoint. What I contend is that the Vertical Poverty Report, in its multiple forms, and in its inter-textual referencing of other United Way materials, positions neighbourhood renewal in light of supporting Toronto's global competitiveness. This is as much an aesthetic plea for cultivating the visual appeal of a neighbourhood (to evidence its thriving arts and culture scene) as an appeal made via a visual technique to interpellate a public supportive of Toronto's creative city aspirations.

The subsection of the extended version of Vertical Poverty entitled "The broader neighbourhood and housing - how they work together", positioned at the end of the introductory section, makes clear that the impetus for focusing on tower neighbourhoods was forged in dialogues exploring strategies to position Toronto on the global stage. I quote a passage at length to illustrate this connection:

At the beginning of the last decade, Canada's 'big cities' mayors held a series of meetings to strategise about how to create a 'new deal' for Canadian cities. What they were looking for were the financial tools that would excel in the 21st century and successfully compete with cities worldwide. In Toronto, this cause was taken up by the newly formed Toronto City Summit Alliance - a coalition of over 40 civic leaders from the private, labour, voluntary, and public sectors in the Toronto region. In 2003,
the Coalition’s report Enough Talk set out a plan of action to make Toronto a great city region in the 21st century... Of significance to those working in the social service sector was the fact that Enough Talk placed strong neighbourhoods and affordable housing alongside regional transportation, tourism, education, and the arts, as important pillars of a strong city region – all with a vital role to play in attracting the talented and creative people to the Toronto region and keep them there....[A future city of Toronto initiative spear-headed in 2004 by the United Way entitled] Action for Neighbourhood Change has become an important vehicle for local residents of the 13 priority neighbourhoods to enrich their communities by spearheading a broad range of beautification, recreational, and community celebration activities” (2011b, pp. 9-10).

Of course, this new deal was a far cry from the “New Deal” of the Roosevelt era, a Keynesian style platform signaling the American state’s formal compliance with a model of welfare liberal governance to mediate the devastating affects of depression era capitalism (and we can think of the Canadian equivalents during the proceeding decades). Rather, the deal being forged by a veritable who’s who list of Toronto’s various “creative industry” stakeholders (Richard Florida, 2007), including the United Way’s CEO Susan McIsaac, hinged on retrofitting priority neighbourhoods’ revitalisation efforts according to the aesthetic and economic norms of vibrant world cities. To be clear, I am not in any way disparaging of United Way’s commitment to fostering access to resource flows in neglected city areas (and specifically, to the intended and perhaps unintended neighbourhood mobilisations that have transpired as a result of such support – see argument below). What I am suggesting though, is that making “Toronto tower communities” and “the surrounding neighbourhoods better places to live” (p. 11) is aligned, first and foremost, with an assemblage of market driven objectives that necessitates that Toronto sell itself according to its appearances as a functioning, multicultural global city. The implication is that the techniques approach to urban renewal. According to Bradford’s reading of the policy, these three pillars include the following commitments: (i) sustained funding transfers to municipalities to support physical infrastructural development (as contrast to a notable lack of emphasis on building social capacity through funding to such programming as settlement programs, child care, family services, libraries, etc); (ii) commitment to tri-level state collaboration for space based policy making; and (iii) a focus on municipalities and communities’ abilities to set policy agendas through community initiated research. With the ascendency of the Conservatives to federal power in 2006, a new path was forged that displaced federal responsibility back onto the provinces/municipalities, favoured modest tax credits and cash incentives to qualifying individuals and households over sustained financial support for programming, and most disturbingly a renewed pledge to bolster a law and order agenda (Bradford, 2006).

18_ It is interesting to note that accompanying the disappearance of welfare liberalism was a percolating interest in North America of formulating plans for a New deal for the 21st century. The wildly popular internationally syndicated TV Game Show Deal or No Deal playing at the time the power group were meeting, weighed in on this debate by offering a more lurid, extenuated version of...
neoliberal contract making that was perhaps more fitting with the realities of people disenfranchised in the wake of globalised capital. The show offered an ocular glimpse and spectacle display of (racialised) impoverished peoples’ psychical desperation and ravaged intimate relationships as they jockeyed on a studio stage to better their fortunes through perilous exercises of choice.

Susan Mclsaac’s press conference address and the Executive Summary report’s coupling of Toronto’s globalised economic prosperity and the objective of “creating healthy neighbourhoods” makes a more oblique reference to the doxic assumption of neoliberal urbanism - creative cities - than did the extended report. To be precise, while it appeared not to be of interest to Mclsaac’s script writer (or Mclsaac herself) or the Executive Summary report’s authors to explicitly articulate what form “the long term health and prosperity of the city of Toronto” might take, I would suggest that the opening video sequence that played as introduction to the CEO’s talk (and plays as introduction to the posted talk on the UWT’s website - www.unitedwaytoronto.com/verticalpoverty/report/introduction) stages a visualised knowledge about the globalised nature of the problem and associated solutions to vertical poverty.

At the beginning of the 3 second sequence, the viewer is introduced to a medium long, low angle shot of a vertical 1980’s high-rise building, positioned to the far left of the screen with an open expanse of blue sky occupying much of the horizon and a small clump of greenery positioned at the bottom right. The sightlines of the low angle shot emphasise both the verticality of the built form and the expansiveness of the sky disappearing on the horizon. A flock of migrating birds appearing from this off screen, unknown space are faintly visible in the distance, flying in the direction of and beyond the space of the tower (fig. 31). Tribal like drumming sounds reverberate across the barren, depopulated landscape with their ominous tones. The portent of the visual stillness that
hangs in the open space punctuated by this threatening sound-scape are interrupted in the next set of frames by the appearance of two opaque white bars, one extending upwards from the bottom of the image, the other from above. As they merge together to form a mass bar splicing through the middle of the image, the word “vertical” (in pumpkin orange font) follows the bar streaming from the bottom, and ‘poverty’ (in “United Way red font) following the stream from above. With this insertion of the United Way’s presence – the appearance of its research findings in the form of the report’s title, together with the simultaneous appearance of the iconic United Way logo placed as an illuminated, white presence in the upper portion of the image - the sound-scape abruptly changes to the melodic, vibrant sounds of laughter and conversations spoken in different languages. The migrating birds, visualised in the beginning sequence as disappearing on the horizon, can now be seen congregating within the space created between the tower and the bar with the words “vertical poverty” (fig. 32).

By forging a representational connection between tower renewal, thriving multiculturalism (as a branding of the creative city) and an urbanism that both attracts and manages to hold onto foreign and local capital and creative migrants (the migrating birds as metaphorical reference), the short sequence might necessarily serve as a visual reminder to the audience of city power brokers and other individuals of an anticipated public, of the United Way’s commitment to, and centrality of place within the project of neoliberal urban renewal. This can be seen, quite transparently, I would suggest in the United Way’s injection of itself into a colourless, lifeless space of risk where risk is represented in its colonialist register as the aggressive and otherness of “primitive” tribal sounds. This self-insertion, while cementing the place of whiteness in mediating the threat of an
unbridled racialised difference, performs another essential catalytic move by inciting a fulfillment of the promise of a thriving and economically prosperous, globally situated, policed multiculturalism. The birds (will) fly away no more.

Key to the operationalisation of Toronto’s New Deal, which *Vertical Poverty* heralds, is the cultivation of subjective compliance with the aesthetic and economic aspirations of a globalised creative city. Here I draw from Ghertner’s work once again, to highlight the importance of subjective identity as a key sightline for governmental practice (Ghertner, 2010, p. 205). Chapter 5 offers a more explicit and sustained detailing of one instance of this attempted imbrication of creative city aspirations and the subject of intervention’s own process of investment (in Foucault’s terms, “the mechanics” of interest (2007). Here I make a casual reference to the recommendations section of *Vertical Poverty*’s apparent hinging of the success of revitalisation to tower dwellers’ (and I might add, social service agencies working in priority neighbourhoods) reflexive ability to view themselves and their behaviours in terms of the two-sided descriptive codes (broken windows, creative cities) that fuel the New Deal. That is, the report attempts to inculcate tower residents into the process of urban revitalisation by binding their deficiencies and improvements, their codes of moral conduct if you will, to the neighbourhood/city’s rejuvenative ability. Following Ghertner’s lead in making incisions into Dean’s description of the place of subjectification in the governance process allows us to consider the mechanics whereby individual rehabilitation is dynamically inscribed within the wider dimensions of municipal rejuvenation dynamics of creative cities’ governmental-ity:

Regimes of government do not determine forms of subjectivity. They elicit, promote,
facilitate, foster and attribute various capacities [in terms of tower residents, their ability to engage in reflexive, responsivised behaviour geared towards neighbourhood improvement], qualities [entrepreneurial, productive, creative, deviant, destructive] and statuses [morally responsible, abject] to different subjects [tower residents]. They are successful to the extent that these agents come to see themselves [and I would add, each other] through such capacities...qualities...and statuses. (Dean, 1999, p/32, cited in Ghertner, 2010, p. 205).

If a multidimensional schema for urban rejuvenation as mapped by the New Deal involved the revitalisation of Toronto’s identity, behaviours and appearances in line with the spirit of global entrepreneurialism, cultural productivity and environmental saviness, then these are the same reflexive/agentic exercises that are expected of priority neighbourhoods\(^\text{20}\), at a secondary scale, and of the individual tower resident at a governmental base-line scale. In other words, prosperity, according to the logic of neoliberal urbanism being propounded by the United Way, hinges on whether the actions and appearances of the three scales align.

Graphic and photographic images that now comprise the bulk of United Way reports, not only artfully re/present the layering of visibilities of health-creativity-safety-entrepreneurial vibrancy as it manifests at the three scales, but they are being circulated to both potential donors and agencies alike to elicit and promote “buy-in” with what is being represented. As illustration of this point, and as a means of drawing this discussion about the knotting of mapping and aesthetic governmentality practices to a close, I would like to draw attention to the ethical, economic, and political valences that the 2010 donor campaign brochure was designed to bear.

The three-paneled brochure (fig. 33) was an image rich marketing tool used to entice individual donations and was relied upon by volunteer team leaders to solicit support from workplace
fig. 33_

United Way of Toronto, Donor’s brochure, 2011.
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colleagues who had been drawn into the United Way’s annual fundraising campaign (Green, personal correspondence, 2011). Opening to the interior of the brochure, the viewer is presented with a two-paneled image boldly coloured in United Way’s chosen palette. The upper two thirds of the space is devoted to a rendering of a Toronto map, imaged in soft neutral grey, with identifying street names and key travel arteries marked in white. This neutral plane of the map is imprinted with a series of boldly coloured dots representing different forms of United Way engagement and the demarcation of identified priority neighbourhoods in mustard yellow. The United Way logo, together with the heavily trafficked slogan – United We Can - appears in a red in-filled text box in the upper left hand corner of the image. Five differently coloured rectangular “callouts” with directional arrows pointing to selected neighbourhoods ring the bottom portion of the map and are over-layered with small, close-up photographic images ringed in either pale blue or red procuring a microscopic view of intimate practices of individual/neighbourhood revitalization occurring across the city-scape. The bottom third of the image houses a strip of four photographs, with each photograph visualizing a different practice of creative city responsivization at a micro scale. Finally, each photograph has a price tag affixed to it, alerting the potential donor/volunteer to the costs involved in ensuring and securing compliance.

Several features of this overall representation are worthy of note. First and in keeping with the scope of the Vertical Poverty report, although the downtown core is dotted with red and purple dots signaling a concentration of United Way funding flows, none of the rectangular callouts or accompanying photographic images detailing the appearance and work of responsivization is directed at this area. Instead, “callouts” are oriented to Toronto’s designated zones of risk – the
13 Priority Neighbourhoods. Indeed, only one callout remains targeted downtown – the one that names two corporate sponsored fundraising/play-oriented “get your team out of the office” Annual Campaign activities - a subtle yet poignant visual reminder and re-inscription of the inner city as a space devoted to the consumptive and entertaining pleasures of those who work in the city’s creative and financial sectors. Thus while the image, as a visibility assemblage, draws the viewer across an imagined multicultural, multigenerational, and differently resourced/privileged landscape to illustrate the work of “being United” across difference, “to make a difference”, the assemblage tacitly avows a global creative cities sensibility that, as Richard Florida suggested, “left to their own devices” (2007) permit a demarcation of urban zones according to the consumptive and productive needs of those profiting from globalised creativity, innovation and intellectual production.

Moreover, this mapping of Toronto elicits governmental intervention according to an aesthetic register designed to represent how the three scales of subjective responsivization and engagement align. This is achieved, I would suggest, through a multidirectional sightline that at once procures a zenith view of the city-scape as a space of creative, social and economic intervention, and simultaneously a microscopic gaze that evidences the intimate workings of neoliberal governmentality in the lives of select neighbourhood residents. To be emphasized here, though, is that the diagnostic of risk and remediation is based on the presence/absence of the visual indicators of safety, health and creative/entrepreneurial prosperity, and that these appearances are meant to bear the weight of evidentiary truth value. Importantly, the graphic also invites viewers to look reflexively, to position themselves as invested subjects within this wider field of engagement and
empowerment. Indeed as United Way’s marketing manager Green made clear, photographic images, including the ones housed in this brochure, are selected with two directed functions: first they are expected to refract back to the subject of focus (e.g., a priority neighbourhood resident or service user of a United Way funded program, a volunteer donor, or even social service provider) as an image of their own empowerment. That is, the image’s utility in the process of subjectivication is that it provisions a scopic field for subjects to recognise themselves as empowered. Second, as was evident in the training session for volunteers that I attended, team leaders (and subsequently team members) are actively encouraged to read themselves into the image as both part of an activated We of the slogan “United We Can”, and if residents of Toronto, into the space of the map itself, “as a neighbour” that is directly impacted by the contamination of social disorder, or conversely, by the cultivation of sensibilities oriented to prosperous cities.

Concluding thoughts: My examination of the different calculative measures that various social policy experts, from early social reformers to contemporary philanthropists have utilised for constructing certain urban issues as socio-spatial problematics, suggests that in these case studies at least, numerics based visual calculative practices have been coupled with an appeal to moral and aesthetic registers to secure social and political allegiances to the proposed interventions. Moreover, these instruments of knowledge production, informed as they are by circulating political rationalities (and often contradictorily so) attempt to imprint social-spatial landscapes and subjects with grids of intelligibility, such that certain normativising interventions are deemed desirable and acceptable by a range of subjects implicated in the web of governance being caste. Finally, I have argued that the types of knowledges about the “social” that get produced as different visually cali-
circuit that attempts to capture that which cannot, ultimately be captured – its own presence (as consciousness) (Lacan, 1977). As Zizek explains, “I am aware of myself, I am compelled to turn reflexively onto myself, only insofar as I can never “encounter myself” in my noumenal dimension, as the Thing I actually am” (Zizek 1999, p. 304). “In the scopic field, the gaze is outside, I am looked at, that is to say, I am a picture’… ‘You never look at me from the place from which I see you”. (Lacan 1977: 103). Like knowing ourselves, we can only know each other, only look at each other as images that can never be filled in entirely; we are propelled to see our selves seeing others seeing us in an endless circuit.

Branded instruments are wielded to interpellate publics, whether that social is aligned more properly according to the dictates of liberal welfarism or to the creative cool of globalised neoliberalism. The following Chapter extends this conceptual rendering to an analysis of a public Service Announcement campaign that the United Way of Toronto released in 2007.

PostScript: A Mapping Intervention: In this postscript, I aim to generate a differently configured grid of intelligibility for seeing the city of Toronto. The Three Cities Map, as a material, visually available form serves as a knowledge baseline, while the conceptual scaffolding and historical referencing generated in Chapter 2, together with interjections offered throughout this chapter serve as analytical touch-points for these interventions.

A first tactical interjection that I suggest is to project onto the Cities Centre’s visual rendering of a city “Losing Ground” (United Way, 2006) other empirical and conceptual findings accounting both for Toronto’s placement in the flight-paths of globalised finance and the racialised nature of disenfranchisement that is concomitantly transpiring across the city landscape. Such a strategy could begin, for example, by referencing a series of statistically generated reports that received no public attention when released and are not cross referenced on the Centre for Urban Studies website (nor on the United Way’s for that matter). Produced within the past 3 years by other Toronto based research and advocacy institutions (cf African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2010; The Colour of Poverty 2011; The Wellesley Institute’s Canada’s Colour Coded Labour Market, 2011), these reports suggest that over the last two decades, ethno-racialised newcomers (in particular those of African, South and West Asian, Arabic, and Latin American descent) together with Canadian born blacks have or continue to experience higher incidences of poverty, greater barriers to accessing adequate housing
and employment reflective of their education and experience, greater racialised profiling, surveillance, incarceration and deportation rates, and an overall deterioration in a sense of belonging and rootedness than earlier waves of newcomers (Henry, 2006; Ornstein, 2006). Racialised women have been particularly susceptible to the exclusionary aims and practices of what the Wellesley Institute labels “the colour code”. Thus, despite decades of economic growth and the promotion of itself as a most tolerant, multicultural nation, the Canadian state, in the words of the African Canadian Legal Clinic (2010), has demonstrated a “sustained failure to comply with the UN convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women” and (specifically focusing on the experiences of racialised black women) has engaged in a “willful blindness to socio-economic exclusion and social marginalisation of African Canadian women”.

What emerges, in other words, if we read Toronto differently than that imaged by the Centre for Urban Studies (and certainly than Florida’s rather rosy declaration of Toronto still being a “cohesive community”), is a representational mapping of a fourfold city landscape demarcated along differential axis of privilege, “creativity”, access, exclusion, and securitisation. City 1 can, in this spirit, be rewritten as an aspired to, near racially exclusive zones of concentrated wealth and often privatised, sanitized and well policed enclaves devoted to the sensuous and creative pleasures of tourists, suburban revelers, employees connected to creative and financial industries and wealthy inner city patrons – services and lifestyles supported by underpaid, under-employed, non-unionised, mostly racialised workers and temporary foreign workers living in other “cities” (Desfor, 2006; Colour of Poverty, 2011). Thriving communities of social, high rise, and cooperative housing, hubs of social activism (anti-poverty, queer, anti-racist, feminist) (Boudreau, Keil, &
Young, 2009) punctuate this landscape of assumed social, racial, and economic homogeneity; City 2 - an analogous second city, thriving in part on the same affective economy of fear and entitlement that drives political/economic processes in City 1 (see below), becomes a far reaching, amorphous splintered zone of mixed income, ethno-racially diverse households giving way to, and resisting the forces of gentrification. As a supplement to this narrative of the two cities we might make note of The United Way’s Priority Neighbourhoods document released in 2005 - produced in conjunction with the city of Toronto (United Way, 2011) - that effectively refocused philanthropic and city social services attention and funding away from inner city programming towards “under-serviced” and highly problematised regions in Toronto’s inner suburbs. What resulted was both a laudable policy focus on building infrastructural and resource support in priority communities and a reduction of inner-city social programming provisioning (Fanelli, 2009); a two-fold governance strategy that might very well have inadvertently eased the path for increased gentrification and facilitated a further flight of the racialised/poor to the outer zones of the city; City 3 - a third city, emerges as a bifurcated zone - (i) swaths of the inner suburbs that house home-owning second to fourth generation European immigrants, affluent residents with a conservative political bent (Boudreau, Keil, & Young, 2009), and recent more economically established racialised immigrants, and (ii) highly securitised zones of concentrated racialised poverty - the “13 Priority Neighbourhoods” - that are comprised of a fragilely employed and often criminalized labour force, and conversely, are the birthplace of vibrant community agencies, hubs of social and cultural production, and political activism (in part a by-product of the re-funneling of City/United Way funding through its “strong neighbourhoods strategy”) negotiating the realities of these new articulations of poverty and securitiza-
tion (Boudreau, Keil, & Young, 2000). New social and economic priorities in Toronto’s City Hall (as of 2010) threaten the future of this funding stream (Toronto Stop the Cuts, 2011). City 4 - finally, we can account for a para-city, the suburban communities surrounding Toronto that are home to the economically insecure middle class, middle class (white) ‘diaspora’ from Toronto (Hulchanski, 2007), racialised communities of 1st second, and now third generation immigrants, and pockets of invisibly rendered rural and inner suburban households living below the poverty line (Murdie, 2002; Toronto Children’s Aid Society, 2008).

Although it is beyond the scope of this dissertation, several other remapping interventions might include, for example, visually representing the coalition building strategies currently being deployed by various anti-poverty groups (Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, Jane-Finch anti-Poverty Coalition; Rexdale Community group; Flemingdon Park) and citizenship rights groups (No One is Illegal; ProBono Students Canada) to reassemble the dissociated “priority neighbourhoods” into a new “city” of resistance and civil rights articulation.

What this cursory remapping exercise gestures towards, I would argue, is the analytical consideration of Toronto’s urbanism and targeted techniques of governance as interpellated effects of operations of globalised neoliberalism, welfare state retrenchment and intervention, and racist/colonialist logics, and as lived, differentiated spatial realities that negotiate these macro-structural forces of power (Fairbanks, 2004) in the forms of accommodation, acquiescence, resistance and disruption. Put another way, Toronto’s socio-economic, political and aesthetic topography can be realigned in such a way as to facilitate the following sightlines of analysis: (i) an accounting of Toronto urbanisation as a multi scalar political, social, culturalised/racialised and economic pro-
Here, metropolis is defined in relationship to the concept’s place in the Western Imaginary—a site or specifically “form” that allows for the structuration/organization or “rationalization” of both capitalist “relations of production” and social relations that complement economic/material processes and relations (Mbembe, p. 383).

It is within this emergent city scape—as textual and analytic construct, as multi scalar space, and as a complex weave of contradictory political rationalities—that I position the two case studies that follow. And yet, as I will argue in the following chapters, the United Way of Toronto’s production and circulation of images about risky/at risk youth from prioritised communities and mural production through the city’s Graffiti Transformation Project need not be simply understood as passive fixtures built into the multidimensional layering of the city. Rather, embracing a post-structuralist reading of governmentality (Foucault, 2004; Miller & Rose, 2008), and following the analytic path forded in this chapter on numerically calculative and aesthetic calculative practices, we can view these programs as productive sites for the shaping of Toronto’s ongoing processes of (mediated) neo-liberal urbanism (Boudreau, Keil, & Young, 2009; Fairbanks, 2004). Recalling an argument made in the introduction, images about youth and made by youth in the two respective projects are caught in a web of ambivalence; they are at once (i) publicly enunciated mechanisms for nurturing the nascent displays of personal responsivisation that manifest in targeted communities, (ii) techniques of governance that traffic self consciously in the optics of hope for a sustained multicultural
“community”, (iii) sites of deterritorialisation, and finally, (iv) touch-points for racialised regulatory practices of surveillance and securitisation. The targeted aim of the following chapters is to dissect these ambivalences that resides in the heart of practices that are contextualised by, and in turn, partially/ unwittingly/ contradictorily contribute to, a particular configuration of Toronto as a globalised, creative city.
The media’s evacuation of the human through the image has to be understood…in terms of the broader problem that normative schemes of intelligibility establish what will and will not be human, what will be a livable life, what will be a grievable death. (Butler, 2004, 146).

As a journalistic declaration, the year 2005 became known as “the Year of the Gun” (Buffam, 2009), with Toronto’s newspaper and television media producing a stream of images featuring the victims of what was heralded as a record number of gun related homicides in the city of Toronto (fig. 1). The victims’ visual representations - close-up facial profiling reminiscent of the “mug shot” (whether actual or imagined) - were accompanied by text that spoke of involvements with illegal and gang related activities (fig. 2). If these images and narratives were used to “affix blackness with a foreboding criminality” (Buffam, 2009, p. 61), their circulation fanned a mounting anxiety about an unrepentant violence that was erupting across the landscape of Toronto. Indeed, in these representations, blackness acquired a threatening abjected presence (Kristeva, 1982), a “phantasmic threat” (Buffam, 2009, p.62) that disavowed the right for these male youth at least, to lay claims to being properly mourned, to being identified in humanistic terms and accorded the dignity that accompanies a proclamation of inclusion in a moral world¹.

A parallel set of media images began circulating months later following several raids conducted in Toronto in June 2006 under the auspices of Canada’s Anti-terrorism Act. The term “home-grown terrorism”, coined by then assistant director of operations for CSIS in response to these raids resurfaced once more on September 26th 2008 in various media’s reporting of the conviction of the first of eleven youth charged under the Act. Key court evidence showing grainy video footage of masked young men “firing guns and waving a black flag in a snowy Canadian

---

¹ This wider grid of intelligibility dictating the limits of humanness, also registered as a suggested aesthetic imposition on priority neighbourhoods where gang activity was understood to take place. In one instance, a roadside memorial, marking the site of the death of Jason Cambell (alleged - although never proven - by the police to have been killed in gang cross-fire in 2002) had been repeatedly targeted for removal for six
years following the shooting despite the fact that a city ordinance requiring the dismantling of road-side memorials after 30 days has rarely been enforced. In response to these persistent acts of erasure of their attempts to publicly memorialise their loss, community members of Ward 7 continued to re-mark the site with new strings of red and orange roses. As well, graffiti was inscribed on the area’s walls deriding what has been termed the police’s unjust targeting of their neighbourhood and its insensitivity to a community’s need and desire to mourn and remember (CBC, 2008). In November 2008, this memorial site was profiled in a motion put forward by a Toronto City Councilor to ban the presence of community initiated roadside memorials honouring the deaths of youth/young adults killed in known gang neighbourhoods. The reading of this memorial site (and others like it) as a marker of “gang turf” held sufficient power to persuade city council to strike a committee to reconsider the ban. (CBC, 2008). The issue was effectively sidestepped in city Council with a tweaking of the ordinance now requiring that city residents receive bureaucratic approval before erecting any type of roadside memorial.

We may recall Thobani’s rather astute claim that if the Canadian wilderness stands in as an operative symbol of settler nationalism, a place of evacuation and resettlement where

woodland” (Freeze, 2008)\(^2\), together with photographic images of the young men taken upon their arrest, resurfaced as well.

Evident in these representational accounts, with each indexing a different spectral form of globally connected, home-grown threat, was a profiling and scapegoating of certain racially marked males as being always responsible (or at least immediately suspected) for disrupting the normative codes of civility, that in Canada, are mediated through a staid multiculturalism and appeal to anglo-celtic values and attributes (Thobani, 2007; Mackey, 2002; see Chapter 2). As Inderpal Grewal (2005) suggests, the discourses and signifiers of “fanaticism” and criminality had become imperceptible in a post September 11th North American/Northern European imaginary, forming a visual grid of intelligibility to guide practices of surveillance and securitised management of targeted subjects (Grewal, 2005, p. 203). Gang/fanatic criminality can in this sense, be considered a typology of signs that allows for identification of a racialised male subject as its logical end point of destructive and animalistic potential; racialised criminality, in its current post-911 guise, serves as both a reminder of the fragility of the project of multicultural, democratic liberalism (i.e., what happens when racialised desire isn’t pacified through the conjoined practices of commodification and neo-liberal responsivisation) and a rallying cry to shore up and stabilize the subjectivity of the exalted body (Thobani, 2007) in the face of this wrong object of threat. Important to consider is that many of these signifiers of a gendered, racialised threat – from body posture, gesture, comportment, to clothing style, accessory choice, and indeed music preference – have not only become implicated in the practices of state securitization, but have a protracted history of being trafficked for their fetishistic and commodified value through the circuits of clothing and music industry.
advertising. Relatedly, circulating commoditised images of youth also trade in the doxa of a depoliticized multiculturalism, where “ethnic differences” are presented as a sequence of stultified, digestable categories for consumptive pleasure. What I am suggesting, then, is that images portraying “risky youth” – whether as fetishised and commodified spectacle, or as spectacles of terror, had become part of the “urban everyday” (Cronin, 2006) of Toronto by 2008, aligning citizen’s “daily rhythms” with targeted ways of seeing and comprehending space and subjectivity.

To this mix of commodified imagery “mapping” Toronto’s spatial sensibilities (Cronin, 2010 cited in Harris, 2012) with principles of commercialism and a renewed securitized nativism, I would also add the various visual image campaigns targeting youth behaviours and practices that have been making public appearances on billboards, posters, in print and television media. Sponsored by various voluntary, private and state sector agencies and institutions, the images jockey for the consumptive attention of targeted audiences, while attempting to territorialise subject matter (the subjectivity of clients aligned with identities of gender, age, race/ethnicity, ability and health) with promises of remediation and risk abatement, healing and empowerment (fig. 3 & 4). Like commercialized and media visual imagery, images produced through social services have social lives – they appear, and disappear from the urban landscape; they attempt to capture attention with colour, font, layout, with graphic sensibility, through affective or moral allure; and they are engaged in the productive work of solicitation, education, promotion, and moralizing (fig. 5). They also attempt to trade on the power of their brand or corporate identity, a visual short-circuiting that attests to the organization’s internal coherence, the verifiability of its practices and approaches, and of its reputation (Du Gay, 2000).

As Rinaldo Walcott (1997) so perceptively argues, racialised, and in particular, Black, youth’s style (from clothing, to language, to attitudes, to artistic production) sets a type of aesthetic and highly commoditised benchmark for the hip, the subversive, and the criminal (of course, Walcott notes, it is supremely ironic that this hyper-visibility of “Black youth culture” stands in stark contrast to the hyper-invisibility of the everyday experiences of racialised youth (Walcott, 1997).

Geographer Ann Cronin suggest that commercial advertising not only register semiotically and affectively, but become part of the haptic economy of cities and city dwellers passively by the inhabitants of urban space; it is advertisements’ very “familiarity and banality” that allow their presence to become naturalized in the way that the city feels to its inhabitants and to those that pass through its spaces. In other words, peoples’ autobiographical lives (their daily ways of inhabiting the world – their bodily rhythms in line with leisure, work, play and care) became sites for communicative

the exalted citizen stakes a claim of belonging and presence, then the black flag marks another type of presence, an intrusion of difference in the landscape of whiteness.
This chapter examines one such youth focused visual campaign sponsored by the United Way of Toronto that appeared on the Toronto landscape starting in 2007 (as of April, 2012, the campaign still retains a circulatory life on the video-social media internet site Youtube, although its link to the United Way of Toronto’s web page was officially disengaged with the release of its newest PSA in the fall of 2011). I detail various dimensions of the social life of the generated film associated with the campaign – the ethical, political and economic valences it is expected to convey, its semiotic exchange with other images and representations of youth, the publics it attempts to interpellate, and how it coheres as a corporate marker of the United Way. One part of this exploration charts how the United Way’s “self-promotional imperative” (Cronin, 2006) in the hyper-competitive arena of fund development, necessitates the production of advertising campaigns that are not only pitched to corporate audiences and a presumed public, but necessarily accord with (and by their defacto compliance with, reinvigorate) already existing normative grids of intelligibility that map certain subjects and spaces. And yet, given the United Way of Toronto’s active involvement in policy arenas, the sightline of analysis also needs to address visual campaigns as techniques of governance aligned with certain political rationalities and as instruments for effecting social policies targeting disenfranchised youth.

**A Way Out Youth campaign: Tracing the spectre of settler unease in a time of multicultural neoliberalism:** In 2007 and then intermittently over the next 4 years, a series of print advertisements began appearing in high-trafficked pedestrian zones (on the sides of Toronto’s bus shelters, on the walls in subway stations), in various Canadian published print media (magazines, newspapers), on various online sources, and in campaign pitches targeting potential donors and volunteers. Ref-
erenced as “public service announcements” and bearing the campaign name “A Way Out” these circulating still images together with a thirty-three second promotional video formed the core of the United Way of Toronto’s annual campaign (fig. 6). Each one of the print advertisements targeted a specific subjectivity that aligned at the time with United Way’s selective focus on four priority populations – “the elderly, youth, immigrants, and homeless” (K. Green, Personal communication, 2011). One of Canada’s leading creative marketing firms, Publicis (writer, David Savoi and art director, Kenneth Fothergill comprised the creative team from Publicis) together with a most sought after commercial videographer/photographer, Mark Zibert and visual effects supervisor and director Sean Cochrane (Crush Agency) provided pro bono work on the campaign.

In both content and mode of circulation, the “A Way Out” Campaign represented a marked departure from previous United Way campaigns. Prior to 2006, and we may recall prior to the United Way’s re-branding of its corporate identity and governance structure (see Chapter 3), public service announcements tended to visualize the United Way’s “heroic” presence in mediating the needs of different marginalized subjects (fig. 7, 8, & 9). Drawing reference to a number of “iconic” Canadian and Toronto based United Way Campaigns that had received considerable critical acclaim for their creative aesthetic “edginess”, writer Kenneth Fothergill from Publicis, alluded to differences in approaches adopted, and to visual precedents that would be re-imaged in the current A Way Out campaign:

There was one campaign, done in 2002, black and white, really iconic, really simple, hard to top creatively, I’ve got to say. They were able to use the hand as an icon within different really stunning photographs. They won basically every award in the advertising industry ...It made a few assumptions too. I mean one of the most obvious, people know the United Way logo. So, just by seeing that disembodied part,

According to George Yudice, the state’s retreat from the provisioning of adequate funding and support for social services provisioning beginning in the late 1980’s resulted in the proliferation of arts based programming targeting economically disenfranchised communities, and the use of the aesthetic more properly as an assumed resource for securing sociopolitical and economic amelioration. In other words, “culture became a lynchpin of a new epistemic framework for which much of what Foucault called disciplinary society (the inoculation of norms in such institutions as education, medicine, psychiatry) are absorbed into an economic or ecological rationality”, (Yudice, 2003, p. 1)

fig. 05
Still, United Way Campaign 2011.
fig. 06
the hand as the hero in a certain situation whether it’s providing some shelter over a homeless person, wiping the tears of a crying child, just so beautifully simple and iconic. But they didn’t have to do TV and they didn’t have to worry about that line [that Publicis was given], “We Help People Help Themselves.” Because in this current campaign that iconic idea would’ve been killed very quickly if we’d come up with that based on the strategy and the plan that we were given. (K. Fothegill, Personal communication, 2011).

By 2006, the targeted focus of thematic content together with an understanding of reception and the nature of the spaces in which images circulated had shifted considerably. First, apart from appearing in traditional venues like newspapers and magazines (and as visual aids in soliciting volunteer support), the PSA’s were targeted for maximum exposure along transportation routes (bus stops as paid advertisements in city of Toronto owned bus shelters, in subway stations, and on the walls of subway trains), as hyperlinks to several posted YouTube sites, and as donated television commercial spots (which imposed its own industry standard of a 30 second limit on the length of the PSA).

The United Way was acutely aware that the PSA would act as a cornerstone of its fund-development strategy, and that it needed to be strategically placed in various trafficked sightlines in order to vie for attention in a hyper-competitive donations market (K. Green, personal communication, 2011).

Secondly, the UWT Marketing Manager at the time, Yishey Chowden, had argued the PSA needed to be more “consumer driven” or at least consumer responsive: “that it wasn’t so much the content that mattered but how it was delivered” (K. Fothergill, Personal communications, 2011). That the PSA needed to create a circuit of affect between a potential donor, an evocative image of the effectivity of the work of the United Way in the lives of service recipients, and the United Way as a

According to Cronin (2006), by the end of the 19th century, European, and North American cities’ spatial organization had become orientated to an extent around visual images and texts associated with the advertising of commodities. Public and private surfaces – the sides of buildings, transportation vehicles, public urinals were blanketed with handbills, beautifully hand decorated signs, and commercially produced billboards, each image or graphic competing for the visual attention of a possible, and projected consumer. What has changed, Cronin argues, apart from form and technology, is that in today’s contemporary urban environments, advertising spaces are “formally” parsed out, privately owned or rented by corporations (or institutions) for periods of time (Cronin, 2006, p. 617). They are strategically placed on major arterial routes so that they optimize (provisionally) urban sightlines, and transmission time as people move through city streets either by car, on foot, bicycle or via public transportation. As Cronin suggests, “these targeting strategies… create important spatiotemporal zones which congeal around bodies, valuable spaces, and the logics of commodity promotion” (p. 619).
catalyst for hope and city rejuvenation, was articulated by United Way’s Toronto Artistic Director, Clara Boudreau when asked to talk about the visual imagery deployed over the past 5 years (since 2006):

I think that it needs to evoke some type of emotional response...It needs to evoke a response for sure. It’s an emotional response, an action response. How do I relate to these people, to their stories...An image can be really powerful and it can be done in such a way that there is that evocative, close up feeling, to the hope that we are providing...The elements of the imagery that we’ve talked about, subconscious or not, the things that jump out, people’s faces, you can see their eyes, that there you can feel a connection when you look at them, that it tells a story or elicits some kind of response. (C. Boudreau, personal communication, 2011).

Finally, as was explicitly stated in exchanged memos between the marketing department at the United Way of Toronto and Publicis, the PSA needed to enliven an articulation between the concepts of “self empowerment” and “building” or enhancing “the capacity of community” (Savoi, personal correspondence, 2011), a goal fitting with its slogan “we are all in this together”.

What they really wanted to communicate in this and it actually came, I think it was part of why they liked this community thing, is cause what they wanted to communicate was that the United Way helps people help themselves. They used the words -- It’s not a handout, it’s a hand up. So that was really important. And they wanted to show empowerment of the people they helped; that’s what the United Way does it empowers people to get themselves out of their situation. That was one of the most tricky things for us to accommodate like how do we show in a single visual or an idea how United Way, your donation, helps people help themselves. (K. Fothergill, personal communication, 2011).

As a means of examining how these three campaign requirements – fund solicitation, demonstration of UWT’s commitment to individualized “empowerment”, and informing of a public - co-
alesced as epistemological imperatives, I begin the analysis obliquely by following a path forged by both the marketing team at the United Way and creative marketing team at Publicis. That is, by way of explanation of what the *A Way Out Youth* campaign’s targeted aims and values were, both marketing groups began via its opposite; without naming explicitly the agency involved, Green and Savoi/Fothergill gestured towards the Salvation Army’s “giving campaigns” that had begun appearing in various public spaces in 2006 as representing a more “charitable” articulation of the relationship forged between donor (as representative of the public/social), social agency, and recipient of giving (fig. 10).

**R:** Could I ask how you understand empowerment?

**L:** So we wouldn’t have somebody huddled in an alleyway, although I’m not bringing any particular charity to mind, (laughter). They have a very special place in the city and there is room enough for everyone, but that is not our branding, our way of operating. So we are not showing the need as much as this is what happened in the progression in this person’s life. (K. Green, personal communication, 2011).

Mirroring this understanding of the social as a space of demonstrated “self empowerment” rather than the procuring of charitable support, David Savoi suggested that contemporary “consumers” of charitable images desired to see their own acts of responsivisation mirrored back to them, to see how their donations were working in activating responsivisation in recipients of services.

When I see the camouflaged youth and the tagline “we see what others don’t”, I get the message but I don’t know what to do. You know, I see them, okay, you’re helping them...but consumers are really looking for more, whether it’s more information about what their money’s doing or more participation or more involvement. (D. Savoi, personal communication, 2011).

The Salvation Army’s advertising series alluded to by Green and Savoi, are identical in

---

**fig. 09**
Still, United Way Campaign 2002.

**fig. 10**
Still, Salvation Army Campaign 2006.
The Salvation Army is a transnational, Christian based faith organization that has supported charitable activities in Canada since 1882 (Salvation Army, 2012). As testimony to the significant role that “shadow state” (Wolch, 1990) actors make to the provisioning of social services in a contemporary post-welfare Canadian context (and specifically, private charitable organizations like the Salvation Army which now functions as the largest contributor of welfare provisioning in the country) (Salvation Army, 2012), Toronto’s mayor Rob Ford proclaimed the week of December 19-26th, 2011 as “Salvation Army week” (Salvation Army, 2012). Their format and design; in each a ghost-like portrait of a youthful solitary figure, translucent and substanceless with hollowed out eyes is depicted, and in one an image of a child adult pair, huddled together in an immaterial embrace. These spectral representations of impoverished destitution are projected into one of a series of marginal urban spaces – an isolated park bench, an abandoned alleyway, stairs leading to a tenement building on a desolate street. The figures are contained in body posture; the shoulders are drawn inwards and the knees pulled upward in their subjective submission to forces that extend beyond their control (and beyond the immediate sight-line of the image). Further, in each image, the spectre is enfolded into a compressed space on the expansive visual horizon, its presence haunting the landscape even in its confinement. Finally, the words ‘We see what most don’t’ are anchored either beneath or above the spectre in crisp, bold white capitalised letters, starkly contrasting with the murky blue and brown washes of the depicted scenarios of homelessness and abandonment that passers by and readers are invited to see.

If the figure’s own agentic abilities to shift positioning outside of the restrictive frames of a situational destitution is representationally foreclosed by the Salvation Army’s positioning its own omni percipience and omniscience through the declaration ‘we see’, then what these images forward, I suggest, is a particular ethical model which assumes a central role for social agencies as both expert witness and as arbiters in redistributive caring for the social’s forgotten citizens. In other words, what Green and the Publicis creative team were seemingly seeing in the Salvation Army advertisement campaign targeting youth and other economically vulnerable populations, was a visual representation of an earlier mode of governance in which an ethics of charitable giving was enmeshed with basic tenets of welfare liberalism. To recall arguments forwarded by a govern-
mentality inspired literature (Powell, 2003; Rose, 1999; Sharland, 2006), it is in a post war (1940’s) welfare era that youth (and children) had became an operative principle in the reconceptualisation of the civic as a space of caring and shared responsibility. State and social agencies’ mobilization of support for youth allowed for a collective forgetting of the ravages of pre-war poverty, and permitted a society to look to an imagined future. Thus youth, like other managed subjects of welfare governance, became emblematic of both modernist possibilities and the social ills that could threaten their realization (Sharland, 2006), and were read as indicators of the effectiveness of a combined state/social intervention (Powell, 2003). Transgressive behaviours, like homelessness, were diagnosed as evidence of a wider moral decline, signaling the need for increased levels of state and charitable funding to mediate the effects of disruption (Kelly & Callahan, 2009; Sharland, 2006). All juvenile criminals and other youth transgressors of normalcy were, in this way, deemed possible candidates for rehabilitation.

Here, in the “we see” public service campaign, the Salvation Army promulgates, via the image, its role as a normativising social force in the lives of youth and other vulnerable subjects in the following two interconnected ways: 1) it is self-invested with an ability to know the truth of a wound that appears in the landscape of the social – a symptom of social fault lines, and 2) it is able to offer remediation and redemption, to renew social life for the person cast as superfluous spectre in the forgotten spaces of capital. Thus, in this governance economy to which the image attests, rents in the social order are remediated through charitable acts and caring redistributive “justice”; a helping hand is extended so that the social order can be reestablished.

We may pause though to consider the nature of this nostalgically remembered space of the
social to which the Salvation Army bears witness. The Salvation Army campaign, in its depictions of the subjectivities worthy of redemption and care are only configured according to the lines of normative whiteness, a positioning that might very well have as much to do with an assumed audience (i.e., an appeal to bolstering a collective social grounded in a presumed Anglo Celtic sensibility) as it speaks to the operating cognitive and scopic technologies at work in these images rendering the mechanisms and manifestations of colonization and racialization invisible and thus representationally occluded from the ongoing psychic and material life of the city. Not only do these representational forms effectively erase the experiences of racialised, economically disenfranchised subjects and the systemic fault lines that conjoin logics of race with capital, but threatens to bracket the scope of caring that is promised through the advertisements themselves. To see here in this campaign is to not see the play of normative whiteness as it plays out in practiced actions of charitable giving and care provisioning.

In contrast, and in alignment with Green and Fothergill, I would argue that the public service announcement *A Way Out Youth* can be best understood as a type of performative display that uses the resource of the aesthetic to enunciate to the United Way’s external (potential) financial stakeholders – its assumed public or “We” – of its shift towards enfolding disciplinary practices of social care into the abiding framework of market rationality. Moreover, I would also argue that there is a different understanding of a preferred social bond that is being trafficked through this public service announcement, and that its rationalised orientation of empowerment and moralized responsivisation is inflected with traces of neo-conservative logic coupled with the logics of race. As a means of fleshing out these claims, I turn first to a formal description of the PSA film
A Way Out Youth: In the opening sequence of the film, a blurred image of a chain link fence leading endlessly into the horizon together with the static sounds of an urban streetscape serve as backdrop for the introduction of the central subject of the video – a pale skinned, early-teens youth, donning a black oversized hoodie and a single silver hoop in each pierced ear. The camera’s attention is paid to the protagonist’s eyes as he casts them to the side, and then downwards towards his feet, and then quickly away again to the disappearing horizon of chain link. The video then flashes (with jump cuts between frames) between a series of moving images - a fragment of a youth’s body, face partially revealed moving behind and along the fence line; a long shot of a group of four racially mixed older youth dressed similarly in baggy dark clothing standing in a darkened recessed entrance of a brick building positioned at the end of an alleyway fenced in on either side by the chain link fencing; two of the profiled youth (both with dark complexions), eyes shifting downwards, their figures revealed through fencing that is displayed both in front and behind them; a close-up of the protagonist’s face placed behind and to the side of a blurred profile of the
clenched jaw and neck-line of one of the older racialised youth; a shot of a youth with brown complexion wearing a black toque speaking, words inaudible, again with fencing positioned in front of and in back of his body. A gun shot sounds in the foreground, a handgun is brandished. The last of the flashing images portrays the four youth turning their backs towards the camera as they move stealthily into the darkened horizon of the fence lined alley leaving the protagonist huddled against the brick wall. A high-pitched piercing sound takes over the soundscape as the video moves into a close-up of the youth’s face, his eyes suddenly blackened, wild, haunted. Now positioned with his back towards the viewer, the protagonist, with clenched fists, begins to tear away at the base of his skull; between the folds of torn flesh, out of a bloodless gaping wound a new subject begins to emerge. As the last vestige of shredded skin falls to the ground the protagonist now sporting pristine, pressed white soccer shorts, knee socks and blue soccer jersey with white numbers, begins to move towards a patch of light – the new sightline for the video. A long shot traces his at first hesitant steps away from the darkened space of the bricked/fenced alleyway towards and then through this threshold of whiteness, marked on one side with an opened gate and on the other by
an overhanging tree branch with its fresh green foliage swaying gently in the breeze. The camera then moves into a close-up to record a faint smile registering on his face, and pans away again to document the protagonist, now in full movement, racing towards a grassy field in which a handful of other uniformed youth are intently occupied in a game of soccer. The final frame positions the United Way logo at its centre, with the soccer game as backdrop. Under the logo, printed in white text are the words: “Without you, there could be no way out”; a voice over repeats this phrase. The screen fades.

**Mining media precedents:** After entertaining several thematic possibilities, the marketing department at the UWT and at Publicis settled on a narrative targeting “at risk youth” living in neighbourhoods where gang activity manifests (Savoi, 2011), an acknowledged, timely theme (Zibbert, 2011) that mirrored a contemporary Toronto zeitgeist preoccupied with a spread of youth implicated, gun related violence (see chapter 3). Given fear of backlash from Toronto’s Black communities and as a means of avoiding stereotyping (Fothergill, personal communication, 2011), a decision was made to side-step the politics of racialized representations of violence by casting a white in appearance boy as the central character. In fact, no black characters are imaged in the PSA, only those that the producers claimed are “ambiguously” raced (K. Fothergill, personal communication, 2011).

The narrative arc of the 30-second A Way Out Youth PSA is similar to that which unfolds in the Vertical Poverty Report (see chapter 3); like in CEO Susan McIsaac’s public address, the film initially grounds its moral actions and support of responsivisation in the marked presence of a social disorder that mars the social landscape. To carry this thematic sketch visually and acoustically,
the creative team mined a host of semiotic codes and filmic conventions drawn from different film genres – social documentary, gangster, melodrama, and horror. What is produced in this blending, I would suggest following Said’s lead in his reading of the production of orientalism⁹, is a “densely imbricated arrangement of imagery and expertise” (Mitchell, 1998, p. 455) that produces racialised youth both as a subjectivity marked by an indelible difference and a dangerous “political reality” disruptive to the moral social.

Documenting Urban Anxiety: According to David Savoi, scriptwriter, “a real bare bones, real kind of look” was deployed to image the “realities of youth gang violence” and to represent to the viewer an “unfiltered” glimpse into gang violence’s infectious qualities (Savoi, personal communications, 2011). As Mark Zibbert, artistic director and videographer confirmed:

M. Once you start getting into overly art directed or light, overly lit, right away I think the audience will see it as an ad or like Hollywood, for lack of a better word. So we really wanted this raw looking film to make it feel as real as possible.
R. Real?
M. Yeah, real as in referencing more a documentary style versus like a cinematic style (M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011).

In keeping with the production techniques commonly practiced within the genre of social documentary, Zibbert made use of hand held cameras to capture “the real action that takes place on the streets” (M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011). There was a reliance on natural lighting present within the film location – a technique which resulted in the hoped for effect of a grainy, shadowed look of the first part of the video (of course the mise-en-scene of the “real” streets was also conducive to the elements of horror and gangster genres inflected throughout the first two sequences) (fig. 18). Relatedly, it was important that filming take place in the darkened recesses of a
high-rise complex to depict the realities of where gang related violence in Toronto was understood to manifest - a location that gave representational support and tacit justification for the United Way’s recent shift in funding practices towards Toronto’s priority neighbourhoods located in the inner-suburbs (fig. 19). Street-scape sounds were also used to bear witness to the sonic authenticity of the chosen locale and attention was paid to capturing the “real” affective states associated with social abjection and violence – angst, anguish, despair (K. Fothergill, personal communication, 2011).

Although the PSA makes no claims to be being an actual representation of gang activity, the creative team involved in the making of the A Way Out Youth film were nevertheless concerned that their representation be in proximity to, or an evocation of, an ontological truth about the subject matter.

A teenager is going to watch this film and not laugh at it. They’re going to watch this film and feel like, that’s legitimate. That’s a real concern that I might have at school or someone I know might have. So that whole thing with showing the gun, and you know, the way they interacted and looked at each other had to feel real you know versus fist pumps and you know, I think you watch that and you’re going to feel like, you know, I think a teenager, especially, will be very... will pick out those little details and know if it’s bullshit or not, instantly. So again back to like shootings all handheld, raw everything, bringing it back to make it as real as possible.
(M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011)

It is this attention to a visual realism produced according to the technologies of social documentary photographs and film/ video that allows the PSA to present itself, as film theorist Elizabeth Cowie (2006) suggests, as a “genre of objective knowability of the world” (p. 20). Indeed, I would argue that what was afforded by this decision to adopt the conventions of social documentary is “a
pleasure of knowing” that both permits the viewer to scrutinize a slice of (imagined) social reality through an assumed empiricist’s lens, and an experiential engagement – as if we were there (both spatially, and temporally), witnessing its event(s) play out before us (Cowie, 2006). As a visualization “of found reality”, the social documentary attempts to eclipse the “agency of the eye, and through cultivating a certain way of not-seeing” (Feldman, 1997, p. 31) it becomes seemingly impossible for the viewer to think and see beyond the scope of the realist frame. Or at least this is what we are led to assume (Feldman, 1997). Several optical techniques are deployed to further realist perceptions: First, there is a collapsing of distance between the social phenomenon that is being examined (the signified) and the abstracted and visually incarnate form of that which is being represented (the signifier). Erased from view is the entire production process that goes into representing the authentic – here in this PSA film an extensive editing process that reduced 8 hours of digital film to a 30 second final version, multiple close-ups to capture “a true nugget of emotion” (M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011), and affective orchestration through filmic devices such as jump cuts, the graininess of the image and carefully orchestrated lighting. The spectator is thus positioned outside of this knowledge about the production process, and enters at that point where signifier and signified are solidified. In other words, we are positioned as consumers of the appearance of the real. (Bleichmar, 2009; Tagg, 1993).

Secondly, according to John Tagg (1993), the realist mode is part of a normativising set of discursive and representational practices that attempts to limit the range of acceptable narratives about the social phenomenon by recalling a reservoir of similar texts enmeshed within the commonsensical social world – a type of “cross-echoing” (Tagg, 1993, p. 56) establishing stability be-
between the text and its limited range of referents. Thus, in an attempt to short-circuit “the real’s” ability to interrupt the realist frame, the image works hard at saying it all, at exhausting all that can be denoted in the images (Tagg, 1993) (fig. 20). What is instantaneously transferred to the depicted scene of social violence, and then transmitted back again to the viewer as evidentiary signifiers deemed proper to the social phenomenon under investigation, are a set of “stereotypical and fetis-hized cultural codes” readily circulating within the cultural imaginary (Feldman, 1997, p. 36). Verifiability of the truth thus hinges on a constellation of readily at hand “recognition codes” about a set of actions or appearances – representational configurations that prefigure a depicted event that can be drawn upon to read what is seen on screen or in media based photographic imagery (Feldman, 1997).

In A Way Out Youth, the authenticity of youth gang violence draws its visual and narrative truth values from 2 explicitly named commercial media sources, the Oscar winning 2002 Brazilian film City of God, directed by Fernando Meirelles’ and Kátia Lund, and Stress, French techno band Justice’s music video shot by videographer and film director Romain Gavras (fig. 21) which graphically depicted the terrorizing of Parisian public space by 5 racialised gang members (fig. 22, 23 &

fig. 22-24
Stills, video Justice – Stress.

fig. 20_
Still, Give A Way Out Youth.

fig. 21_
CD Cover Image from MIA “Born Free”, Directed by Gavras
Film director Mark Zibbert, recalling the aesthetic precedents referenced in the PSA, said this about Stress:

“This is really effective, this video, for Justice. It’s the music video for this French techno band. We referenced this because these kids are believable. And they still look young, but at fifteen, sixteen there’s a toughness about them... it uses that similar same stuff, handheld, dreary, there’s no positive message here, it’s just documenting these kids on a rampage. This is all real shit, you know like... But maybe you have to go dark and dreary with this [PSA’s targeting at risk youth]... to really make it effective and believable (M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011).

Kenneth Fothergill, also when speaking about the construction of the PSA, praised Zibbert’s ability to gather visual precedents that were “real”, “raw” and “arresting” (Fothergill, 2011) in their visual effect (Images 25-28):

“The City of God was the second reference that he [Mark Zibbert] came back with. It really presented not only a filmmaking look to it but also it’s an editing style that was really arresting and wanted to capture as much emotion as possible without dialogue. We are dealing with only 30 seconds, which is really a short period of time when it comes to telling a story. And we wholeheartedly agree that that was a great example of how to tell a very dramatic, stressful story and be very effective. We wanted to bring in a rawness, we wanted it to be real, we wanted something that had a documentary style feel to it” (K. Fothergill, personal communication, 2011).

The point here is not that the marketing and creative teams were off the mark in their presentation of an authentic gang reality, but that in the first segment of A Way Out Youth, an epistemology of realism is enmeshed in the readily circulating pleasures afforded by consumerist and media culture. Indeed, I would argue in this very convergence of the realist effects of social documentary together with the highly trafficked genres of gangster and urban action (especially as they manifest
in popular media – music videos, video games, movies) and their extra referencing to news coverage of gang violence, that the geo-political space of Toronto’s prioritized neighbourhoods is transformed, without having to explicitly visualize it as such, into a spectacle that performs to the expectations of the intended audience.

**Urban dread:** In accordance with the stylised, adrenalin pumped aesthetic of gangster-action thrillers and gangsta rap music videos, 
*A Way Out Youth* in the first sequence parades a series of visually compelling images that feed on an intended public’s conflicted desire to see both the exotic, the forbidden, the prohibited and to feel the fear associated with the anticipated witnessing of an endless stream of random, irrational violence preying on the social in unanticipated ways (fig. 29-32). Through the visual effect of eye-level shooting and hand-held camera, the viewer is at once seemingly present amidst an action unfolding in this penned in, maze like space of fences and brick wall. Flash cut shots recall simultaneously the frenetic and contiguous nature of “gang violence” as it does the nature of the movements of youth characters in both filmic precedents (and obviously similarly placed genre references). Moreover, through close-ups of bodies moving against surfaces, the audience is afforded an experiential and intimate glimpse into the effect of dangerous urban elements pressing in on subjective choice and positioning.

In another sense however, the viewer is also afforded a critical distance from the scene through the penetrating presence of the camera (fig. 33). As film theorist Ravi Vasudevan (2002) suggests, key to the “mise-en scene of urban terror” cultivated in this subgenre is the inability of the central characters to conceal their actions or their emotions (as the antithesis of reason) from an omnipresent gaze. Thus, the viewing subject is granted an insider’s glance beyond the exterior
of “cold ruthlessness” (p.64) into the paranoiac and violent psychical worlds of gang involved members (fig. 34 & 35). Cross-cutting of close-up reaction shots of facial expressions registering impatience, anger, hostility, with point of view shots (from the protagonist’s perspective) of bodies moving and interacting within the walled in, fenced in narrativised space of urban lawlessness, invites the public to witness the spatialised and moralised equivalence of an inner-psychical life, and a hint of the inner logics that dictate gang activities.

The omnipresent gaze also affords the reassuring sense of how vulnerable these spaces and bodies are to surveillance, a feeling that is supported elsewhere by the knowledge that since 2005, Toronto’s public housing communities have become intensified zones of police presence, flash interrogations, and highly technologised forms of tracking and surveillance. In other words, I would argue the spectacle of an anticipated violence and a glimpse into its generative abilities can be perversely enjoyed by a viewing public because the camera’s omnipresence reassuringly recalls a governmentality of state/privatised-securitised surveillance at work across the city’s social landscape. This knotting of the scopic with penalty plays out visually in the first sequence; the presumed gang involved youth are only visually represented between impenetrable surfaces – between two fences, between a fence and a brick wall - a filmic technique that projectively ties the youths’ current destructive behaviours to a non-redeemable present/future. This ideological imperative of retributive punishment - that the lawless are already condemned to incarceration – as a recycling of a stock convention of the gangster genre, offers a type of cathexis for a viewer that has indulged in a furtive guilty pleasure of being/seeing in the presence of “social disorder” (Hayward, 2006).

But as I suggested above, there is a visual restlessness, a pictorial rendering of an excess
of non-linearity and irrationality as depicted in the flash cutting of movement and expression that threatens to disrupt a simple (and assured) reading of youth space as containable through a governmentality of surveillance. Moreover, as I will elaborate below in the following section (the monstrous), the resolution that is introduced in the concluding sequence - the film’s projection of the protagonist into a bucolic social order emboldened by the “we” of an interpellated public - is haunted by a series of monstrous/horrific elements introduced in the first sequence that threaten to spillover beyond the confines of the enclosed space of the alleyway. In other words, what I will argue, is despite the optics of a securitized state, the audience is left with the uneasy feeling that “the spectre of...[gendered, youth] violence is always proximate” (to requote film theorist Lalitha Gopalan (2007), referencing another context).

Vital to consider here, is the highly racialised nature of this threat to an assumed we that the United Way posits in the tag appearing at the end of the PSA. Indeed, I would suggest the “public’s ability” to share an omnipresent view of contaminated/contaminating racialised geographies, and the ability to separate out the protagonist as redeemable subject from the gang members as morally failed and irredeemable subjectivities, rests on an entwining of the codes of racialised logic together with the political rationality of a punitive moralism. As criminologist Marianna Valverde (2007) argues, Toronto’s post-colonialist social order that presumed a stabilized racial geography has been confounded and disrupted by waves of immigration over the past few decades. Part of the effort to re-territorialise the civic order as lactified space (or more precisely, as a managed multicultural space – see chapter 2) apart from permitting and inducing displacement through market forces, is the renewed investment in surveillance technologies to police the spatial, temporal flows of certain
bodies across the city scape (Buffam, 2009; Valverde, 2007). Critical race theorist Theo Goldberg (2009) makes the rather astute claim that the use of surveillance technologies as a biopolitics of neo-liberal, racialised states, hinges on an ability to deploy a configuration of racialised semiotic codes to differentiate between “a criminogenic outsider” and “a law-abiding public”. Here the aesthetics of racialised criminality - stylized “gangsta movement”, aggressive posturing, the optics of a cluster of racialised youth just hanging out, baggy clothing with boxer shorts exposed in conjunction with dark(er) skin tones – permits for an easy reading of criminality at a topographical level, and specifically, of the impression of “black criminality” although never fully visualized or “technically accounted for” in subsequent close-ups (K. Jain, personal communication).

This mode of subjective identification eliding race with criminality further recalls a popularized criminology strategy commonly deployed in corporatised media to differentiate subjectivities along racialised/moral lines – the use of the “trope of the absent paternal figure” to explain black male criminality and black male youth’s propensity for violence (Buffam, 2009, p. 67). According to the psychoanalytic registers that this trope draws upon, without the intervening presence of the father as the central mediating force of the symbolic order, black male subjects (raised presumably in female exclusive households) fail to learn how to regulate “and properly perform desire”, a psychical fault-line short-circuiting their ability “to fulfill the prescriptive function of the law” (Buffam, 2009, p. 67). In a Way Out Youth, as in City of God, and Stress, there is a marked absence of paternal or state sanctioned authorative figures, an absence that gives rise to the wielding of guns rather than the exercise of self-discipline and responsivisation as the operative logic of sociability and economy amongst these youth. I would suggest the sequence’s imaging of an unabashed display
of raw, racialised, masculine yet youthful power re-territorialising the codes of civil society permits the activation of a racialised fantasy repressed in multicultural discourse (the libidinal and affective pleasure and anxiety associated with racialised presence), yet simultaneously allows the audience to bracket their own involvement in the dissemination of its racialised logics. (Bellin, 2005). As a complement to the spate of media attention that circulated post 2005 in response to shootings, A Way Out Youth similarly performs the social anxieties of a compliant, lactified public, and in its aesthetic projections, helps to crystallise that which must be morally disavowed. It is this inter-textual referencing of racialised logics linking previous media and commercialized discourses with an anticipated furthering of the discourse in the circulating life of the PSA - “a concatenation of texts through time” as Warner suggests - that constitutes the appellative energy necessary for publics to coalesce (Warner, 2002, p. 62).

To be precise, what I am suggesting is the aesthetic narrativising of the seductive yet ultimately pathological and profoundly uncivil nature of gang relationality suggests one essential pillar to the formation of a public – a public that coalesces around a moralized and emotionally charged politics couched in the language and sentiment of securitization and “management of security threats” (Gourevitch, 2010, p. 415). Moreover, I would argue that a complimentarity of political rationalities is at play in the opening sequence of the PSA, a dramatic unfolding forging a linkage between this inculcation of a racialised politics and morality grounded in an anxiety/fear/pleasure nexus, and a logic of neoliberal productivity revealing itself in the look and actions of the central protagonist. This epistemological unveiling will further shape the limits of the “way out” solution provided at the apex of the film. In other words, I would suggest the protagonist’s nascent
display of responsivisation in the face of threat/seduction, serves as a lynchpin of psychical and affective connection for the interpellated public. As Kenneth Fothergill explained when asked about the defining characteristics the creative team was looking for when casting the film’s central character:

“...why we selected that main kid, was cause he just nailed it. He had kind of a natural brooding nature to him, and on the day he was just perfect. The look on his face... he had that look that for someone his age he had an immense amount of weight on his shoulders and he could play that, he could play that really well and then when he smiles, he lights up. So he was able to do the transformation without the special effects, is what I’m saying” (K. Fothergill, personal communication, 2011).

Apart from the ability to clearly perform a marked set of emotions, the actor needed to possess a certain appearance of “innocence” that could be traded to elicit “sympathies” from the targeted audience (M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011) (fig. 36). As Zibbert clarifies,

“The acting has to be so subtle to be believable. So we were looking for a young guy with a baby face that could pull off tough without it being funny. You know. And that was a challenge. We looked at a lot of kids for that hero role and he had an edge, the guy we went with, he definitely had an edge about him but he still had that young baby face that you would still be sympathetic towards him but still believe that, you know, he is a tough kid” (M. Zibbert, personal communication, 2011).

It is precisely within this playing out of a tension between vulnerability and potentiality, innocence (of whiteness) and a worldly weariness emanating from exposure to the harshness and violating potentials of “inner city realities” (K. Fothergill, personal communication, 2011) that the viewing subject is sutured into the fabric of the film (fig. 37). The first sequence opens with a shallow focus of a chain-link fence, with one plane of the image sharply detailing the impenetrability of the fence’s tightly woven surface, the other plane imagining the fence’s gradual disappear-

10 According to film theorist Kaja Silverman, “suturing” is a classic cinematic device used to “sew” the spectator into the unfolding drama of the film, such that the filmic world, rather than the spectator’s own consciously understood social reality” becomes a space for psychical investment: “The classic cinematic organization depends upon the object’s willingness to become absent to itself by permitting the fictional character to “stand in” for, or by allowing a particular point of view to define what it sees. The operation of suture is successful at the moment that the viewing subject says, “Yes, that’s me”, or “that’s what I see” (Silverman, 1983, p. 205).
ance into a foreboding and endless horizon (fig. 38). It is the camera’s “uncanny eye of surveil-

lance” (Gopalan, p.40) tracing the endless contours of a chain link fence – an open image devoid of people - that alerts the viewing subject something, as yet, undetermined, will break into the film’s unfolding diegisis. Indeed, as film theorist Gopalan suggests via a re-reading of Gilles Deleuze’s discussions of cinematic time/space, there is a “repressed political dimension” that “returns within the aesthetic form of the open image”; it is this anticipatory, yet unremarkable presence that both opens up the possibility for the event of the monstrous to emerge and reels the viewing subject into its visual/auditory “economy of neurotic anticipation” (Gopalan, 2007, p. 63).

The momentary instance of the open image that trafficks a certain dread of the unknown is carried over into the next sequence of the film as the protagonist’s body moves into the frame. With his back initially turned to the camera, he restlessly re-shifts his position so his body is pressed against the row of fencing allowing the viewing subject an initial glimpse into the protagonist’s conflicted psyche - a representational foregrounding of a vulnerability of whiteness positioned at the threshold of a foreboding blackness engulfing the sight-line of the vanishing fence (fig. 39-40). As the camera directs our attention to his fearful, anticipatory stare, the viewing subject is invited to further witness the central character’s seeming impotence in the face of a gradually materializing shadowy set of legs, swathed in baggy clothing. That the threat is only partially seen compounds the subject’s/the public’s ability to properly contain the perceived threat through the act of identifying/naming its aggressor. This aestheticisation of a pathos of innocence and vulnerability, typical of a melodramatic genre (Hayward, 2006), functions to further suture an interpellated public in a cinematic moment playing between a potentially recuperable white innocence (as the marker of
nascent morality) and a seductive lawless subjectivity emerging from the darkened recesses of an alleyway.

The narrative that unfolds after these initial shots is filled with erratic and restless movement as the camera frantically follows the gang characters as they move within the space of the alleyway. The jerkiness of the camera’s minute tracing of an impending but never realized violence mirrors the protagonist’s anxious casting of his eyes towards offsite spaces of impending threat. Through this conjoinment of an intruding cinematic eye, with the vulnerable, restless eye of a youth being inducted into gang membership, the viewing subject is once again urged into the mise-en-scene of an unfolding urban “terror” (Gopalan, 2007, p. 36) projectively capturing the anxieties of a contemporary political moment in Toronto.

**Turning toward the light:** At the climax of *A Way Out Youth*, a gun shot is heard, a gun is brandished, and then via a point of view shot, we (the viewing subject and the vulnerable youth) follow the bodies of the gang members as they shift back into the darkened recesses of the alleyway, evidencing an ability of un-civil energies to slip away from the penetrating gaze of the camera. This disappearance to an off-screen place that nevertheless continues to haunt the filmic present, foreshadows the film’s projected future, a conceptualization of a social that grounds an imperative of competitive responsivisation within a neo-conservative moralism. Captured here in affective and viscerally comprehensible terms is an insight into the operative logic of a moral injunction that deems certain populations as both surplus and threat to the logic of self-governance and productivity; rendered as already failed subjects, the group of racialised youth are displaced by the camera to the abjected edges of a productive civility where a presumed carceral state awaits with
its own terms of retributive justice (Rudick, 2006). For these youth, unlike for the central character, there can be no “Way out”.

In the next sequence, the camera offers a close-up image of the central character’s expression of reflexive anguish; here again the viewing subject is afforded a privileged insight into a pivotal decision making moment when the protagonist turns away from a projected agonistic and criminogenic future, to a set of actions that will render him morally and socially redeemable. The marketing team wanted to show this key element of what they called “empowerment”. It is the youth, abandoned by all forms of civic protection and left to his own devices, who must demonstrate a shift towards responsivisation and self-governance by tearing away at his own skin, by peeling away the layer of lawlessness that entraps a kernel of moral goodness (I will return to an analysis of this monstrous element of peeled away skin in the next section). Indeed, like in the Vertical Poverty report, it is only after a display of nascent good citizenship the protagonist is avowed the possibility of crossing the threshold from an abyss of blackness/social disorder toward the light of civility and grace. In this moralizing fantasy, the impending threat that never materializes - that elides social disorder with blackness, racialised subjects, and deadened urban environments - is pacified by the insertion of the goodness of the United We. This is an imagined social that belongs properly to the space of dappled sunlight, resuscitated whiteness (associated with the protagonist’s freshly pressed white shorts, the bold white numbers on his royal blue soccer jersey, and his lit-up, re-claimed look of innocence), the bucolic lushness of green foliage swaying in the breeze, birds chirping (fig. 41-43).

Here in this public service announcement about “building community” is, I would argue,
Numerous writers (Coakley, 2006; Messner, 2007) have noted the cooptation of youth sport by different corporate interests, and the current investment in inculcating a spirit of competitiveness in the activity of play as an instructive precursor to the acting out of citizenship in hyper-competitive globalised markets. In addition, organized sport - as evidence of a seepage of neoliberalism into the intimate recesses of privatized life - now currently is made to carry the appearance of parental responsivisation; good parents are involved in crafting specific youth subjectivities, ones that are in line with productive sensibilities of the market. We may contrast these inscriptions of market sensibility within the play of sport, to the sensibilities at play in Hull House and other early settlement houses in their support of organized sport. For these early social reformers, sports offered instruction on the codes of rule-bound civility”, collegiality (i.e., “good sportsmanship”) and the regulation of passions. These were traits necessary for the cultivation of a citizen committed to a both the principles of the market and to a social collectivity.

In the final sequence of the film, a long shot traces the youth’s movements as he runs towards a grassy pitch populated by other similarly uniformed youth engaged in a game of soccer. High-rise buildings are visibly positioned as background to the playing field, an indexical reference once again to Toronto’s “Priority Neighbourhoods” and the target of United Way’s funding/policy strategies. This harnessing of a masculine energy towards the instructive competitive play of organized and orchestrated sport, signals a narrative closure to a psychologically unbearable fantasy that flirted dangerously with the image of a social over-run by an unabashed, un-orchestrated
homo-social masculinity. Moreover, at one crucial moment, as the youth is racing toward the pitch, the viewing audience, now positioned at a distance from the protagonist, witnesses him quite literally being enfolded in the embracing, inviting hand of the United Way logo, and then by the word “you” of the slogan “without you there could be no way out” (fig. 44). This imaging of what the We, as the interpellated you/donor can “contain”\(^\text{12}\), is, I would argue, a symbolization of a collapsing of the agendas of social care and social control which, in a previous welfare era, had been in tension in social work policy and practices (Park 2006) again, we can recall the Salvation army campaign in which care hinges on the visibility of social need rather than on the demonstration of productive responsivisation).

To summarise thus far, I have argued that the public service announcement signals an important political shift away from a welfare modality of governance avowing practices of a restorative justice (or at least the claim allowed for a contestation over its actually practiced forms of inclusions and exclusion) towards what Ranciere refers to as an “ethical” turn in the policing of subjectivities, aesthetics and spaces. Drawing from Ranciere’s (1999) rather astute reading of a contemporary “politics”, I suggest that there are three markers of this gravitational pull: First, this ascendancy of a specific orientation of “ethics” signals a desire to turn “humanity” towards a renewed image of social cohesion grounded in specified truisms: in a neo-liberal guise, the principles of vigilant self governance and responsivisation. Second, as we shall see in some detail in Chapter 5, the ethical turn suggests a definition of politics that is saturated with an instilled truth potential aligned with market logic. This is the ascendancy of a consensual, de-democratised politics, a politics that for Ranciere, is defined by a managerial policing of different socio-political interests

\(^\text{12}\) Here, I am using the word contain in its Kleinian psychoanalytic sense, a concept coined by Bion to describe the spatiality of a projected identification, a space that is able to realize and hold the unmanageable feelings of an anxious public so as to re-realise psychical investments of relationality (cf Hinshelwood, 1999).
fig. 44
Still, Give a Way Out Youth.
jockeying for the distribution of resources against a normativised backdrop of market attachments (Ranciere, 1999). What is disavowed in this politics, is the possibility for “dissensus”, a constant agitation within the social body by those radically abjected from its policed space.

Finally, in this PSA, we are witness to what Ranciere refers to as a “compensatory return of an absolute morality” (Ranciere, 2002, p. 6) in which the practices of “infinite justice” and punitive, non restorative management of specified subjectivities become the rule rather than the exception. Thus, instead of presenting a more politically inspired, critical examination of the historic, globalised, socio-economic contexts of gang involvement and the systemic and discursive forces that shape choices and render others impossible in racialised and economically disenfranchised neighbourhoods, A Way Out Youth presents the viewer with an aestheticisation of a polarised morality, a dramatic embattlement between light and darkness, evil and goodness that gets played out quite literally at the level of the skin. As I have attempted to argue above, with the recent spate of gun violence in Toronto, there was a circulating anxiety around the vulnerability of different apparatuses to regulate the flows of desires, interactions and communications between subjects across differently demarcated, specialised zones of the city. As social historian Steven Connor (2004) notes, this, really, is an anxiety around the policing of borders in late modernity and a question of the integrity and reliability of the “skin” as the signifier of an intended social body to regulate the contiguous intimacy between bodies. If, as was presented in A Way Out Youth (and certainly gets echoed in the phrase “homegrown terrorism”), the social dis-ease is, in its rationalist/moralist rendition, understood to manifest both from within and outside of the social body as a quasi-separate entity with its own ontological presence; importantly though, this “alien” presence is now thought to metastasise,

13_Corporeal schema, according to Freud, is a projection of the body’s limits onto the surface of the body, an image that becomes a definitive structuring of the self in relationship to an unfolding, experienced world (de Lauretis, 2002, p. 56).
Part of the practice of “self-dissection” could include the performative display of a metaphorical, post-flayed luminescence before the elected Christian community, a reflective display of God’s divining presence. Perhaps it is not a far stretch to link this exhibitionary practice rooted in a deep religiosity to that which occurs in the PSA, albeit as a secular, although equally moral version of that practice.

**The breach of the monstrous**: But what do we make of this decision on behalf of the various creative teams, and finally of The United Way itself, to cinematically represent “social disorder” as a monstrous effect that haunts the urban landscape, and even when stripped away in an act of responsivisation, lingers with its energies intact in the darkened recesses (if we follow the logic of the horror genre on which this dramaturgical/aesthetic element was based) only to reassume in
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14. Part of the practice of “self-dissection” could include the performative display of a metaphorical, post-flayed skin. Welcome Institute images.
another guise, in another materialization of social dysfunction (fig. 47-49)? The appearance of the monstrous can be read in a psychoanalytic register as “symptom” of that which has been repressed, but nevertheless returns, in a compulsively repetitive manner, as an unsettling remainder or excess of the proper (that is, what is understood to be “proper” to different subjectivities, places, social realities (Royle, 2003) – the distribution of the sensible, in Ranciere’s parlance). The symptom signals a cotermination of that which was/is intimately interior (an embodied secret, a repressed element essential to the formation of the social) and that which manifests as an uncomfortable, anxiety provoking exterior presence (Dolar, 1991, p. 7), a stain on the social that disrupts and exposes the comprehensible limits of the well trodden and ascribed to social divisionings

A Way out Youth, as a paradigmatic horror narrative, attempts to placate anxieties and thus enact cathexis for an interpellated public by both prescriptively filling in, in sociological terms, what we should be fearful of – racialised gang members - and by rendering the threat flaccid, as a stripped away presence and re-relegated to a darkened recess away from the bucolic play of light and whiteness. At one level, we can read this compulsive representational accounting of the monstrous that threatens to engulf the morality of whiteness, as a racialised fantasy that betrays the
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Of course, the monstrous, as exception (that breaches both the laws of nature, and what “civil” law can contain through its categorizations becomes, in modernity, an unreasonable problem and affront to the capacities of reasonable thinking (cf Foucault, 2005). Indeed, despite an arsenal of diagnostic instruments of modernity that are brought to bear on what is experienced affectively as the exception – risk assessment
legitimacy of Toronto’s claim to embodying a functioning liberal pluralism. Like other racialised fantasies that circulate through the popular imaginary via newspaper accounts, films, etc, this fantasy seeks to harness the flows of psychical and affective identifications presumed to suture a viewing subject and the protagonist towards shoring up the boundaries and attachments of an effected public. In this reading, the PSA configures a particular knotting of a neoliberal indifference to issues of democratic egalitarianism and social provisioning of care (Brown 2009) with a neo-conservative and xenophobic moralism that draws on the disciplinary power of the state (as supported by a righteous voting citizenry) to enforce boundaries between subjects, spaces and to defend a particular “imaginary of the West and its values” (Brown, 2006).

In other words, I would argue, that despite what else might be happening in terms of United Way’s funding support for politically progressive and possibly disruptive programming (see concluding comments in this chapter, and chapter 6 for an elucidation of this point and its relevance for social work practices), this visual campaign explicitly constructed for the purposes of demarcating the boundaries of youth policy directives and the limits of a “United We”, is seemingly oriented towards bolstering the foundations of a battered whiteness in response to a post-colonial racialised and ethnic pluralism and tightening support for neoliberal rationalities in the face of globalised economic restructuring. The socio-political effect of such a fantasy is (an unwitting) endorsement of policies and practices that would effectively cut even deeper divides between already disenfranchised communities, such that social programming is reserved for those demonstrating requisite levels of responsivisation to the exclusion of disengaged youth or youth already engaged in para-legal activities. This unfolding divisioning of spatial behaviours and classification of bod-
ies out of place/in place according to a normativised grid of how bodies should function within the flows of transnational/localized capital (Feldman, 2001) recalls Ranciere’s understanding of a sociological and cultural policing in process: a materialization of inequality, and ideological structuring of the distribution of the sensible interpelling subjectivities and spaces to “act” as if these divisionings of safety and risk were true.

And yet this representational accounting of an excessive, monstrous element and its disappearance into an imperceptible darkened place, unknown, off-screen, seemingly urges another reading - the lingering monstrous as an unwitting acknowledgement of the failure of the apparatus of state/social control (surveillance, risk assessment, intervention strategies) to wholly regulate and contain the racialised disorder’s political presence and to effect an absolute transition from a fear driven affective economy to a pastoralised rendering of a moralized, social collectivity - despite the appearances offered at the end of the PSA of a bucolic “enjoyment economy” featuring the pleasures of a functioning, normativised multiculturalism. In other words, the monstrous points to the limits of a social conscripted along the lines of a moralized responsivisation of the individual shored up by repressive modalities of a racialised securitisation. This is a rent that appears not only in the folds of modernity’s guiding liberal practices of multicultural inclusionism, but threatens to disrupt the image that Toronto [and defacto, the United Way of Toronto] has of itself and that it peddles in globalised market places – a city [and “city builder”] where tolerance, productivity and communitarian pleasure are possible.

Considerations for practice: As a funding body invested in generating sufficient capital to finance and nurture social programming throughout the city, The United Way of Toronto is com-
pelled, pragmatically, to abide by contemporary practices in marketing including the use of tropes carrying a certain neoliberal density. In one sense, as I argued in this chapter, and in the previous case, these practices as a wider epistemological assemblage, dictate certain frames of reference and hold marketing bodies (including philanthropic agencies) attuned to the assumed desires of an anticipated audience, and perhaps most importantly, complicit with, a circulating set of rationalities fusing the imperative of productive responsivisation with a moralism that hooks into geovernance discourses of risk and race. To be clear though, what I am not arguing is that individuals working within the United Way don’t have their own ideological and moral investments and their own affective and semiotic understandings of the work United Way produced images. Moreover, as I casually mentioned previously – and both of these points bear further, more empirically based investigation to substantiate their claims - the United Way of Toronto, at least at this particular historical juncture, appears to be funding some programming that, in its implementation (and I emphasise this point) is disruptive to, or at least in friction with the political rationalities deployed in and though its marketing materials. In other words, and as elaboration and illustration of this point, the case study examining youth/social policy that follows in Chapter 5 explores the messiness, contradictions and incongruence of policy imperatives as practiced by the targeted recipients (and indeed, social/youth workers) of such neoliberal urban policies. And yet, as a concluding point to this chapter, I offer the following cautionary note: despite this apparent slippage between assemblage imperative and practice on the ground, the very formulation of a public or the “United We” cultivated through this assemblage does, as I forwarded in chapter 03, impress upon the nature of a normativised social that the United Way is helping to forge given McIsaac’s explicit knotting of
philanthropic practices with “community building” (as both policy and programming practices explored in chapter 03). To this end, I suggest the need for further research, and critical reflection on the ongoing imprint that this configuration has on programming, and given the United Way’s stature in policy circles, on swaying present and future municipal social-spatial policy commitments.
This chapter examines the deployment and practices of community mural making as rationalized, aesthetic techniques for achieving two inter-related neo-liberal governance initiatives: the mending of a tear in the socio-economic fabric of the city, and the governing of disenfranchised/racialised youth in alignment with globalised creative city aspirations. If the previous two chapters focused on governance modalities as promulgated by selected social policy “experts”, then this chapter explores what happens when governance strategies, articulated at the crossroads of different geo-spatial scales and different political rationalities, “hit the ground” and are mediated by its locally designated practitioners. The case study that follows, based on ethnographic fieldwork conducted at a youth serving agency located in one of Toronto’s designated “Priority neighbourhoods”, examines a social policy initiative that sought to forge a link between graffiti abatement, neighbourhood beautification/gentrification through mural production, and “at risk” youth civic engagement and crime prevention. In the first part of the chapter, I locate a very local example of mural making at the crossroads of three overlapping policy directives: state withdrawal of poverty alleviation and social programming targeting economically disenfranchised communities; the rise of punitive securitisation as a mechanism for controlling the (racialised) poor; and the global positioning of Toronto as a creative, functioning multicultural city. Here, I offer an analysis of different institutionally placed stakeholders’ investments in realising the Graffiti Transformation Program as a form of knowledge grid aligning “normal” social behaviour, as framed within a liberal multicultural sensibility, with a market oriented and moralized understanding of how globalised urban centres and subjects should function. In the latter part of the chapter I draw from two events to highlight the various tactics that programme participants’ deployed to negotiate their compliance with these
stated program imperatives.

**Visual/Policy Fields**

**Context: Living Modern(ist) urban fantasies.** “Jane-Finch” is an often referenced, geospatial designation for an area located in the northwest region of the city of Toronto and whose heart lies at the intersection of two main arteries – Jane Street, and Finch Avenue. The entire geographical space is approximately 12sq kilometers and is bounded by Highway 400 to the west of Jane Street and Black Creek Boulevard to the east, and on the north-south axis, Shepparrd Avenue/Highway 401 to the south and Steeles Avenue to the north (the dividing line between Toronto and York region) (Boudreau et. al., 2009). As a municipal presence, Jane-Finch is officially encapsulated under the post-amalgamation North York community of Ward 8 York West (although depending on a social agency’s reach, small sections of Wards 7 and 9 may be included as well), and is comprised of two principal neighbourhoods – Black Creek and Glenfield-Jane Heights (City of Toronto, 2012) (fig. 1). Approximately 100,000 people live in the neighbourhood in a combination of publicly run and privately owned high-rise, and a few low-rise housing complexes, and private residences. And yet, despite it being a friendly, engaging neighbourhood according to a number of youth residents hanging out at the Spot (personal communication, 2011) (fig. 2), it bears the stain of a social imaginary that exceeds its rather non-descript suburban appearance and feeling (Boudreau et. al. 2009); the area is representationally known by popular media and many of those living outside of its geographical reaches as a place of “violence, poverty, and foreboding suburban design” (Cash, 2006, cited in Boudreau et. al., 2009, p. 122).

As a built environment within Toronto’s planned social landscape, Jane-Finch is unique;
its particular socio-geographic configuration, according to Boudreau, Keil and Young (2006), is a blending of a Fordist social welfare visioning of modern urbanism to together with three ideas of modernization. The first of these ideas was support for the construction of public housing that came about through amendments to the National Housing Act (NHA) in 1964. By 1975, the Ontario Housing Corporation, making use of both federal and provincially available funds, and tapping into a North York City council’s desire to attract industrial and housing development, had constructed a network of public housing accounting for 22.5% of all dwellings in what now is configured as Ward 8 in the amalgamated city. The second idea, aligning with a Metro Toronto planners’ design map for the district gave support to the concept of a mixed planned housing environment featuring high-rise buildings (the plan was for 50% of dwellings to be accommodated within high-rise buildings) and townhouses, and mixes of public, multi-unit rental housing and private housing. Pedestrian and vehicular routes in this plan were completely separated from one another. The third “modern idea” followed from the deregulation of immigration policy; Jane Finch became a zone of affordable housing for newly arriving immigrants, many of whom were racialized and from non-European countries (Boudreau et. al., 2009; Rigakos, Kwashie, & Bosanic, 2004).

From its inception, Jane-Finch was marked as a failed social experiment that deviated too far from Toronto’s normative axis of Anglo-Celtic cultural sensibility, ideal of home ownership, and distrust of excessive social welfare support (Boudreau et. al., 2009). Bearing the mark of difference in both its physical appearance, and in terms of the appearance of its inhabitants in relationship to other neighbourhoods/neighbours in the city, the “Jane-Finch corridor” as it became quickly known in the popular press (fig. 3), was branded as a zone of danger and excess - too much pov-

Modern urbanism, prevalent in Toronto as an urban planning model from the 1950’s through until the 1970’s, was based on a functionalist approach to conceptualizing and planning social reproduction in alignment with design principles attentive to Fordist logic – “decomposition” (the parsing out of tasks into their most basic of components, “differentiation” (involving zoning and articulation of space into distinctive work/production, dwelling, recreational and circulation zones – each having their own functional requirement), “repetition” (the homogeneity of each differentiated zone, together with the homogeneity of household consumer goods), and “integration” (transport, production and communication systems connecting different zones). The deployment of these optimally efficient standards for urban living and capitalist production were facilitated through the mechanisms and institutional networks of the welfare state, and included a focus on the spatial layout of housing within a planned environment, the production of mass produced consumer goods that could facilitate the efficiency of household production/reproduction, and the development of arterial corridors linking differentiated zones (Schumacher & Rogner, 2001).

For a more detailed and nuanced historical accounting of the planning of...
property, crime, ugliness, too much social housing, and too much un-integrated, concentrated racial difference (Rigakos, Kwashie, & Bosanic, 2004).

Contemporary sociological and journalistic practice documenting the area’s “excesses and barriers” are now in abundant circulation and offer a more critical reading of systemic, urban planning and social fault-lines that have contributed to these characteristics and experiences than that offered up in popular media accountings. Influential reports include the United Way of Toronto’s *Poverty by Postal Code* (UWT, 2004), and *If Low Income Women of Colour Counted in Toronto* (Punam, 2003). Demographic features highlighted in these reports include high concentration of poverty (approximately 40%), and a predominance of racialised inhabitants (between 75% and 65%) as opposed to 43% for Toronto in general. Many of the inhabitants of the area are born outside of Canada (65%) and approximately 13% have recently arrived. According to this literature, the district also includes high numbers of single-parent households (mostly women - estimated at close to 40%) a household structure that is correlated with poverty. Other demographic and socio-material characteristics noted include lower post-secondary educational levels, a concentration of individuals with precarious citizenship, highly educated immigrants whose experiences have been discounted through racialised labour practices, lack of public transportation, deteriorating and poorly maintained housing stock, and police profiling and police concentration (in terms of surveillance and securitisation measures). What is clear, is that over the last decade specifically (and albeit casually, since its inception), Jane-Finch, as a home to a portion of the city’s population, has been problematised as a geo-spatial subject worthy of analytical and evaluative attention, and one in need of targeted intervention by a host of experts across an array of disciplinary fields - from social

---

**fig. 03**
Edystone Community (Jane-Finch.com archive)2011.

This connection is indicative of not only the lack of other contributing incomes to the household economy, but as was discussed in chapter 2, that racialised women earn less in the labour market than non-racialised women and men, and many occupy low-waged, precarious employment regardless of their skill-set and educational experiences. Other single income earners living in the area are reliant on some form of inadequately funded social assistance to sustain their households.
work scholars, to sociologists, criminologists, urban planners, and social geographers.

**Mobilizations:** Largely because of the catalytic efforts of neighbourhood political mobilization starting in 1989 and gaining momentum throughout the 1990’s, Toronto city Council had, by 1999, became directly involved in envisioning the rebuilding of Jane-Finch. As was touched upon in Chapter 3, in 2003, “The Strong Neighbourhood Task Force”, comprised of community groups, business, labour, state representatives (municipal and provincial), the UWT, and business, forged a strategy that was designed to address the identified two trends of “growing neighbourhood poverty and inadequate community infrastructure” (United Way of Toronto, 2004, p. 3). Nine neighbourhoods were targeted for “immediate investment” including the neighbourhoods located in Ward 8 (this number was subsequently expanded to thirteen amidst some political controversy (Boudreau et. al., 2009; Bradford 2006). According to the Task Force, poverty and social exclusion (and the resulting detrimental effects on “health, well being, and prosperity” of “the entire city”) rather than being charted systemically/or supra-locally as a fall-out of the twining of shifts in neoliberal, globalised capital and the operationalisation of renewed workings of racialised rationalities (Boudreau et al., 2009; Brennan, 2004; Walcott et al, 2011) were comprehended in spatialised terms, and for managerial convenience, bundled into localized “priority neighbourhoods” or “administrative fictions” as one Jane and Finch community activist quipped (S. Gopal, personal communication, 2011) (Boudreau et al., 2009; United Way, 2004). Moreover, as Boudreau et al. (2009) make clear, the use of the word “investment” clearly demarcates the “entrepreneurial” focus of contemporary Toronto urban governance with its emphasis on community empowerment, engagement, responsivisation, and productivity. Stripped away in the vision is an understanding of the “social entitlement” or
In this current neo-liberal/risk environment, youth are marked by ambivalence: On the one hand, youth are now viewed as a valuable resource both in terms of their future market value/potential, and in terms of their current and projected voracious consumption patterns and insatiable appetites for the new (Fleetwood, 2005; Sharland, 2006). Conversely (and perhaps, in relation to their value as contributors to the reproduction of consumerist culture), youth, as an identity and as a set of conducts and behaviours, have become re-problematised as risky business, and importantly as Sharland (2006) notes, have become central to the operationalisation of risk regulation and mediation. According to this discursive framing, youth are deemed “endangered and dangerous”; in other words at risk not only to themselves, but also to the coherency and safety of the wider communal, consumptive and productive body (Kelly, 2006; Sharland, 2006; Skott-Myhre, 2008; Swadener & Lubeck, 1995). The result in both instances, has been a “hypervisibility” of youth in different forms of media, and an emerging “imperative to protect, monitor and sustain young people in the transition to moral, productive, and “responsible adulthood” (Fleetwood, 2005; Sharland, 2006, p. 248).

A focus on youth: As was explored in Chapters 3 and 4, the spate of gun related violence in 2005, as a symbolic/material site in which to channel racialised fears and anxieties, acted as a catalyst for prompting renewed multi-state attention (Boudreau et al. 2009) towards programming and social-educational-health related supports for youth deemed “at risk” for involvement with the criminal justice system, and for other anti-social behaviours (including teen pregnancy, violence, drug use, unemployment, reliance on social assistance, etc) (Walcott, Foster, Campbell, Sealey, 2010). The Spot – “Where YOU(th) Wanna Be”, was born in 2006 out of this spirited conjunction between policy strategies directed towards neighbourhood revitalisation and investment, and those emphasizing involvement/engagement of disenfranchised youth living in the multiple neighbourhoods of Jane and Finch (together with other priority neighbourhoods) (www.janefinch-centre.org) (fig. 4). The youth led, youth dedicated space operates in the Yorkgate Mall (one of the two malls located at the intersection of Jane-Finch) as a satellite of the Jane Finch community and Family Services, a well-established social fixture in the neighbourhood since 1976 (fig.5). Although the Spot offers a series of onsite structured programming including the A G Thing (a young women’s group,) Brothers We’ll Become (a young men’s empowerment programme) and a newcomer’s...
youth settlement programme, together with educational/recreational supports within the local intermediate and high schools (www.janefinchcentre.org/), much of what is offered in terms of services occurs informally or through “outreach” via peer mentors or youth workers in area malls and at local schools (Jasmeet K., the Spot youth worker, personal communication, 2011). The drop-in component allows informal access to the Spot’s common space during operation hours. What this relatively unstructured space provides is an opportunity for youth to socialize with one another as long as they abide by youth generated codes of behaviour—“how we wanna be with one another”. Youth can also make use of computers, receive informal counseling or guidance support through impromptu interactions with peer, volunteer or staff mentors, and participate in a network of care that is provided by the youth staff (eg., the ability to partake of an afternoon meal, receive psycho-social support). In one sense, the drop-in together with other programming offered through the Spot, can be read as techniques of neo-liberal governance adhering to the dictates of what has become known since its early 1990’s inception in youth policy circles as “positive youth development” (Crousee, Roets, De Bie, 2009). The basic tenets of this outcomes based programming – an emphasis on employment readiness, academic achievement, acquisition of cultural and social capital to become responsive ready social participants, local community engagement, fostering of “pro-social” behaviours and skills, nurturing of a sense of belonging, cultivation of self care, and “discovery of the self (strengths, interests and identities)” (Crouse et al., 2009, p. 423) - are casually emphasized and soft sold by youth staff and peer mentors whose own experiences of career/academic success serve as important referents in conversation and informal mentorship interactions (Zenab. M, youth worker, The Spot, personal communication, 2011). Conversely, the very acces-
sibility of the Spot as a place for “positive” youth engagement aligns casually with wider policing-civic-state initiatives in selected Toronto neighbourhoods (Buffam, 2009) to curtail youth (and other intransigent subjects’) movement, activity and visible presence in public spaces through surveillance and other securitization techniques provisioned by state and privately financed policing. Interpreted differently, however, the provisioning of youth space that provides an opportunity for racialised youth to just hang out without the fear or annoyance of being interrogated by security/police forces (Noel G., personal communication, 2011) must be seen as a mediating counterweight to the materialized effects of racialised discourses of fear that are now operative in their neighbourhood. Moreover, as I will argue below through a more detailed accounting of the workings of the Graffiti Transformation Project, the Spot’s informal and formal programming are not singly productive of the rationalities of neoliberal governance. Rather, their ongoing use of a politics of multiculturalism to navigate the space of citizenship and belonging, effects on occasion, a quasi deterriorialisation of the limits of articulated normalcy, or in Ranciere’s words, a momentary disruption to the distribution of the sensible where these limits are put into question.

The Graffiti Transformation Project: Community mural making as an instrumental mode of healing socio-economic divides.

Toronto’s Graffiti Transformation Project (GTP) was a social-urban planning policy initiative that was cross-coordinated through two municipal departments – Transportation Services and Community Development and Recreation – and was supported in part by the “City of Toronto Clean and Beautiful Programme (see chapter 2 for details of this initiative’s consolidated “global cities” aspirations). The GTP, just ending this previous year after 16 years of operation (1996-2011),
offered funding to community organizations to hire “marginalized youth” to create murals in “graffiti prone areas” (City of Toronto, 2010, p. 2). The expressed intention of the programme, as documented in its literature was to provide skills-based, employment ready training to “at risk” youth, render “unsafe” neighbourhood more publicly accessible, and to engender wider “Toronto civic pride”. As the City of Toronto’s last annual report on the programme proclaimed, since the programme’s inception, the GTP was responsible for removing “25,000 individual tags” and “cleaning 350 sites of the illegal presence of graffiti”. 720 murals were created in their place, and approximately 2,128 youth had received some form of financial remuneration together with skills acquisition (see below) (City of Toronto, 2011).

I would suggest that this turn in the mid 1990’s towards deploying “culture” as an “expedient” (Yudice, 2003) policy modality for mediating and bridging economic and social concerns, can be understood, at least partially, as symptomatic of the significant transformations in municipal socio-economic governance strategies that were occurring during that period. As we recall from Chapter 2, the first wave of federally induced “neoliberal” austerity and monetary policies and state restructuring practices - as both “roll back” social provisioning and aggressive strategic interventions - were beginning to be felt at a local scale. The “Common Sense Revolution”, as a neo-liberal set of techniques peppered liberally with neo-conservative gestures towards the moralisation and punitive regulation of the province’s (racialised) poor, was just gaining momentum in the Province of Ontario with unprecedented cuts to social and arts programming. Amalgamation of the City of Toronto with its 4 adjoining suburbs was in the final planning stages, a move that would download responsibilities for social service costs onto the city. Nascent plans were also un-

06_ Here, I draw upon two rather provocative claims forwarded by George Yudice (2003) in his book, the Expediency of Culture. As explanation for his central thesis that “conventional notions of culture have been largely emptied out” (p.9) in the forging of its use as a socio-political and economic resource, Yudice suggests the following two intertwined historical occurrences: First, in the wake of the dismantling of cold war era politics, the capitalist state (in his text, the reference point is the United States) relinquished its management and cultivation of arts production as an expression of “artistic freedom”. And here artistic freedom functioned as a signifier of the “West’s freedom through capitalist liberalism. This emptying of the state’s role in supporting a certain idealized, and thus “transcendent understanding” of culture, made space for a more market oriented, or instrumentalist approach to arts funding and support for different artistic expressions. Second, Yudice argues that globalised capital, as a system that affects an accelerated flow of finances, ideas, aesthetic practices/ideals, information, goods, services and bodies across (and within) nationalist borders, further complicated or troubled the use of culture for restrictive state controlled nationalist purposes. Instead, nationalist/expressions of difference (either local or on a national scale) have been rendered marketable and subsequently trafficked as a commoditised resource in circuits of tourism,
as patented cultural commodities, and at times as sites for military or charitable investment. Yudice further argues that the expedited flows of culture, as resource, across borders incites the formation of knowledge systems that render certain symbolic/material forms, practices and zones intelligible and thus normative (and concomitantly, certain expressions or zones as unintelligible, and thus deviant). The ability to truck in this system necessitates that “performativity” (i.e., how well one performs the normative) becomes the lynch pin of social and economic functioning and social capital acquisition. Mutation is rendered possible because of slips or disruptions in performance, and yet, as Chapple, Karen, & Jackson (2010) concur, late capitalism has a voracious appetite for the new, the mutant, and for the cultural spin-offs of social disorder (Yudice, 2003; cf. Boltanski & Chiapello (2005).

According to social geographer, Sue Rudick (2006), under a current regime of penality and securitisation, the discourse of criminality has undergone a significant mutation. In what she refers to as the “new normal” (p. 56), assessed past risk inducing behaviours (that are in and of themselves not illegal) are conflated “in a near collapse” with predicted futures such that a reconstruction of a subject “who already resembles his crime before he has committed it” is made possible (Foucault, quoted

underway at a municipal and regional scale to facilitate Toronto’s competitive and “creative” advantage on the globalised financial stage (Boudreau et. al. 2009; Kipfer, 1998; Kipfer & Klein, 2002). As much an economic necessity as perhaps a gesture of Bay street’s civic hubris, this marketing of an aesthetics of “ethnic” /globalised diversity and livable/urbane cosmopolitanism as a lure for globalised capital investment, required a shifting of policies and practices geared towards sanitising and controlling Toronto’s geo-social landscape (Desfor et. al. 2006). Other contextual factors for situating the GTP are identified as the following: Toronto Business Improvement Associations (BIAs) together with newly emerging home-owner/neighbourhood associations were beginning to wield significant political influence at a municipal scale (Stren et. al., 2011). Moreover, community policing, which meant the bolstering of surveillance strategies and a stronger police presence (physically and optically) in selected racialised and economically disenfranchised neighbourhoods had gained significant traction as a preferred means of security management in Toronto (Ericson, 1994; Jackson, 1994). This shift towards enhanced securitization not only involved the forging of ties between police and local BIA’s and home-owner associations, but was supported ideologically and eventually, legislatively, in 1999 with Ontario Premier Harris’s introduction of punitive, fear induced “war on crime” strategies targeting young offenders, welfare “abusers” and those “at risk” of offending (Case & Tester, 2000)\(^7\). This more retributive, morally sanctioned outreach of the state, endorsed by a mostly non-urban based voting public, was in tension with the largely “left leaning” sentiments of Toronto’s pre-amalgamation Mayor, Barbara Hall, who was supportive of more welfare oriented social intervention strategies targeting disenfranchised youth (Boudreau, 1999).

The 1990’s were also a period that saw resurgence in graffiti and tagging production in
selected gentrifying neighbourhoods (and to much lesser extent, in the inner-suburbs of East York, Etobicoke and Scarborough), and an increase in the complexity and scale of some of the graffiti “pieces” (Senseslost, 2009). Influenced by hip-hop culture (“writing” was perceived as the “fourth element of hip-hop culture”) and deriving originally from New York’s ghettoized neighbourhoods (Style Wars, 1983), graffiti had, by the mid 1990’s, become a globalised, youth based creative/political practice popularised and commoditised through hip hop music videos and other related commercial products like album covers, video games, magazines, and Hollywood films. Graffiti or “street art” as an emergent nomenclature, had also firmly established itself in the commercial art world as a “legitimate” and thus marketable art form. Indeed, as Farkas suggests (2011), numerous crews operating across the city in the early 1990’s were comprised of writers/artists trained at the Ontario College of Art and Design and at other arts colleges. Graffiti’s heightened visible presence in Toronto’s urban streetscape was also accompanied by a mounting public debate about its aesthetic and legal qualities and indeed its legitimacy to claim a right of place in a city becoming aware of its financial needs and aspirations (Bowen, 1999; Farkas, 2011). Playing out in Toronto’s media, discourse about graffiti bore the weight of its by then politicized and commercialised association with racialised inner city life, and trafficked heavily in the American state-business led doxa of linking the public writing practice with poverty and (racialised) criminality (Bowen, 1999; Dickinson, 2008; Farkas, 2011). According to this grid of intelligibility, graffiti needed to be read symptomatically- attesting to the presence of gang activity, indexically - as a visual marking of the neighbourhood’s lawlessness, violence and lack of safety, as an affront to or violation of private ownership, and as an actuarial accounting or diagnostic of risk - where the petty crime of...
A by now rich lexicon exists within globalised/localized graffiti communities detailing the aesthetics and practices of its writers. The following common words are used throughout this chapter: **Writer** - a practitioner of graffiti; **Writing** – the practice of the art form; **Piece** (as a short form of “masterpiece”) - an elaborate, graffiti painting usually employing more than 3 colours; **Graf** - short form for graffiti; **Tag** – the most basic form of graffiti representing the writer’s personal logo or stylized signature. Outside of graffiti culture, a tag can also refer to a gang’s signature; **Crew** – a loosely organized group of writers always acknowledged in “throw-ups”, i.e., pieces or tags.

By the early 1980’s, however, the practice of graffiti was being gradually re-written by middle-class white youth writers because of its associated hipness and because of the spirit of rebellion that it was understood to signal (StyleWars, 1983).

Vandalism was perceived to be a gateway to more serious acts of criminality (Buffam, 2009; Dickinson, 2008; Schacter, 2008). For others weighing in on the debate, certain identified graffiti forms (although not all – namely tags) were praised for their aesthetic qualities and for their contribution to the creative edginess of the city (Bowen, 1999; Farkas, 2011).

As Dickinson (2008) persuasively argues for the New York context (and I would, argue similarly for Toronto), for graffiti - and as an individuation of the problem, graffiti writers - to be seen as a social, and thus debatable problem would not have been possible if the sensibility of urban neoliberal restructuring and an orientation towards a globalised understanding of metropolitan aesthetic had not become at least familiar and thus sensible, if not “commonsensical or inevitable” (p. 34), to those influencing urban policy direction. Similarly, the conceptualization of a programme like Graffiti Transformation as a policing (Ranciere, 1999) response to a perceived disruption to an aspiring social/aesthetic was forged at this juncture of policies nascently geared towards global competitiveness and a criminalization of those who stood in the way of its realization. The programme’s design, together with the criminal justice apparatus that supported its thrust towards graffiti abatement, was grounded in precedents already firmly established by the mural/Anti-graffiti Network programme in Philadelphia, and similar graffiti abatement/community based strategies in New York and Chicago.

Based on the working assumption that “the issue of unwanted graffiti negatively impacts neighbourhoods across the city” (City of Toronto, 2010, p. 3), the programme adopted by Toronto council was designed to put up community murals in place of illegal tags. (p. 3). Every January, with a relatively small budget of approximately $350,000, the Social Development office would
solicit proposals from a range of community arts organization and non-profit health and social service agencies servicing “marginalized youth facing multiple barriers to employment” (City of Toronto, 2009) to run summer graffiti eradication and mural creation programmes (fig. 6, fig. 7, fig. 8, 9). Proposals were assessed on the applicant’s experience working with “marginalized” youth and their proven track record in working with neighbourhood beautification/enhancement initiatives. The anticipated “impact of the project across the city” (2010, p. 4) also weighed in the decision for funding. In theory, successfully funded projects (approximately 20 per year) needed to accomplish the following goals: (i) employment of neighbourhood youth - through wage or honorarium; (ii) education for youth participants about the impact that graffiti and tagging were having on different neighbourhood’s built form (i.e, its illegality, its aesthetic blight); (iii) targeted graffiti and tag removal; (iv) skills training - “customer service”, “technical aspects of graffiti removal and outdoor art installation”, life skills, cultivation of “strong work habits”, pro-social skills; (v) establishing partnerships with local police precincts, business associations, neighbourhood associations and local business owners to secure space for community murals; (vi) negotiation with community
members about the content of the murals; (vii) and the employment of a community artist to work with the youth team (O. Segin, Social Development project coordinator, personal communication, 2011; City of Toronto, 2010). Apart from the three priority objectives of “remediation of graffiti”, neighbourhood enhancement and increased safety, and “youth employability”, youth civic engagement in their local community and youth recognition were also pointed to as resulting, favourable outcomes of the programme (fig. 10). As the 2010 summary report states:

Youth participants also receive attention and recognition for their community contribution through a variety of expressions of community interest: donations and sales, kind words from neighbours, public applause, and peer recognition. For many youth, participation offers not only skills and artistic opportunities but the experience of being drawn into the fabric of the community in a way they may not have previously known.

Certainly, making use of the arts to further the work of the social is not new to civic, social work practices (see Chapter 1 for details). Indeed, early settlement workers were one of the first to make prolific use of the arts in their programming with new immigrants and working class/working poor citizens (Addams, 2007). As further illustration, for a brief period during the 1930’s depression and as part of the New Deal initiative, the American state commissioned community/public building murals as both a make work project for unemployed artists and to stimulate civic, nationalist discussion (Kennedy & Larkin, 2009). And yet, as Yudice (2003) argues, the thrust for this level of social/political engagement of culture was tied to a previous liberal welfare rationality in which different aesthetic registers were drawn upon in an attempt to instruct the proper comportment of a nationalist, liberal citizenry and to outline the contours of a nationalist landscape (whether in it assimilationist or multicultural guise). In keeping with a turn towards a globalised
market rationalisation of the processes of social life, including the formation of subjective identity and practices of “productive” citizenship (Bradstadter, Wade and Woodward, 2011; Yudice, 2003). “culture” has adopted a new guise – “as resource” for political and economic amelioration (Yudice, 2003, p. 11) (fig. 11).

The GTP, I would suggest, can be understood as precisely this type of managerialist approach to governance, a technique which attempts to knot state-business-voluntary sector financing of cultural production within a localized social setting to a procured and secured socio-economic future. Following Yudice’s line of argument, the programme makes strategic use of the aesthetic - as therapeutic investment – because of its assumed ability to repair tears in the social fabric (the healing of social/moral disorder and multi-cultural dysfunction) and to stimulate economic, globalised prosperity (Yudice, 2003). More precisely, I would suggest that the Graffiti Transformation Project, as it was officially orchestrated and managed, sought to deploy the aesthetic in three “expedient” ways: as visualised actuary; as index of social cohesion and as performance of global hip; and finally, as technique of regulation/caring.

In one instrumentalist register, Graffiti abatement through mural production can be read as the City of Toronto’s attempt to visually coordinate and “institutionalise” risk perception and remediation (Feldman, 2005, p. 206). Drawing from Allen Feldman’s reading of the spectacle of American securitization and the use of normativised, perceptual grids to appease (and fuel) threat of the terrorist other, we can think of the programme’s ability to govern risk aesthetically according to the following modalities: First, the diagnosing of “safety” and “social disorder”, as index of actualised criminality and actuarising risk to assess actions of future criminality, was managed

**fig. 11**  
GTP sponsored mural. Grandravine
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For Yudice (2003), the initial claims of “cultural citizenship” as political praxis - as the “recognition of cultural identities”, and the “democratic proclamation of civic inclusion (including access to its resources, rights and responsibilities) that grew out of civil rights struggles (and to this, Brandstater, Wade and Woodward (2011) correctly add decolonisation efforts, indigenous movements and new social movements) reoriented the nature of political citizenship (as a generic subjectivity) and paved a complementary path for culture to be seen as a proper site for investment. The problem, as both Brandstater et. al.(2011) and Yudice (2003) make clear, is that claims on cultural recognition, and the political mobilization of difference have become “over-determined by the encroachment of globalised capital” into what had, in a previous era, been “uncolonised recesses of civic/personal life”. Rather than understanding the expedient
visually by tracking graffiti’s disruptive presence on the visual landscape through anti-graffiti by-law enforcement. According to Rafael Schacter’s ethnographic examination of the governance economy of street art in London, graffiti’s presence in public/privatized space was read by both detractors and practitioners/enthusiasts alike not only for its aesthetic qualities and for its semiotic content, but as a marker of its “corporeal illicitness” - a materiality that performs its defiant and audacious disregard for techniques of spatial governance as regulated through the flows of capital and sanctioned by the state’s security apparatus (Harvey, 2006). As she clarifies, it is the very medium (a wall, a sign, a bridge) as signifier of the limits of a designated normalcy and legality of usage of space (and in Ranciere’s terms, physical/spatial zones in alignment with a given distribution of the sensible) that is being overwitten by graffiti’s performance of its own impossible subjectivity (Schacter, 2005). Graffiti, understood here as a transient “subjectivity”, incises its illicit, material presence into a dialogue about space from which it has been discounted (fig. 12). We need only recall Toronto Mayor Rob Ford’s most recent 2012 vociferous attacks on graffiti as “violent” contaminant and contagious “blight” to city property (fig. 13), and Toronto city documents (2010, 2011) attesting to writing as “vandalism” to support Schacter’s claim (via, art theorist Belting, 2005) that it is the medium, its “corporeality”, as fused with the design, that demands attention (fig.14).

Second, one can think of the coordinated spectacle of a crew of “marginalised youth - as marked bodies of risk - performing the subjectivity of compliant, productive citizen through their public display of sanctioned “buffing”\textsuperscript{11}. This public orchestration can be read as a type of visualised realisation of the state’s ability to control “criminality” and criminalized bodies, or conversely to “build up” nascent responsivisation. Relatedly, we can also think of the sanctioned “putting up” of state/
private sponsored murals as an exhibitionary flaunting of state vigilance in regulating insecurity and re-territorialising dangerous public space as a zone of propriety and legality (Wacquant, 2009). In other words, the mural’s utility, as an aesthetic technique of governance, lies in its assumed ability to agentically radiate its licitness (fig. 16); as visual material presence, murals are suggestive of a corporeality in place, of a subjectivity that abides by litigious and securitised codes of behaviour, movement and flows of bodies across the cityscape.

Mural production was also deployed because it could traffic as an index or visual trace of local social cohesion across economic and “ethnic” divides, of a community “healing itself”, and of a functioning multiculturalism (fig. 16). According to the Social Development Committee officer responsible for the coordination of the GTP, the programme was designed to afford youth, working in conjunction with community artists, the skills necessary “to sell their ideas about what is important to them and to learn how to present them”, graphically, through dialogue with “invested partners” (O. Segin, personal communication, 2011). In conjunction with this effort to provide a space for youth to “express their creativity, vulnerability, needs, and spirit” (S. O’Brien, Police officer, personal communication, 2011), at the heart of the project was an expectation that marginalized youth would learn the skills of negotiating different understandings of “community” by working collaboratively with local business, city councilors, police, apartment landowners, and importantly other local community members. Cultural engagement, as a commoditised/state sanctioned exercise, was thus understood to create, as one city bureaucrat suggested, “an opportunity for citizens, who might never do so [i.e., youth and neighbourhood residents] to participate in civic dialogue and to contribute to an atmosphere of understanding and respect” extending beyond the boundar-
ies of their own neighbourhood (O. Segin, SD officer, personal communication, 2011). Murals were also thought of as an indexical trace of “the spirit of collaboration” at work - as negotiation of differences - and as a representational accounting of how a “healthy functioning diversity of different groups and cultural expressions” operated in their neighbourhood (Jannice B., project coordinator community health centre, personal communication, 2011). Finally, mural creation and display was believed to reference and inspire the “strength” of a community to address, and heal from, its own social dysfunction (Jannice B., personal communication, 2011).

I would suggest the GTP’s dual practice of buffing and creating murals in “visible public spaces” previously stained by “disordered social behaviour” (United Way, 2011), adhered, following Ranciere’s schema (chapter 1), to the logic of an aesthetic-mimetic tradition in which the social efficacy or verisimilitude of the murals were thought to lie in their communicative moment. The wall murals, in their public expression and in their ability to “dramatize” truths of resilience or functioning multiculturalism, or to courageously address unspeakable truths (like “gang related” or “domestic violence” (Jannice B., personal communication, 2011)), was understood by some of its official administrators to cathect the needs of the audience/subject and shape its transference to productive, individually or communally manifested, transformative ends. As Ranciere (2009) so astutely notes, however, no modification (or redistribution) to the sensible actually transpires in this operative transaction given that anyone who recognizes the medium’s message(s) already buys-in to its identifications and prescriptions; recognition, in this sense, is the effect of a reinscription of “policed borders”, “a functionalist affirmation of the status quo of objective givens” (Ranciere, 2007a, p.5) which discounts the role that the “discounted” (or unaccounted for) can play in
the reformulation of community. To be specific, I would argue that murals are here functioning in accordance with the logic of the representative regime, pace Ranciere; part of the transaction of recognition of the “worth” of murals, as an instance of the operation of border policing within this register, is a re-articulation of a hierachicalised distinction between murals and graffiti, a genre effect which is then generative of other hierachicalised orderings of subjects and actions.

Read from the “outside” in, murals are understood here as verification of a hierachicalised social ordering that confers and reconfirms certain prescriptive qualities (eg., pathological, poor, creative, resilient, multicultural, dignified) to selected people and spaces. Culture, in this sense, as a compulsively repetitive invitation for “prioritised subjectivities and neighbourhoods” to publicly visualize their pain and empowerment, to perform their victimisation and resilience for a normativised audience, can reinvigorate the very spacialised and temporal boundaries between normal/empowered and those always in the process of healing/empowering (Yudice, 2003). This perceived redemptive and communicative functioning of cultural expression trucks easily in the domestic spaces of multicultural liberalism (chapter 2) and equally as well in the circuits of globalised capitalism with its voracious appetites for “the authentic”, for “survivor art”, “art from the diaspora”, or for “outsider art” (Mercer, 1998).

Read from the inside out, murals are seen as proof of an operative community resilience and “spirit”, a cathartic desire to pastorally contain, through aesthetic dialogue, expressions of social unrest, formations of political excess, and other aesthetic sensibilities that threaten to undo any meaning that this social politics of art might confer. In this sense, murals, articulated as communicative expression/action, are thought to facilitate a stitching of bodies and spaces (back) into the
fabric of a thriving metropolis - but on its own representational terms. This is an accommodationist politics, as Ranciere and Yudice suggest, seeking to mediate the coming together of difference against a normativised backdrop of market attachments, by being “in control” of how the community’s inclusion or “exchange” in a multicultural fray happens and by what representational criteria. Foreclosed from the interaction, is a disruption to the sensibility of “who counts”, and of the very networks and flows of power that dictate the terms and limits of sensible distribution in the first instance (and by implication of how “empowerment” “can be experienced and expressed”) (Yudice, 2003, p. 161; Ranciere, 1999).

Finally, the GTP can be seen as both conferring social support for disenfranchised communities and youth (a lingering welfare sentiment that deferred to a tacit recognition of the state’s caring role in managing the effects of economic disenfranchisement) and more robustly, as a neo-liberal governance strategy to socially contain an “at risk” subjectivity and cultivate the sensibilities of productive responsivisation. Despite efforts (as a prescribed mandate, and as a deference to welfare sentiment) to “outreach to hard to reach youth”, one of the perceived shortcomings of the programme as understood by those interviewed for this research, was that the programme tended to attract youth who were already psychically invested in its marketed goals of employability, skills acquisition and community engagement. As I will explore below in some detail, the moral and market oriented scaffolding that supports the GTP and the means by which that programming is implemented, has a tendency to induce a further social disenfranchising of potential youth participants who are already disenfranchised from normative modes of economic and social productivity. In addition, one of the other recognized, although unresolved tensions in the programme was the
possibility that the social investments of the programme could stand in the way of “the aesthetic integrity” of the final product (Jed B., community artist, personal communication, 2011; O. Senegin, SD officer, personal communication, 2011). Youth identifying community artists, employed to facilitate the programme, were laden with the responsibility of mediating between these two poles, and of translating “experiences” into representational renderings in accord with an aesthetics of “beautification” and functional multiculturalism. As both the aesthetic and social components followed their own prescriptive logics (although, as I will argue below, not without some degree of disruption), and depending on where emphasis was placed, the ability to mediate their differences was met with varying degrees of “success” across projects, and across the duration of the programme (O. Segin, SD Officer, personal communication, 2011).

The Graffiti Transformation Project, together with the more generic practice of throwing up funded murals in neighbourhoods like Jane and Finch is not without its detractors. Calling attention to the growing discrepancy between rich and poor, and to the need for more sustained and robust, state led social and economic programming in her neighbourhood, one Jane-Finch activist said this about murals - “Rich people get to buy their way out of problems, poor folks get art projects” (Sorrel P., personal communication, 2011). Moreover, a number of community workers and residents that I spoke with argued against mural practice because of its “stigmatizing qualities”. As one youth resident quipped, “we might as well have a neon sign saying ghetto” (Dwayne G., personal communication, 2011). Complimenting this sentiment are the words of one cultural youth worker working in the “prioritized” neighbourhood of Flemingdon Park in east Scarborough, who suggested the need for racialised and economically disenfranchised people to step outside of what
Yudice (2003) describes as the “double bind of representation” (p. 156) - the desire to gain control over stereotypical representations of experiences and the “compulsion to see and put our guts on display” ... “we [as racialised people] are tired of telling our fucking stories. We’re here, so get over it” (C. Pinheiro, personal communication, 2010).

Others, including city councilor Anthony Peruzzo, similarly argue against the presence of murals in their ward, not because of its dehumanizing or depoliticizing effects, but because their presence frustrates development aspirations planned for the neighbourhood’s economic revitalization (Kamika B., youth worker, personal communication, 2011). Murals, understood as visual signifiers of a “poor but dignified” or “pathological but healing” neighbourhood (Yudice, 2003) are clearly out of sync with the efforts to rebrand Jane - Finch into “University Heights”, a coalitional effort led by neighbourhood and business associations, private developers, and municipal politicians in 2009 to clear representational space for future waves of development in the area (Jane-Finch.com, 2011).

GTF at the Spot: The Spot has been a recipient of GTP funding since the youth satellite opened its doors in 2006. During the first year of its operation, the programme was facilitated by a youth worker who had no claims to being an artist, but was passionate about working with community youth (Noel G., manager, personal communication, 2011). Given the mixed artistic quality of the murals and artwork that were produced that year, and in a strategic effort to receive future funding, the Spot decided to hire a gifted emerging artist, Lucia V., for subsequent years of the programme’s operation. Lucia’s identification as a community artist, her credibility as a commercially successful illustrator and painter, and her experience as a graffiti writer fit both the City’s profile...
of a “rehabilitated graffiti artist” and the Spot’s preference for its youth workers to “role model” certain attributes or skills (in L’s case, her entrepreneurial spirit, her patience, and her commitment to cultivating youth’s artistic talent which was understood as a personal attribute and vocational opportunity (Noel G., manager, personal communication, 2011). Jasmeet K., a youth worker at the Spot, provided administrative staff support for the programme and was the point person responsible for writing grants and brokering community relations with Toronto Community Housing, the police association, Mall management, partnered community agencies, the local BIA, and owners of the Palisades, a set of high rise towers across the road from Yorkgate Mall). Melissa Y, a talented grade 12 artist, who has aspirations of becoming a fashion designer, was hired as a youth administrator and mentor for the project.

By all accounts, the Graffiti Transformation project was one of the most popular structured programmes offered through the Spot, although in practice, it operated more like a drop-in programme. Approximately 20 youth participated over the course of 8 months (the programme ran from May until December, 4 days a week during the summer months, and 3 days a week during the two school semesters) with some, approximately 12 out of the 20, having more regular attendance than others. All of the participating youth attended the three high schools in the area and ranged in ages from 14 to 19. For the first few months of the programme, only young women were in attendance, but by mid July, 4 young men started participating with some regularity. The youth who were attracted to the programme were racially/ethnically diverse. Initially, the group consisted of three clusters of friends distinguished by their ethnicities – three white identifying, 3 Tamil identifying, and 4 Latina (Columbian, Equadorian and Peruvian). By mid-summer, the group had
become more racially diversified with 5 Caribbean black identifying youth joining together with 4 “Asian” youth and 1 white youth.

The majority of participants, with the exception of 5 youth, (including 1 white male youth) tended to not hang out regularly at the Spot as drop-in participants. As acknowledged by some of the staff, the drop-in itself had a distinctly Afro-centric vibe to it (fig. 17, fig. 18), and despite the Spot’s investment in cultivating a multicultural sensibility and being receptive to all ethnicities, youth tended to be rather self-selecting about which programmes if any they participated in. Indeed, throughout the GTP, most youth tended to interact almost exclusively with their racialised/ethnic cohorts (which importantly were also friendship based from high school), an interactional pattern that replicates a socio-cultural and systemically induced pattern of cohort interactions and selection in the majority of high schools across the GTA (whether publicly funded or not) (cf., Quadeer, 2006 on the benefits of ethnic enclaves). That this was never openly problematised by Lucia and Jasmeet or expressed as an issue of importance by the youth themselves when brainstorming ideas for how to represent “ethnic pride and multiculturalism” (The Spot, 2011) in group murals may be suggestive of how normativised these practices of a cleavaged ethnic pluralism had become for these youth.

Motivations for attending varied with participants – the meal that was provided and bus tokens were a significant draw (in an area where household poverty was endemic, this programme incentive was a necessary stop-gap fix to what was understood by everyone at the Spot to be a wider systemic issue) as were the community service hours for programme participation (a mandatory requirement for all Ontario secondary students). Others came because it provided a place to hang
out after school free from police/security harassment or away from troubled family/home environments (Jasmeet K., personal communication, 2011). Some youth had a passion for art making either as a pleasurable past-time experience and/or as an employable skill to cultivate for future work in creative/arts industries. And some came because their friends were there. Lucia worked hard to navigate these varying degrees of investments and commitments, and to keep youth engaged in the various activities that had been planned for the day.

In a very specific sense, although the flyer that was used to recruit youth promised that the programme’s scope of activity would be “youth led”, the process of framing how the programme would unfold had been articulated months before through the City of Toronto’s grant writing process. In other words, the Spot’s application for funding can be read as a type of narrative genre that mimetically rearticulated normative codes (Berry-Flint, 2007; cf. Fleetwood, 2005) established by the City’s “Request For Proposal” (RFP). Indeed, the pressure to secure funding dollars from an ever-diminishing pool of resources flowing to social services, necessitates that agencies comply, at least as a performative gesture, with an RFP’s textual and social grammars designed to orchestrate respondents’ programming behaviour and objectives. According to City reports, all of the youth serving agencies that received funding for years 2010 and 2011, relied on the following tropes - community enhancement, public safety, youth engagement – to render their projects in line with the genre’s expected morally/economically infused coding (City of Toronto, 2010, 2011).

The Spot’s 2011 submission, coyly entitled “Off the Wall” emphasized not only the abatement component of the project but the project’s desire to “empower youth to foster their individual talents” and “make artistic contributions to the neighbourhood” (p. 2). Cultivating “team build-

---

I wish to thank Rupaleem Bhuyan for suggesting this connection.
ing”, leadership training, community development skills, and a knowledge about “the ethics of creating community art” were also included as programme outcomes (p.4). The notion of “community” was articulated here as a spatial configuration and as a set of social networks aligning business, residents, agency workers and 31 police division. The RFP also noted the use of “official graffiti art making” as a vehicle for local youth to express the “authenticity” of their experiences and to “reflect on their social and cultural diversity and pride” (p. 4). This emphasis on relying on youth’s subjective expression as a touchpoint for pedagogy and activism (Fleetwood, 2005) was reiterated in the next stated objective:

Youth ideas and images will be represented and live in the murals. The objective of the graffiti art is to validate “at risk” youth and create a youth friendly and welcoming environment. We want to capture the essence of youth living in Jane/Finch by representing their ideas and visions in the mural painting (The Spot, 2011, p. 2).

That the murals would embody and agentically represent something about the “selves” of the youth artists and that the artists would imbue the very materiality of the mural with their identities and characteristics of themselves (Schacter, 2008)\textsuperscript{15}, reflects the proposal’s desire to both individualize the experience of participants (i.e., the murals would allow youth to work through who they were, “essentially”), and to privilege “Jane-Finch youth” as a collectivity, as having an authentic spirit (or culture) worthy of being represented to the community and city at large (I explore this point in detail below). The proposal went on to claim that recruited youth would be those who were “at risk” for behaviours ranging from “gang involvement to drug activities and family contact [sic - conflict]”. Experiences of racism and “conflict with the law” although tangentially referenced as systemically generated, were personalized and articulated as manifesting in “feelings of

\textsuperscript{15} Schacter makes use of anthropologist Alfred Gell’s conceptualization of ritual objects’ agentic and alluring ability to “capture, hold and transform cognitive operations” for her own analysis of graffiti as a process of objectification in which the selves of the writers are worked through in the actual materialization of the graffiti (cf. Schacter, 2008, p. 38-39).
hopelessness”. In further accordance with the genre’s conventions, “participation” was understood therapeutically and as a modality for redemptive empowerment” that would touch all community residents, not only youth; as the Spot’s RFP reads, “the project outcomes will provide meaningful and skills enhancing opportunities of great personal and community value” (p. 3). Finally, as a means of further justifying the social/aesthetic relevance of the proposed programme, the proposal argued that youth would be able to make a positive impact in an area where graffiti/tagging was “a prominent issue” because of its “association with gangs and turf issues” (p.1).

Jasmeet K’s strategic mimicking of the language of “graffiti abatement” – gesturing towards “graffiti/tagging’s prominent position in the neighbourhood, its seductive and threatening qualities, and referencing the murals “as graffiti art projects” – had the effect of stitching the proposed project into a normative moral-aesthetic economy oriented around diminishing the perceived threat of racial/class disruption. And yet, as Jasmeet, Lucia and other youth workers understood, this racialised narrative fetish feeding into the securitised politics of actuarial aesthetics was disconnected from the way in which graffiti and tagging operated in the lives of youth attending the programme. In fact, “graf” as a writing practice associated with hip hop (and the writing that is prevalent throughout different areas of the pre-amalgamated city of Toronto and the aesthetic practice that pre-occupies public sentiment) has no physical presence in the Jane Finch area at all. Several possible explanations hold for this absence. First, as youth explained, most public and private space where this type of writing could appear has been subjected to optical surveillance by the police or privatized security forces employed by landowners and shopping malls (and schools) – a practice that compliments other techniques visualizing disciplinary presence (Feldman, 1997)

16 I borrow the phrase “narrative fetishism” from Eric Santner (1992) to signal the narrative economies (their production, circulation, consumption) that wittingly or not are activated as a means of expunging or disavowing the “traumatic event” that gave rise to it in the first instance but nevertheless holds an unacknowledged allure or fascination. Given graffiti’s history as a deterrioralising act born in response to racialised class exclusion, I would suggest that graffiti carries a charge that is surplus to its discursive/aesthetic reterritorialization as an illegal/violating act to property. Occluded from this litigious narrativising of graffiti is this specific urban resistance’s racialised origins and thus its presence as a marker of a failed multiculturalism to absorb the threat of the racialised other in the midst of propertied whiteness. If the racial element is systematically denied, the trace that graffiti bears nevertheless holds an allure beyond that nurtured through neoliberal discourses of risk and responsivisation. Throughout this dissertation, I make reference to the inherent racialised/post-colonialist trauma at the heart of a liberal humanist project imperative (see the subsection - Contending with the logics of race, Chapter 2).
deployed in their neighbourhood like stop-searching, foot and cycle patrols, and racial profiling. For youth whose very subjectivities necessitate a daily negotiation of these scopically positioned, intrusionary practices, writing, as a petty criminal offence that carried legal penalty, was simply too risky or not worthy of their effort. Another possible explanation offered was that a secondary, para-legal optical surveillance system was in operation in their neighbourhoods, one that was connected to different local gangs’ control of specific social-spatial geographies throughout the Jane Finch area. To put up unauthorized graffiti was seen as a type of violation to this geo-political grid that allowed only an occasional “official” tag demarcating gang ownership or some other form of messaging.

And yet, perhaps the most compelling reason for their being a marked absence of graffiti in the Jane-Finch area lies in youth’s relative indifference to its practice. During one group session that was designed to fulfill the mandated educational component of the programme, Lucia decided to show *Style Wars* (fig. 19 & fig 20), a documentary that exposed a wider North American audience to New York’s graffiti writing culture in the early 1980’s. Importantly, the film traces an important connection between the newly emerging visual language to other highly politicized hip hop aesthetic practices (breakdancing, DJ’ing, poetry) that had gained a place of prominence in racialised urban areas. Given that the film was screened in the larger drop-in space, not only youth connected to the programme were able to view the documentary but interested drop-in participants as well. Approximately 5 minutes into the documentary, Lucia and I noticed the majority of youth were beginning to disengage; some started texting on their phones, some started talking or joking around with friends beside them, and some simply got up and wandered to the desk of computers...
positioned on the other side of the television monitor. Indeed, the only time when youth seemed to re-engage and become more attentive to the content of the documentary was when the film had redirected its focus to capture early forms of breakdancing or to highlight club scenes where DJ’s were spinning hip hop (with which a number of youth had some familiarity). In the discussion that followed, one youth in speaking about her experience watching the film, said the following “yeah, it was interesting, but it’s not really me”. Others concurred with the sentiment.

In one sense, the aesthetic practices of graffiti serve as an all too familiar and highly commoditised, subjectivising backdrop to their lived experiences as youth, and as racialised youth living in prioritized neighbourhoods. As detailed above, graffiti had become ubiquitous as a marketing tool. It was deployed not only by music and fashion industries but also by social services agencies as well to traffic a by now normativised version of a style/sensibility understood to define urban youth identity or be a touchstone of youth subjectification. Indeed, most of the youth agencies in the Jane-Fine area frequently deployed images of “graffiti writing” to promote social programmes, and as a decorative style in drop-in spaces because of its assumed visual appeal to youth (Noel G., personal communication, 2011). Although designed to interpellate a specific youth public (or at minimum, provide some form of visual appeal or allure), the aesthetic of graffiti seemingly had no real traction in, or immediate relevance to, youth’s current interests and psychical investments - as expressions of “who they are”. For these youth at least, the stultifying register of graffiti which houses its own prescribed, and I sensed, for them, lactified rendering of racialised youth identity, was seemingly eschewed in favour of other expressive modalities like the sonic and the kinetic as more likely aesthetic sites for subject(ivat)ion, and quite possibly politics (in its Rancerian
sense). Of course, the Spot and other agencies in the area recognized the instrumentality of these other aesthetic modalities in enfranchising youth and productively engaging them (and the larger community) in the production of Afro-centric culture as a validated form of citizenship; the drop-in together with other hosted events co-hosted by the Spot like a bi-weekly evening event called Freedom Fridays (an event for community youth to showcase spoken word, dance, rap, DJ’ing skills and talents) opened up space for such engagements.

If this narrative gesture towards the place of graffiti in the lives of youth living in the Jane-Finch area served as a strategic device to secure funding dollars (and tangentially, as tool for recruitment based an on its assumed commercial/instrumental allure), other declarative gestures made throughout the proposal coupled more favourably with the City’s objective of using murals as a technique of multicultural neoliberal governance. But not precisely. I would argue that as an important part of the proposal that effectively mimicked the grammar and language of city beautification as a creative cities aspiration, the reference to “multiculturalism” nevertheless served as a type of narrative slyness for the Spot to entertain a particular resistant/resisting subjectivity. In other words, as I will detail below, Jasmeet K., in keeping with the practices of the Spot, conscripted “multiculturalism” as a discursive-aesthetic space in which disenfranchised youth are imagined to not only dis-identify with stereotypical representations of “youth at risk”, but are empowered to rearticulate their subjectivities in accordance with a more “authentic” register. In one sense, writing youth’s experiences as being extraordinary or “off the wall” and thus deserving of public expression underscores an unproblematised understanding of experience as “non-constructed” and essentialist (or at least housing some essential qualities) (Fleetwood, 2005). And yet, in the space of

17 My use of the word “sly” makes an oblique reference to Homi Bhabha’s (1994) coinage of the term “sly civility” to denote “the native’s” refusal to fully satisfy the colonialist civilizing imperative – that the colonialist authority be addressed directly as the bearer of truth for the good of the generalized common body. Under cover of direct speech acquiescence, the native offers the appearance of compliance as a “sign of civility” (that the national body is acting as one voice although opinions may differ – in Ranciere’s terms, consensus). And yet, this response is peppered by evasive tones, ambiguous words, oblique gestures, a type of narrative and kinesthetic refusal that frustrates this colonialist narcissistic need for affirmation of its authorial wholeness (and thus of its superiority over an imagined whole – the metropole and its colonized lands).
the proposal, this essentialist rendering of cultural identity which maps, as we have seen, onto the state’s own promotion of neo-liberal multiculturalism (see chapter 2) is in tension with what I read to be a complimentary or parallel suggested usage of the aesthetic space of multiculturalism - a desire for the GTP to function as a vehicle for engaging youth in a negotiated politics of representation at an intra and extra community scale. In other words, the validated subjectivity that is understood to emerge from within a negotiated terrain of ethnic plurality and multiculturalism, speaks, in part to the Spot’s desire to draw upon aesthetic techniques of governance as a means of engaging in conversations about citizenship, belonging and specifically, racialised youth’s ability to make a mark on how the social is constructed.

Throughout the course of eight months of programming, youth participants of the GTP were actively courted into this genre specified, yet slyly negotiated terrain of expectations for the activities of mural making - as sites for cultivating responsive and responsivised selves, for drawing out authentic and individuated cultural selves, and for fostering socio-politicized selves according to the declarative possibilities of representational politics. Here, I focus on two incidents occurring in different local visual fields - the one having an intra-communal sight-line; the other, more extra-communal and thus more explicitly implicated in globalised circuits of “creative” urbanism - to illustrate how youth mediated these different performative injunctions.

Defacing Disney cuteness for “real shit” at the Palisades

Before youth had been fully recruited to the programme, Lucia and Jasmeet had negotiated with Stephanie Payne, a local community activist and Executive Director of San Romanoway Revitalization Association, to put up a mural on the exterior entrance to SRRA (housed in one of one
of the three apartment buildings collectively known as the Palisades - a high rise bloc opposite the York Gate Mall) and on an inside wall of the recording studio that is run by the association. The state of the art recording studio, one of several programmes housed under the Youth N’ Charge programming, provides an opportunity for neighbourhood youth, 16-29, to receive instruction in beats production either informally as drop-in participants or more formally through the Music Entrepreneurship and Publishing Skills (MEPS) programme. Youth workers who have gained some industry success as recording artists or music producers staff the studio. The project, funded by Frontier College, the Ontario Arts Council and the Toronto Arts Council, is based on the operative premise of “crime prevention through social development” (S. Payne, personal communication, 2011). After the first week of programming devoted to group introduction and the setting of group norms and goals, the assembled group of 10 youth, all young women between the ages of 14 and 17, began working on preliminary sketches for the studio wall mural. Lucia had provided little guidance on themes for the mural apart from that it should abide by Stephanie Payne’s wishes that it be “up-beat” and “hopeful”. In fact, Lucia’s tacit refusal to formally orchestrate the mural in overtly political or social terms, was in keeping with a more ethical-aesthetic approach to art’s sensibilities (pace Ranciere) embraced in part by the Spot and indicative of Lucia’s own approach to art as an individuated, affective, journey that allows a person to “tap into their imaginations” to discover something about themselves and their world (Lucia V., personal correspondence, 2011).

Although none of the participants had ever been in the recording studio (a symptom of gender and perhaps age difference as it was about ethnicity/racialised identity - it was frequented almost exclusively by young black identifying men most of whom were over 16 years of age (Mat-
Consensus formed quickly as to the style and subject matter of the proposed mural; the wall on which the mural was to be painted was about 5 meters in length and would depict the importance of music in the lives of “youth” (as a generic subjectivity”) living in the Jane-Finch community. The youth artists also wanted to portray “different groups” interacting with one another as a signifier of the multicultural spirit of the community. The chosen aesthetic was hybridised, disarming and playful and drew its representational inspiration from different globalised, commercialised circuits of animation styles that are typical of the community mural genre - Japanese Manga, “urban animation” (the animated television series/comic strip “the Boondocks” was named explicitly by the group as a principal reference), and most prominently, Disney’s portrayal of racialised and “ethnic” characters in films like The Princess and the Frog (again, another specific source referenced). An integral part of the chosen design was the inclusion of cute animal figures anthropomorphized so that apart from their smaller size, their actions would be synonymous with the 3 human figures that also figured prominently in the initial design. The left portion of the panel would depict two “animated “old school” jazz musicians – cute old green turtles with glasses, bow-ties and straw hats playing saxophones - as tropes to signify the historical roots of contemporary music listened to by youth participants. This idea was introduced by Jasmeet and agreed upon by the youth who then substituted the humans for turtles. The remaining portion would portray 3 youth of varying ethnicities in a sound studio, surrounded by recording equipment (speakers, sound board) and engaged in some form of beats production. A fourth figure, a rather humorous looking scruffy dog was imaged attempting some type of breakdancing move. Two of the characters (the human and the dog) would be wearing headphones and
the other two human characters would be actively working the soundboard.

The youth started to work on the mural the following afternoon and by the third day it became apparent to those attending the drop-in recording studio how the intended design for their space would unfold. Reactions against the design were explosive. In addition to being angry about their exclusion from the design process in the first instance, 3 vociferously vocal youth, together with the youth worker Matthew, expressed how incensed they were by the puerile content of the mural and in particular, by the inclusion of “cutesy animals”; as one youth muttered, “what do you think this is, a fuck’n daycare?”. The youth artists were initially stunned by such damming response, but later on in the day, one of the youth remarked in passing “what did they expect, look at who designed it”. Lucia and Matthew met separately and renegotiated the content of the mural. It was finally decided that the hybrid style of urban animation blended with a character intensity typical of manga would suffice for the overall design because of its credible usage in hip hop magazines. Moreover, the mural would be expanded to include 3 panels, and the cute animal figures popularized in Disney films would be dropped and replaced by 5 additional youth characters (fig. 21). The inclusion of female characters was grudgingly accepted although brushed off as unrealistic - on the left panel, a male youth would be portrayed breakdancing, on the right, another male youth would be portrayed just hanging out, as if leaning against the wall of the studio listening to the beats (fig. 22). The most significant change to the original design was a shift from its seemingly a-political, fantastical sensibility (see below) to that of memorial commemorating the gang related death of a regular programme participant who reportedly was on the verge of cutting a recording deal. K.D was much admired and respected by the regulars of the studio, although was known
only through rumour by the youth attending the GTP (fig. 23). What studio participants wanted was “a realistic image of K.D” to commemorate “who he really was” and to serve as a symbolic reminder of the importance of sticking to their dreams regardless of what life dealt them. Finally the youth wanted the new mural to speak to the poetic sentiment expressed by another memorial that had been put up on an adjoining studio wall a few years previously. Although all agreed that the existing mural, entitled *Thoughts and Real Talks* was amateurishly done, they identified with the mural’s ability to deal with “real shit” and specifically with the spirit of the words spoken in two of its conversation bubbles, “Livin life is really tough, but then again you just gotta be tough” and “We ride together…Play together, Laugh together…But at the end of the day…we all together” (Matthew R., personal communication, 2011) (fig. 24).

That the representational accounting of how “we all together”, was, for these different groups of youth, a highly contested terrain, is as much symptomatic, I would suggest, of the youths’ own subjective positioning and investments within circuits of a neoliberal multiculturalism as it was of the ways in which they managed and interpreted different commoditised representational sources used to express their versions of “pride and empowerment” (the Spot, 2011). In one sense, the two groups were in agreement about the animation style that would be chosen for the mural. Trafficked heavily in different commercialized and commodified media/entertainment circuits (video games, cartoons, films, merchandise, dvds and comics) it was a style that had become synonymous with “ghetto culture” and popularly deployed to represent inter-racial/inter ethnic interactions. How they wanted to weigh in on this representational front was what was being contested.
The art form ultimately referenced for the mural has its roots in the American Black Power era, where a stylized, animated iconography referencing “black cultural experiences” began developing as part of a larger movement in the production of a cultural nationalism. Comic strips found in journals and newspaper targeting African American audiences deployed these iconographic forms to consolidate political messages, cultivate and influence the direction of Black power, deliver searing critique of the racist polity, exert control over how their bodies were represented, and “to poke fun at the absurdities of racialised bigotry” (Breaux, 2010, p. 83).

By the mid to late 1960’s these icons, animation styles, rhetoric and symbols of self love and political mobilization (as a democratic politics from the ground up) were picked up as marketable objects of “cool” and youthfulness, and as objects capable of expressing “personal style”. This trend towards the containment and pacification of a politics, and the discovery of Black culture/Black audiences (and other racialised groups) as both viable commodity sources and viable commodity markets, spilled over into the burgeoning television programming market (a by then popularized and accessible media form). The Jackson 5ive animated series was one of the first TV programmes (1971-73) broadcasted to a wider American audience, including Black consumers, to portray elements of Black cultural discourses and style together with non stereotypical (i.e., non minstrel type) representations of black subjects (fig. 25). The animated series paved the way for other “non-stereotypical” series like the wildly commercially successful series Fat Albert and The Cosby Kids (fig. 26), and cemented an animated style that would become foundational to films like Disney’s re-release of The Princess and the Frog (fig. 27). As Breaux persuasively argues, these 1970’s animated series allowed for the projected multi-racial audiences to experience “Martin Luther King’s interracial
dream as already being fulfilled” (p. 89) by affirming that a presentation of non-stereotypical representations was possible on mainstream television. Moreover, as Breaux suggests, their messages of a depoliticized and personalized sense of social/cultural empowerment appealed to a generation trying to come to terms with civil rights and Black power ideologies. Importantly, they also acted as normativising counterweights to the release of the Moynihan report linking different identified pathological attributes of Black culture and Black female headed households to criminalized behaviour, drug use and poverty. (Breaux, 2010).

I would argue that for the youth at the Spot, this depoliticised, individualised “urban” animated style accommodated their proposed representational accounting of youth community pride celebrating its love of music and its integrationist/democratic spirit in which different ethnicities and indeed species, could play together. It also allowed for this accounting to be cast as a pastoralised multiculturalism, normativising racialised youth as engaged, cool, and productive. Indeed, their original design worked hard at disavowing any marks of difference or systemically induced tensions that could possibly have disrupted this imaging of a “post-racial” harmony. It also expunged from view any traces of persisting racially, gendered or class induced inequities that could preclude the fulfillment of belonging and the procurement of social/economic capital. By all accounts this sentiment of functioning multiculturalism not only tapped into a neo-liberal promise that productivity, responsivization and social accountability can be highly pleasurable (and thus desirable as a sustaining fantasy in which to deposit further investment (Stavrakakis, 2006) but that productive engagements might very well be foundational to or at least coterminous with harmonious, inter-racial social organization. Such a rendering was certainly in keeping with the City’s
aspirations to cast the city aglow in visualized representations of a thriving communitarian civic structure based on mediated/celebrated difference. It also aligned with the grammar of the proposal that proposed mural making as a gateway to creating safe/vibrant communities.

The decision to cast cute, anthropomorphised animals into the productive, social space of a sound studio, although interpreted as infantile by youth at the studio, could also be read as a (unwitting?) gesture to shore up this scene of responsivised, functioning diversity. In the original mural design, the cementing of a sonic present in the representational figures of two maturely wise, green, saxophone-playing turtles, stripped away the specificity of its Afro-centricity by reframing that music history as a multicultural experience - the turtles were green, just one colour of the diversity spectrum. Moreover, the presence of the cute old turtles, not only played on the stereotype of ol’ uncle Tom, but cast a Disney-like innocence (Stamp, 2004) on a history of Afro-centric music production, bracketing from view the political potency of its utterances, and the pleasures/specified knowledges that it produced for black audiences (Wehilye, 2005). Moreover, I would suggest, that the presence of the break dancing dog (and indeed, of the turtles), offered a comic relief to the scene that is hauntingly similar to the functioning of “coloured” minstral figures in animated series popular until the late 1960’s (cf., Ciarlo, 2011, Breaux, 2010). Conversely, the dog’s playful-like qualities and cultivated familiarity (i.e. the dog renders himself/is rendered familiar through mimicry) pacifies the potentially threatening nature of his species’ otherness (Artz, 2004; Stamp, 2004). Indeed, it is the dog’s very performance of pleasurable productivity that confers his socially harmless subjectivity, a gesture that encapsulates and signifies the importance of accommodation to a functioning multiculturalism. Important to consider, though, is that the dog still retains its “do-
gness”, (ie., although the dog is fully anthropomorphised, it retains its difference at a topographical level) a subtle injection of an accommodationist politics that insists on accounting for the contribution of a unique-in-appearance, yet wholly mediated difference to a multicultural landscape.

Perhaps this representational accounting, that in one sense draws attention to the imperative of performativity as entre to being recognized and legitimated in social/productive space, was an important piece of knowledge for the young artists to hold onto as they negotiated the contours of their own subjectivities and entrances to wider social spaces. Indeed, all of the youth involved in the initial design for the mural were dedicated to being good students, had aspirations of going on to university, and had social circles comprised of similarly aspiring youth. The group was also savvy to the machinations of racialised power flows as they played out in their own community and in their respective schools, understanding that to be counted and to be “empowered” necessitated a strategic construing of their subjectivities to both preserve and present who they were (their “uniqueness” and their “authenticity”) and to accommodate the injunctions of responsivisation. What the group wasn’t interested in (more as a passive gesture rather than an articulated position) was using the mural as an “aesthetic-mimetic” device (pace Ranciere) to critique both power flows and the policing of who gets accounted for in the first instance.

In tension with this understanding of multiculturalism as strategic accommodation and mediation of difference, was a politics put forward by Matthew and the other invested youth at the studio that sought to highlight the impossible place of certain subjects within this imagined space of a functioning (neoliberal) pluralist polity. The insistence of incising a likeness of their friend KD into the imagined, remediated multicultural space depicted in the original mural design, dis-
placed and rendered untenable the distracting presence of cute animals and their ability to render innocent socio-racialised-moral/economic circuits hierarchicalising and discounting certain subjects and bodies. By insisting on visually commemorating and memorialising the death of their friend KD in its realist guise (two friends downloaded Facebook images so that his likeness could be captured more precisely), his friends, I would suggest, were seeking to re-address KD’s social invisibility. In other words, they were invested in accounting for his discounting in the visible field as a non-compliant racialised, black identifying youth apart from a hypervisibility as “phantasmic threat”. This was a desire to re/member KD for “who he really was” – as friend, as talented artist, as someone who was about to cut a music deal.

The youth also insisted that KD be portrayed wearing three solid gold chains. They had become his trade-mark in the last few months before his death, and signified, for the youth, his burgeoning success as a recording artist, his social-economic status within the community, and tangentially, although never stated directly, his “outlaw” status as a gangsta. According to Law professor D. Marvin Jones (2005), the subjectivity of the “gangsta”, as explored through rap by self-identified Black artists, is both symptomatic of modernism’s failure to secure equality of promise for black racialised males, and a politicised “vehicle for expressing the frustration” of youth experiencing racialised socio-economic abjection and a devolution of civil rights (p. 65) (cf, Gilroy, 1993). While both Gilroy (1993) and Jones (2005) read the gangsta as a contradictory and ironic construct, they nevertheless argue that the subjectivity signals an attempt to forge a resistent and “authentic ngritude” (Jones, 2005, p. 67) in contradistinction to the portrayals of emasculated black men (the stock character of the minstral, as eg.). Following this line of thinking, for the studio youth, the memori-
alisation of KD as an effort to reinstantiate the subjectivity of belongingness and the right to mourn appeared in its identitarian political guise - as an effort to assert a subjectivity of blackness within the “the larger white world” (Jones, 2005, p. 67). And yet, I would argue that the claim exceeded, or was at the threshold of the logics of a racialised discourse, and that what was being enunciated was a more elemental expression of collectivized citizenship – a declarative, prescriptive “We are who we are and who we will dream to be” (and in Ranciere’s terms, a performative gesture enunciating the part that has no part). That the representation of KD’s empowerment and social recognition was also grounded in consumerism and drew from circuits of commercialized media (music videos, games, and films) for inspiration serves as illustration and reminder of the ways in which claims for citizenship are as much caught up in markets as they are in attempts to stake out extra-market ways of configuring the social (cf., Fleetwood, 2005; Yudice, 2003).

These negotiations over the nature of civic participation and representation at the limits of a racialised neoliberal governance raise questions of whether youth who were able to make claims on a sense of belonging and entitlement in the studio (certainly enough to make claims as to how their lives would be mirrored back to them) would be able to craft a similar place for themselves within more structured programming at the Spot (or in other agencies adhering to a “positive youth development” governance modality). In other words - and I frame this as an instructive and hopefully productive question - to what extent does the moral and market oriented scaffolding that supports programmes like the GTP and the informal means by which these rationalities are practiced have a tendency to induce a further social disenfranchising of potential youth participants who are already disenfranchised from normative modes of economic and social productivity. By way of
partial response, I offer the following postscript to this incident. Immediately after the mural was completed, Matthew was fired from his youth worker role at the studio for being “insolent” and not providing enough “guidance” of the right sort to youth attending the drop-in. For Matthew, beats production was about “trusting your own voice… and sometimes that means hittin’ people with real shit” (Matthew, personal correspondence, 2011). While there no doubt were other reasons for Matthew’s dismissal, the spin that he offered, and one which makes sense to me, suggests that his commitment to providing a space for aesthetic engagement that wasn’t altogether productive of multicultural civility was deemed too potentially disorienting (and threatening) to a preferred bundle of practices tied to youth responsivisation and the cultivation of cultural products amenable to consensual dialogue (pace Ranciere, 1999).

**Munching Donuts**

By late July, the group had reconfigured itself with the addition of 8 more youth. They were more vocal about their “politics” and more critically expressive about how they understood various experiences happening in the community, or in their respective schools. It was precisely at this time that a precinct police association had become involved as a complementary partner in the GTP, offering a modest amount of funds to supplement what the City had already granted to the Spot. For the police association, the project fit within the larger mandate of community policing, and was specifically pitched as a technique for (re)building the trust of a community that had become a targeted zone of zero tolerance securitization (O’Brien, personal communication, 2011). On three occasions, members from the association had shown up to the agency unannounced, always in a group of two or three – mixed gender, almost exclusively white - and always in uniform de-
spite having received stern warnings from Jasmeet that such visibility was distressing to the youth who participated in the Graffiti and drop-in programmes. The change in the youth’s demeanor was palpable when the visiting groups were present and then after, when they had departed. Laughter and animated conversation, silly antics and idle chatting turned into a dead quietness; responses were terse and vague, bodies contained in comportment and gesture. And then a stream of cursing by some, animated stories about police harassment, joking about the appearance or behaviours of one or two of the visiting police, and sometimes a defense of the one that seemed cool enough.

As the weeks progressed, the association suggested that the youth include representations of the police in one of the murals for which they were currently sketching out designs. This request to image an imagined interaction between youth and police had further complicated what had already been a rather difficult negotiation over representational content and formalist qualities with numerous actors weighing in on the discussion - the property management firm that controlled the high-rise apartment building on whose wall the mural was being put up, the director of a community agency who had suggested the mural, several vocal residents of the tower, and the youth participants themselves. The group had eventually settled on a rather bucolic scene of a group of youth hanging out under a tree (the trunk of which had a wise woman’s face etched into its surface) – one youth was imaged reading a book, some were listening to music and 2 others were dancing hip-hop, with the animated figures stylized in the popularized hybridised form wedding Japanese manga style with “urban animation” as used in other murals. Angered by this further evidence of police intrusion and surveillance into their activities and relationships, the youth who had no choice but to accommodate the request, reanimated their own understanding of community
policing by prominently positioning two cop figures into the design– one was a representation of
a rather doughy white male officer, with bursting uniform and puffy reddened face, munching on
a super-sized doughnut, the other, of a wispy white male sporting a grin that was both “idiotic” in
its representational gesturing and indexically linked to the rather grimacing way in which his torso,
arms and legs were being contorted – a botched mimetic attempt at “busting” a hip hop dance
move being performed so artfully by the racialised youth characters in the image. As the youth
artists were setting out to transcribe their completed sketches on to the building’s surface, a fur-
ther directive from the police association came via Jasmeet requesting that the police characters be
redrawn in a “more respectful and favourable” light (Jasmeet K. personal communication, 2011).

The youths’ decision to bank on a set of well greased clichés about donut munching cops
and white guys who can’t dance could be read as a rather humorous, predictable, and playfully
provocative effort to shore up (at least momentarily) an obvious power imbalance that exists be-
tween the police and youth living in racialised, economically disenfranchised communities. A
rich tradition of anthropological literature, cultural studies, social history and labour studies has
developed around an at times romanticized reading of this very type of wielding of humour by
subaltern classes (however that is defined) as a type of informal resistance to, or critique of hege-
monic control (cf. Davies, 2007; Scott, 1990; Weaver, 2010 to name but a few). Certainly, the youth
were signaling, at least tacitly, their non-compliance with an overbearing police presence that had
disrupted their activities at the Spot. I would suggest however, that more was at stake than police
embarrassment about having been shown up by youth, or youth’s attempts at informally jockey-
ing for control over the limits of police surveillance, how youth space should be organized and by

18 As a postscript to this event, it should be noted that the mural was never actualized. On the second day of
mural making, a work crew appeared at the high-rise complex to begin the work of overhauling the façade of the
building including the replacement of balconies. The delay caused by the police interjection in the youth’s
design process together with the failure by the complex’s management to notify the Spot of a changed work plan resulted in a final interruption to the mural’s tumultuous life journey.
whom. Such a mural, if it had been publicly exhibited (and perhaps, even if it hadn’t), might just very well have created a brief short-circuiting of several epistemological tenets that held the belief in the aesthetic instrumentality of the murals in place.

To recall the beginning of this last section on the GTP, I argued that mural making, as an aesthetic technique of governance, supports three claims made by the “state-machine” in its exercise of social regulation: murals are expected to signify and embody their licitness as bodies in place in the visual field – a visual presence attesting to the effectivity of the state’s security apparatus in regulating flows of bodies and abating criminal activity; murals also serve as index of intra and inter-community consensus; and finally, there is a knowledge that the very appearance of murals attests to a caring for and a regulation of youth deemed at risk. That these instrumental imperatives for murals “hold true” for social service practitioners and other invested partners attests to how normalised and essential the practice and public appearance of these objects have become as a component in the governance of Toronto’s urban economies. Seen in this light, I venture a tentative claim that murals, as created through the GTP, symbolise what Michael Taussig refers to as a type of “public secret” – common-sensical information about the functioning of civic power that must be kept invisible or concealed from the public eye (Taussig, 1999). Part of the dictum of this power to conceal lies in the cultivation of social subjects that are taught to abide by the prohibitionary imperative “know what not to know” (p. 4). And yet, as Surin’s (2001) reading of Taussig suggests, the most potent grounding of state power is the performative aspect of this sanctioned concealment: that even if the subject knows the secret, he/she must abide by a further imperative, “Even when X is generally known, you are enjoined to act and think as if X cannot be known” (p.
In one important sense, as attested to by a number of neighbourhood residents that I spoke with during fieldwork (see Dwayne’s, Payne’s and Pinheiro’s insightful critiques detailed above), people in the community already “know” about the fantasies that murals work hard at sustaining (and by implication, the secrets that they conceal) – the police apparatus as an impartial, protective, securitising mechanism serving all citizens and “communities” equitably, respectfully, and justly; liberal multiculturalism as an effective technique for abating the racialisation of difference; and neighbourhood revitalization (as implicated in the machinations of globalised capital flows) as beneficial to all residents and business alike.

What was possibly transgressive about the youth’s proposed mural design was not (merely) that it revealed the intertwinement of some of these barely concealed secrets through its signifying powers, but that it strategically operated from within the very medium itself to highlight murals as a technique of concealment. In other words, what the youths’ sketches quite possibly revealed was a “truth” functioning of the murals - as a type of wish fulfillment or fantasy mechanism that sustains and appeases a desire to experience the feeling of security and productivity in the face of economic and social upheaval. State-agency supported mural making, as a symbol of public secrets, I venture, might very well generate a set of compelling and normativising tropes for orchestrating the sensible – community enhancement, public safety, youth engagement – to help youth serving agencies and community members sustain hope in the face of declining funding for social services provisioning, increased state sanctioned racialised targeting of non-preferred residents, and rising socio-economic disparity (to name but a few of the challenges currently facing disenfran-
chised communities). The rhetoric framing murals’ redemptive and restorative powers also serves as an important, reflexive bolstering counter-point to the negative stereotyping plaguing their neighbourhood. At a more obvious level, murals also serve the police (and state) in legitimating their regulatory, “community building” and other securitisation efforts. But the secret of murals’ “contrived illusion” (Taussig, 1999, p. 101) was revealed, if only momentarily, in a burst of youthful enthusiasm and retaliation. In Ranciere’s terms, the youth artists had disrupted a functioning distribution of the sensible by momentarily “misrecognising” the sanctity of murals’ place in the sensible’s orchestration, thereby underscoring one of the orienting mechanisms through which the state’s/social work’s social/cultural truths were being produced. That this dis-accommodation of a given sensible field had a brief temporality, went virtually unnoticed, and was swiftly papered over through the Police Association’s re-assertion of the mural’s fictive allure with the injunction (and with the Spot’s complicity with that request) that youth artists comply by the codes of civility and represent “community partnerships” in a more “respectful manner” is perhaps indicative of how fleeting these moments of transgression are in social services spaces. And yet, that they occur, also gives social work pause for challenge and hope, a twist perhaps, on what is more casually referred to, in its neoliberal guise, as client/youth empowerment.

**Considerations:** If the Graffiti Transformation Project, as institutionalized practice, sought to consolidate and orient youth subjectivity and the usage of civic space in line with the dictates of a certain globalised, moralized neo-liberal aesthetic, then these two selected moments of intra-communal and inter-communal transgression that I have explored above are illustrative of the types of short-circuiting that can possibly transpire in the operationalisation of policy governance
techniques. What was being negotiated without resolve, and at times out of sync with a state sanctioned interpellation, were understandings about the limits of citizenship (its dimensions, culpabilities, responsibilities and (ideological) affiliations), about the political utility of difference (as strategic intervention or accommodation, as multicultural identity politics or as site-line for politics) and importantly, about the configurations of aesthetic governance in the practices of the social.

That these disruptive moments are representative of openings within social policy practices in which its practitioners – youth(clients), workers, policy makers, researchers – experience a dis-junctive encounter, for however briefly, at the junction between the functionings, falterings and re-imaginings of a given distribution of the sensible, begs the question of how it is that we think through this play between police and dissensus as an instructive exercise for professional practice? In the concluding chapter, I pick up this very Rancerian challenge to address the possibilities that such exercises in re-thinking might afford.
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This study of the aesthetics of social work, examined a contemporary social work/social policy reliance on aesthetic modes of governance for securing desired social and economic outcomes. The first case study (Chapter 3) historicised the practice of deploying different techniques of “state” power – those based on numerically based visual calculative practices, those that were understood to be indexically linked to subjects of study (photograph and film images), and those drawn from sensibilities coalesced around contemporary aesthetic norms and codes - to render knowable and to problematise classed/racialised subjectivities and spaces. Whether unwittingly or strategically deployed, these techniques were wielded by policy experts (social reformers, academics, philanthropist/policy advocates) as differently configured knowledge assemblages to further the aims of particular liberal rationalities of rule. That there were ambiguities in intended directions, and at times contradictory pulls between different political discourses serves as reminder of the constantly changing, and contextual nature of configurations of political rule. As we also examined, the truths that were produced about socio-economic difference, and by extension, the modalities of intervention that were propounded as means of address, were inflected with colonialist/racialised logics and served, in one sense, to shore up the exalted status of whiteness in the multicultural urban environments explored.

The second case (Chapter 4) showed how the United Way of Toronto drew upon circulating commoditised and fetishised representations of youth in their promotional/educational/fundraising campaign as an interpellative device for assembling a moralized public around the doxa of responsivisation, competitive productivity and performative self-empowerment. What was revealing about this case, was the extent to which the moralism that was called forth was both haunted
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by a racialised unconscious and a repressed religiosity that belied efforts to present a pastoralised, sanitized understanding of the functioning of liberal tolerance in addressing the problem of “at risk youth”.

Finally, the third case (Chapter 5) examined the operationalisation of an aesthetic technique of governance as an instrumentalist, remunerative resource for aligning two divergent policy goals – bolstering the appearance of a thriving globalised urbanism, and mediating the threat of seeking the inclusion of, racialised, economically disenfranchised youth through practices of care, civic regulation, containment and the instruction of self-regulation. And yet, as I argued, in the very staging of community murals intended to perform certain normative codes of inter/subjective comportment and behaviour aligning with liberal multiculturalism, different practices of disidentification took place exposing how vulnerable and resilient government is to disruption and reformulation. This case also exposed the fault-lines in social services’ claims to staging the authenticity of youth “culture” or subjectivity, suggesting that representational claims, whether as accommodationist gestures or as counter conducts, are not only tied into the rationalities of rule as demarcated by the different governance strategies framing programme direction and objectives, but importantly, they are also linked into commercial/commoditised circuitry. As such, youth representations of identity and belonging can tend towards a more conservative (i.e., status quo) and restrictive reformulation of how the sensible can and should be demarcated. This is not to say, however, that these representations signify a type of “false-consciousness”, and that youth subjects are bereft of a knowledge of racialised and classed fault-lines that obstruct certain possibilities. What I am suggesting though, is that given the aesthetic boundaries carved through the mechanisms and multi-scale investments of
the Graffiti Transformation Project (and indeed, as connected to the Spot’s own regulatory/caring/resistant practices), a certain structuration of the sensible policed what could be visibly articulated. In other words, accommodation (whether strategically taken up or not) and tactical fine-tuning of “difference”, as consensual negotiation, become the avowed means of address for youth participants. Conversely, as I hinted at, for some youth living in the Jane Finch area at least, the visual might not be the preferred or privileged aesthetic register for self or creative expression.

The methods used to generate and interpret data, together with the discussion and arguments that were produced, were informed by, and were informing, of principles of analysis (Chambon, 2007) drawing from various bodies of literature: (1) First, the dissertation articulates with an emerging social policy literature (Bhuyan, 2008; Fairbanks, 2004, McKee, 2009; Shore & Wright, 2005) in its reworking of Foucault’s concepts of governance, subjectivity, penalisation and moralism as contested spaces of language, politics (Brown, 2006; Miller & Rose, 2008; O’Malley, 2003; Wacquant, 2009) and the aesthetic (Ghertner, 2010; Wacquant, 2009); (2) Second, building upon a nascent practice in social policy scholarship (Fairbanks, 2004; Fairbanks & Lloyd, 2011), I made use of ethnographic methods as a preferred modality for detailing consequences, the limits, contradictions, and possibilities afforded by the implementation of urban policies in a specified local context. (3) Third, the arguments are in dialogue with Cultural Studies’ interventions into the signifying and representational practices of images and texts as they visually and linguistically traffic in fields of (post)colonial racial discourses (Hall, 1997; Mercer, 1998) and neo-liberal discourses (Goldberg, 2009; Amin, 2009). Moreover, Cultural studies’ visual reading strategies were employed when considering the inter-textual referencing of images with various media sources (television, film,
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A further body of literature drawing from Visual Studies, Post-Colonial Studies and Anthropology of Media approaches to images’ performative qualities (Poole, 1999; Rogoff, 1999; Hirschkind, 2006; Jain, 2007; Larkin, 2008) informed an essential part of the dissertations analysis; (3) Finally, Jacques Ranciere’s 3 principle theoretical concepts – equality, aesthetics, and politics - provided a foundational poetics for re-thinking, rewriting the aesthetics of the work of the social as articulated through the other principles of analysis.

In the concluding few pages, I turn my attention to the specific interventions that this study has forged in social policy and social work scholarship and consider the relevance of these analytical and empirical forays for positioning future policy practice – as analysis, research, and targeted practices with disenfranchised youth living in globalised urban areas. I also make note of analytical shortcomings throughout, arenas of thought for practice that are worthy of future consideration.

**Intervention One:** Principally, this study was about the work of visuality, as a preferred aesthetic register in the exercise of government, and relatedly, an exploration of the structuration of the aesthetic in the everyday work of social policy/social work practices. At a first level intervention, and following the lead of social geographer Asher Ghertner (2010), and the nascent explorations of Loic Wacquant (2009), my research stretches the analytical framework of governmentality studies by suggesting that the deployment of policy programmes and knowledges about differently placed subjects and spaces, hinges to an extent on the ability to evoke “subjunctive imaginaries” (Ghertner, 2010, p, 211) - through storytelling, through the practices of visuality - that might possibly resonate with, and thus reinvigorate a targeted public. As my study revealed, affect and libidinal charges of a racialised unconscious, together with normativised moralism around responsivisa-
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...and productivity are as much implicated in the policy process and proffer policy’s relevance as more mechanically produced, “objective” criteria (Ghertner, p. 211) that are assumed to be at play by the literature. This exploratory probing of the epistemologies of government at work in the local urban geographies of Toronto and more cursorily, Chicago, and at a specific temporal juncture (the nascent ascendancy of welfare governance in Chicago, and the devolution of the welfare state in Toronto and shifts towards globalised neoliberalism) reveal that influential policy actors relied on aesthetic evidence to mobilize public support for intervention strategies geared towards shoring up differences between aspirations (Toronto as the “most envied city in the world”; and for settlement workers, a civic minded nationalism) and perceived shortcomings. In other words, various aesthetic sensibilities – spatial order, cleanliness, broken windows, community safety, creativity, and urban renewal - were liberally drawn upon by acknowledged experts as legitimate criteria to assess and render knowable the operation and conducts of risk and appropriate remedial interventions necessary for transformation. Through case three, however, I made preliminary forays into examining how these normativised standards/sensibilities are vulnerable to disruption and possibly reorientation once staged and experienced in the everyday lives of participants and youth workers living/working in the Jane Finch area of Toronto.

**Practice relevance:** On a practical level, having a more robust, multifaceted understanding of the machinations of power, including the ways in which aesthetic and moral knowledges and practices are being drawn upon by “the state” to further targeted social/economic strategies, challenges those working within social work spaces to be more reflexive about generating counter claims or positing other moral/aesthetic futures. This research also alerts policy practitioners of a
need to be vigilant about the ever-shifting terrain of technologies of governance called forth to craft and mediate the social. That strategizing to re-devise numerically based calculable techniques, and to counter numerically generated evidence with other numbers (whether with statistically generated maps, graphs, charts or “just” numbers) has become commonplace practice in justice-oriented pursuits is to say nothing new to a social work audiences. And yet, as Canadians have witnessed at a recent (2012) level of federal level politics (the Omnibus crime bill -bill C-10; changes to the Immigration and refugee Protection Act – Bill C-31), and as I attempted to illustrate through the three case studies in this study, numerically based assessments, as counter evidence, are being discounted, simply ignored, supplemented, overwritten, or unwittingly juxtaposed with aesthetically and morally referenced knowledges. The result of this wielding of differently based calculative mechanisms, may very well be an unchecked re-assigning of socio-political/economic injustices. As a social justice/caring praxis at this particular historical juncture, social work has, I would suggest, much to consider in terms of its responses to, and reflexive considerations of its collusions with, this evidenced aesthetic turn in the regulatory practices of social governance. Jacques Ranciere’s reflections on the knotting of aesthetics and politics, and his instructive philosophical/writing practices offer one possible analytical route in considering strategic next steps to thinking through this praxis. I return to this proposition in the concluding section.

**Intervention Two:** A second level intervention sought to expand a conceptual framework for critically analysing policy projects deployed to care for, regulate and render intelligible youth subjectivities living in (sub)urban, prioritized neighbourhoods. Thus, rather than focus on youth policy in isolation (in terms of its targeted focus, the theoretical approach(es) embraced by the tar-
geted policy, its desired outcomes), I attempted to contextualise approaches to youth government (and more generally, the governance of racialised, economically disengaged sub/urban communities) as sites of mediation between macro political economies, competing political rationalities, circuits of commodification and everyday practices of youth/youth workers (Kipfer & Petrunia, 2009). The conceptual framework brought together governance literature, conceptual writings on risk and morality, post-colonial readings on the politics of multiculturalism and the limits of liberal tolerance, and an infusion of literature focusing on urban restructuring and the racialised/penal character of western neo-liberal states. At first blush, the very inter-disciplinary nature of the frame allowed us to understand how the case specific, social governance strategies trafficking in contemporary aesthetic domains and targeting socially and economically disenfranchised communities and youth subjects propound the importance of self-responsivisation and community/individual ”empowerment” as a moral imperative, as well as a type of coping mechanism for navigating the tumultuous waters of globalised capitalism and neoliberal governance. Couched in the theoretical languages of risk prevention, resiliency, assets building and engagement (United Way, 2008), these targeted projects envision several projected futures – youth as socially engaged and invested, youth as employable and productive, and youth as risk averse. And yet as I attempted to demonstrate through this more expansive frame, these projects, in addition to being subject focused, are as much reflective of urban restructuring efforts (as positioned within a globalised imaginary and Canadian multicultural sensibility) and efforts at the rescaling of government, as they are tied to welfare retrenchment, tangentially to punitive and racialised carceral politics, and most specifically to the ascendency of market rationality into governance practices.
Practice relevance: Several implications flow from these findings. First, programs that hinge on liberal principles of self reflexivity and “empowerment”, and social engagement through communal/individual responsivisation, might, I would acknowledge, possibly be generative - at least theoretically, and in this specific socio-historic context – for probing the contours of psychical/relational and social limitations and possibilities.(cf Butler, 1999, 2011; Fanon, 1967; Trevelyan, Crath, & Chambon, 2012), and for instantiating community mobilization for resistance/change in how the sensible is organized. And yet, as I have attempted to demonstrate for the specific case studies at least, there is an apparent centrifugal draw towards reorienting subjects and spaces, under the guise of social inclusion and empowerment, in alignment with accommodationist, marketised logics and globalised economic outcomes. That these neoliberal tendencies are geared towards managing disruption and preempting conflict when it occurs (cf Kipfer & Petrunia, 2009; Ranciere, 1999), that they attempt to retool the social around individuals’ self-sufficiency, consumption and ability to maximise profitability, and are highly moralized, serve as reminder of the need to be analytically savvy when projecting the “emancipatory effects” that certain policies will have on youth subjects and disenfranchised communities.

Moreover, and this is my second related point, reading youth empowerment initiatives through a more complex, inter-disciplinary analytical lens alerts a social work readership to the potential perils of identifying civic inclusion/engagement (as, for example, articulated through the United We forwarded by the United Way of Toronto and perhaps, more ambiguously, through the GTP) with a communitarian ethics that discounts anyone who fails to identify with the prescribed social’s identifying markers of responsivisation and market aligned productivity. Such moral-
ism, as Ranciere reminds us, constructs the social such that right to membership (equated with the identifying markers that bind individuals together) is inscribed as an indelible (because morally inscribed) fact. Those that fail to abide by this moral stricture tend towards being discounted as threats to the spirit that is both understood to indwell in the nature of counted subjects and that which manifests between the counted. In this configuration, there is simply, then, no place imagined, no “way out”, except as being rendered radically, morally other (Ranciere, 2010). My dissertation research suggests that this type of knotting between an exclusionary moralism and a carceral, punitive logic is articulating, at least nascently, and ambiguously within the social governance mechanisms operating in Toronto’s racialised/economically disenfranchised neighbourhoods. A future, fertile area of research would be to interrogate to what extent this nascent policing towards discounting certain subjects as having any place in the socius is correlated with changes in the nature of philanthropic funding flows (i.e., the United Way’s pragmatic tying of corporate interest to project management and policy directives) and associated demands for new managerial forms of accountability.

**Intervention Three**²: If a complex analytical assemblage allows insight as to when, and in what ways these proclivities - towards either a discounting of politics’ potential in the name of consensual mediation or a marketised individualism, or a moralism that harnesses the affective states of fear and angst to discount that which is (potentially) threatening to communitarian social order - might be operational within social policy/social work practices, this framing, I would suggest, read in conjunction with Ranciere’s poetic reflections on aesthetics and politics, might very well open up other possible trajectories for what can be thought/done in the governance of the social.
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A third level of intervention was to introduce the work of Jacques Ranciere, and to claim the value of his insights for rethinking Social work’s interventions in knowledge production to inform policy and practice, and in caring for and regulating social subjects. As a means of re-staging this claim and to punctuate key arguments made throughout the dissertation, I end with an example drawn from my fieldwork with the Alexander Park, ArtStarts and Whippersnapper Gallery collaboration funded through the Graffiti Transformation Project.

Six youth living in the Alexander Park community, a public housing project in the heart of downtown Toronto’s Chinatown, together with newly emerging public/community artists Jed B. and Sean Martindale, created a series of “sculptural interventions” in the social geography of the neighbourhood in which youth resided. Entitled Make your Mark on Paradise, the six impermanent sculptural interventions making use of found materials in the community, and one permanent intervention - a community mural, using photographic images, found material and paint to document the weeks of activity making and community members’ interaction with the sculptural forms (fig. 1) – were intended as public response to residents’ mounting anxieties and discontents surrounding the anticipated “revitalization” of their community commencing in 2013 (Jed B., personal communication, 2011).

The one project as event in the life of the programme involved a sculptural intervention graphically emphasizing an act “of vandalism” that had occurred months before to a basketball court in the Park (someone had burrowed in through the fence to gain access to the court locked at night to prevent its use for illegal activities). Taking found pieces of red and blue plastic, the artistic crew fashioned two arms with extended hands, one placed on either side of the opening (figs. 2 and 3).
3). In one sense, the intervention offered a structural solidity, regardless of how impermanent, to a temporally fragile intervention made to gain access to an unsupervised or unsanctioned (and thus, in its neo-liberal guise, unproductive) form of activity. That the youth’s sculptural form marked a disruption that had transpired to a policed visual field (a literal physical incision into a policing of borders and spaces), suggested not only a willingness to engage with a community resident’s discontentment with the processes of social life in the public housing complex, but gestured, in the register of the aesthetic, towards a different way of being together oriented around principles of access and equality. What I find remarkable about the intervention - as metaphor, I would argue, for critical social work dis/engagement - is that the team had participated in a transformation of the fabric of social space such that the very politicized practice of being public, together, was centred around an empty space, a space that recalled both a past foreclosure, its disruption, and a re-inscription as opening towards future capacities and “subjective enunciations” (Ranciere, 2010, p. 142) not yet inscribed.

Paradoxically though, the very same week that the team had crafted their intervention, city councilor Adam Vaughn had been invited by Jed, and one of the youth programme managers at Alexander Park community Centre, to address why the youth’s community was in need of revitalization and to pacify their fears/concerns over possible disruption and dislocation. Vaughn, apart from offering a set of predictable sentiments culled from Toronto’s new deal plea for mixed income neighbourhoods and the revitalization of derelict downtown housing stock, also lauded the youth artists/participants as “Toronto’s future”, arguing that they had a vital role to play, as youth, in re-imagining their revitalized neighbourhood as an engine of Toronto’s globalised economic pros-
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Not only was the constituting of a re-imagined “social” aligned with late-capitalist aspirations and a consensual ethics, but youth’s conscripted involvement, as Toronto’s future, was also inscribed into this operative logic.

As two aspects of the playing out of a policy/programme imperative, one aesthetic intervention, and one an unfolding of the machinations of power and the use of consensual mechanisms to disengage potential dissent, what was being practiced was a re-framing of common experience – as mappings of temporality, as understandings of spatial configuration, and as processes of subjectification and relationality at different scales. In the spirit of Ranciere’s philosophical method “of practicing another way of considering” (Ranciere, as cited in Mechelon, 2004, p. 9), I wish to draw attention to the two events’ “dissociation” from one another. One element of their disassociation lies in the spatiality of the occurrences – the meeting with Adam Vaughn was contained spatially within a designated community meeting space with its abiding principle (for that moment at least) of exercising consensual agreement. The other space, where youth regularly hang-out or pass through, was a place marked by a two-fold disruption to the visual field: as marked by the initial incision in the fence, a challenge to the effectivity of surveillance techniques to wholly monitor the uses of public space in the community; and a disruption to the very ability of the “state” to lay claim to this act of defiance as vandalism (or in aesthetic governance terms – the optics of broken windows to justify revitalization) signified by the sculptural intervention’s “beautifying” (Jed B., personal communications, 2011) and making plural (communal) the initial, individualised act of incision. Moreover, there was a temporal disjuncture between the two events – a non-linear temporality that defied a type of conscientising, reprepresentational logic suggesting causality between either learn-
ing and doing, or seeing, learning and doing (a movement which, as we recall, short-circuits politics by narrowing the field of acceptable outcomes). I would suggest that it is the very act of re-staging these events as writing practice (pace Ranciere), that avows a certain simultaneity of parallel propositions not (necessarily) bearing a correlative relationship with one another. In this instance, one “as if” (the pull towards a normativised status accorded by police logic) and another “as if” (a set of events marked by dissolution of borders and boundaries, and a marking of the very presence of these regulatory techniques) have been brought in tension with one another as a further, and pragmatic disruption to a logic of a prevailing temporal linearity accompanying more managerialist, instrumental approaches to social work/social policy practices. Finally, one can recount a type of disjunctuous unfolding between different forms of subjectivisation: One was rendered through a police order aligning bodies and subjectivities with individual/ community responsivisation, city renewal and global prosperity. Important to note are the ways in which this interpellation seeks to maintain hierarchically de-marcated differences between races and classes; And one consisted of a set of aesthetic propositions that in one sense memorialized a tear in the police order enacted previously, and in another sense, gestured towards an openness of a not yet performed set of subjective interactions and placements in an indeterminate social space.

**Practice relevance:** This reflexive re-calling of a moment that occurred in the workings of the Graffiti Transformation Project, serves as illustration of an ability to write through/ think through social policy and social work practice retrospectively as a first moment of intervention in re-imagining other futures for engagement with youth communities. To be clear, what I am emphasising as “best practice” differs from a current rhetoric of social work futurity that cultivates its authorial
position to harness an imagined future for the social by diagnosing contemporary best practices of regulation and intervention and projecting those assessments into an already positioned future. Indeed, the register of writing and other aesthetic oriented practice interventions (if carried out “ignorantly”), as I have attempted to demonstrate throughout the dissertation and pointedly at the end, via an illustration, challenge a critical attentiveness to the aesthetic dimensions of social policy/social work government as a terrain in which consensual practices and other policing strategies condense and displace divisions onto the body politic, and the very ways in which these very (social) practices might be held in dispute. The practices of writing, in other words, might very well re-jig the framing of our perceptions as to how the social is/can be configured differently, and offer retrospective insight into how the aesthetic manifests in particular instances according to its own rhythms in spite of what is envisaged by policy and its practitioners. This level of attentiveness to the eruption of politics as an enunciation of equality, moreover, further challenges practitioners to approach the limits of knowing about the nature of affective investments that disavow and affirm possibilities highlighted in reflexive engagement (Ranciere, 2010).

A second level of attentiveness focuses on social work practice itself, a challenge really for practitioners to be “sensorially or experientially” (K. Jain, personal communication, 2012) receptive to the textures of dissensus occurring randomly in youth designated spaces and programmes forged along instrumentalist, managerialist governance lines. As illustration of how this might unfold, I wish to recall the signs of disruption that played out during mural making at the Pallisades. To an extent, the youth who claimed a sense of proprietary over the aesthetic configuration of their studio space, were staging a claim about citizenship. – about the right to be present and to garner
a sense of belonging within the space of a pluralist polity. Their demands to memorialise the presence of their deceased friend KD in a mural unapologetically recalled KD’s multifaceted subjectivity – as friend, as recording artist, as gang member – as an inextricable (economic-representational) power/presence/threat in a racialised, economically disenfranchising polity. Moreover, I would suggest that the very act of memorializing a subjectivity/actions of social insubordination (pace Jones, 2005) was directed as much against an assimilationist multiculturalism embraced by youth participants at the Spot, as it was an audacious testament to their unwillingness to abide by the strictures of who and what could count as countable in the social polity. Finally, the rememberance of KD offered representational witness to an ongoing criminalization and economic displacement of racialised (black) male youth in contemporary globalised, urban economies as a contradictory counterweight to youth policy/practice promising economic and social remuneration in exchange for behavioural compliance. I would suggest that this moment of memorialisation and transgression challenge a social work audience to (re) consider the practice/policy parameters set for not only suturing the brokeness created by past and present acts of racialised and classed erasure and segregation, but for creating new modes of consideration for what constitutes a liveable life, the spatial configurations of public/civic space that can make that happen and what the receptiveness to the vocalization of a part that has no part might entail. As such, this incident created a potential template for how social work practice might be realised differently - and I am thinking spatially, representationally and relationally here - in which all of the participants matter in a way that repositions a practice sightline away from a normativising, commodifying and racialising positioning of subjects as surplus in their democratic value (or a subjectivity redeemable only in it’s neo-liberal
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guise), towards one that allows for an intersubjective unfolding of identity, place and belonging in new and surprising ways.

**Concluding sentiment:** As gesture towards future scholarship efforts to reflect on social work’s/social policies’ investments in visuality in relation to the dynamics of affect, and counter-moves that attempt to position perception differently, I offer this proposition as a lesson from Ranciere, and as a lesson from fieldwork: What would it take to re/define social work policy practice as a pragmatic and ethical commitment to routing out and cultivating the points of practices’ intelligibility, and the possibilities for its own creative, and paradoxically “ignorant”, engagements? Implied in this Rancerian lesson is a set of reflexive interactions transpiring at multiple scales – at the site of aesthetic disruption, as an intra-personal strategy and inter-relational engagement with practice problematics, and a commitment to interdisciplinary border crossing as a means of re-invigorating and interrogating what is implied by social services engagement. Moreover, such a proposition, I suggest, would outline a social work/policy knowledge production that is grounded in a three-fold “refracted” praxis: 1) demarcating the policing mechanisms that inhere in the present; 2) memorializing (in writing, through “ignorant” aesthetic interventions) past moments of dissensus; and 3) making an appeal to “the virtual” (a future not yet) (Adkins and Lury, 2009, p. 10). This praxis represents a commitment to reckoning with social problematics as both efforts at policing sociological spaces and subjects (social work’s regulatory function of defining ontological realities), and as an opening up to another “what if”, an ontology as yet to be filled in. Such a process, I would contend, while not being able to procure easy explanations (Adkins and Kurry, 2009; Fraser, 2009), argues for a knowledge building that is restless and generative, one that would alert
us to the contradictory movements of the present and allow us to ask which “realities” do we want to mark as more relevant here, now (Adkins and Lury, 2009, p. 11), and in an anticipated, unrealized future. Being attentive to the different calculative technologies deployed in policy practice - from the aesthetic to the numerical, to the various registers from which these technologies draw (affective, moral, rational) and to the ignorant enunciations that pose impossible questions to a police order, may just vary well induce new vigor into social work’s “emancipatory, caring” aspirations. Or at least, this is a proposition that was entertained in a writing through about selected aesthetic interventions occurring in the space of the social reviewed through the three case studies. Despite prescriptive policy strategies to harness the aesthetic for instrumentalist ends, to exhaust (or synthesis) all that images have to say, the aesthetic works also in its own register. A proposed mural about a cop eating a donut calling attention to current aesthetic techniques of the arch or the desires of certain youth to memorialize on a studio wall a redistribution of the sensible in which a discounted subjectivity was positioned as the whole are aesthetic moments that rent the logic of regulation with other rationalities, other dispositions. And then there was the logic of an opening in a fence, re-membered and memorialised through an intervention making use of recycled red and blue plastic found by the side of a road.
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Details of Methods

(A) Data Generation: To address study aims, three cases were selected for comparative analysis. For the cases, data was generated from 4 sources in addition to that generated through participant observation: (i) documentary evidence; (ii) in-depth semi-structured interviews with key informants; (iii) visual evidence; and (iv) field notes.

(i) Documentary Evidence: As a means of gaining a multidimensional understanding of the two cases, textual based evidence was reviewed including, for Case 1: archival material, newspaper article; public reports (including annual reports and newsletters, documents posted to agency websites, and mission statements of the organization); for Case 2: intra agency memos, consultation guides or reports connected to the campaigns, public reports (including annual reports and newsletters, documents posted to agency websites, and mission statements of the organization); for Case 3: funding proposals and final reports connected to the two projects; public reports (including annual reports and newsletters, documents posted to agency websites, and police and city of Toronto websites); and mission statements.

(ii) In-depth, Open Ended Key Informant Interviews: In depth, open ended interviews (Kvale, 1996) were conducted with a host of individuals involved in various aspects of the production and circulation of mural and youth based “images”. For Case 2, this involved semi-structured conversations with the Creative Director and Marketing Director at the United Way of Toronto, and a telephone interview with David Hulchanski, Director The Cities Centre. For Case 2, this involved formal conversations with the Creative Director and Marketing Director at the United Way of Toronto, The Creative Video Director of the Way out Youth campaign (Mark Zibbert) and the design team at Publicis (the creative marketing firm who sponsored the public service announcement). For Case 3, interviews were conducted with the 2 community artists employed through the GTP; youth programmers and executive directors at the respective programmes; community members volunteering at the Spot, and several paid staff connected to neighbourhood youth serving agencies; city councilors in the two ridings; community police representatives; and a the city bureaucrat responsible for administering the GTP. (Please see below for Interview Guides and for Letters for Informed Consent). Interview guides were employed for each group to “solicit” their “localized” perspectives, interpretations, and intended meanings. To be explicit, discourse produced by interlocutors was not understood as revealing a latent or essential content. Rather, my interest was in thinking through the rhetorical devices drawn upon by those interviewed and the different performative
tactics employed, as a means of revealing contradictions and slippages within their stated intentions about investments and disinvestments in mobilizing certain representations/images (and the rationalities that informed and were informed by these images).

All interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed, and followed the ethics protocols as approved by the University of Toronto’s Ethics Review Board. Key informants were contacted either by telephone, email or in person, and after having been informed of the purposes and intent of the study and after having offered their consent, interview time and place was established. Interviews lasted between 1 to 2 hours and were held at places and times that were mutually agreed upon (coffee shops, people’s offices, food courts). (See below for Letters of Information and Consent).

(iii) Visual Evidence: The central images that were considered for analysis were for Case 1; Photographic Images, maps, and charts first published through Hull House; print video images, maps and charts connected to the Vertical Poverty Campaign (UWT); maps and graphs generated through the cities Centre. Case 2: the videos and print media that accompanied “A Way Out – Youth” Campaign – video, print advertisements for newspapers and magazines, on-line images posted on the United Way website (including press conferences); a series of reports published between 2008 and 2011 produced by the United Way’s Marketing team for funding drives and as Public Service announcements; and the Salvation Army Public Service campaign, 2006-2010. For Case 3, I focused on murals that were produced at the two sites, paintings that were exhibited at the end of term art show (the Spot) and images of the mural process that were posted on the respective agency websites. As a means of contextualizing these images within their local context, other videos/print media associated with the wider campaign (Case 2), together with other murals produced by youth in previous GTPs (Case 3) were included for visual analysis. Further to this interest in reading the aesthetic context at work in the different case sites, I examined other images that circulate: for Case 2) images produced by the United Way that relate to youth (visual mappings of priority neighbourhoods, graphic materials analysing risk behaviours, incidents of poverty etc), Web Site images, images in annual reports, and images/text appearing on the You tube site; and visual references made explicit by key informants (e.g., City of God as referenced in an interview with Mark Zibert (photographer and director) and Sean Cochrane, Crush (special effects) (2008)) and for Case 3, web site images, flyers and posters for the Graffiti Transformation project and other youth programming. As a means of documenting the inter-textual referencing of the
central images, various popular media images (television, film, print-media images imaging risky, racialised, ghettoized youth) that were referenced directly or indirectly by the informants (both those formally interviewed and those with whom I had casual conversations with during field work) were examined along with text or sound that accompanies these images. All visual images were examined with intent of revealing the wider socio-cultural, economic, and political symbolic fields that the images reference or engage with.

(iv) Field notes: As a means of fostering self-reflexivity (specifically in reference to: the terms of my own desires, subjective investments, influences from theoretical readings and informal conversations, ideological and ethical presuppositions or those in formation during the field work experience) (Lather, 1992, Creswell, 2007) and as a means of tracking observations, insights, content from informal conversations with study participants, and provisional conceptualizations, a field note journal was kept throughout the data collection process (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000).

(B) Selection and Recruitment of Participants: Participants for Case Two (the United Way campaign) were drawn from 2 sites – (1) those who are employed directly through the United Way and were involved in the production/circulation of visual images deployed in marketing/funding campaigns and as PSA’s (2) the creative team directly responsible for creating the Way Out Youth campaign Creative team at Marketing firm that designs media campaigns (Publicus Toronto - art director Ken Fothergill and copywriter David Savoie specifically volunteered their time to creating the advertisement); Director and photographer who shot the advertisement (Mark Zibert). A purposeful sampling (Singleton and Straits, 2004) was employed to recruit participants for interviews. UWT Inclusion criteria included: (a) direct participation in the production and institutional support of United Way visual campaigns, involvement in United Way sponsored programming, or direct participation in funding campaigns; (b) ability and willingness to participate in in-depth interviews; (c) ability and willingness to give informed consent.

Participants for Case 3 were recruited from those directly involved with the Spot’s programme and the Art Starts programme (excluding youth participants), and from different “institutions – the police, city bureaucracy and governing council, other youth serving agencies. A purposeful sampling (Singleton and Straits, 2004) was employed to recruit participants for interviews. Inclusion criteria included: (a) direct or tangential participation in the production and institutional support of the two Graffiti Transformation sponsored projects (b) ability and willingness to participate in in-depth interviews; (c) ability and willingness to give informed consent; (d) willingness to be observed in
the production/creation of murals and public art pieces.

Confidentiality is a dilemma given that several of the key subjects of the research are images that have a public identity: The video “A Way out Youth and other associated print media, produced by the United Way of Toronto and Cities Centre circulate in the public domain. Both sets of visual images are “branded” by the respective agencies. Given the public nature of this material, together with the immediate availability of the names and positions of all employees associated with the United Way media campaigns and ArtStart’s/ the Spot’s arts programing, maintaining complete anonymity for research participants would be impossible. Although I did not explicitly name interviewees in the dissertation, given the nature of the branded subject matter, it was impossible not to name the agencies directly. The following steps were taken to mediate these challenges: 1. The purpose of the research is not to critique or judge the rationalities and practices that are mobilised by research participants, nor was I interested in embracing a research epistemology that insist on the truth value of its findings. Rather, I was interested in a wider theoretical exploration (that I argue has direct practice considerations) of what it is about the aesthetic (the assumptions about its political, ethical, economic efficacy; how practitioners operationalise its modalities and what they presume about these actions) that holds such a charge for social services at this particular historical juncture. All participants were made aware of these research aims in the consent process.

2. During the consent process, all potential interviewees were verbally made aware of the impossibility of maintaining complete anonymity of their identities in any future published data, despite the precautions taken of not naming participants explicitly in any published documents. They were reminded that participation is completely voluntary and that if they had any discomfort with the lack of guaranteed confidentiality, they had the right to not participate or to withdraw their participation at any time during the research process.

(C) Data Analysis:

The analysis proceeded iteratively (Chambon, 2007) and was demarcated by the conceptual apparatus detailed in chapters 1 and 2 (again, it must be emphasized that my field research and the process of analysis, was in itself, generative of this conceptual framing). These conceptual frames were complimented by epistemologically compatible methodologies for interpretively approaching textual materials and visual material: (i) Discourse Analysis was employed to examine what
people say (their bodily expressions, their language, the tropes and grammar employed, the feelings, ideologies, beliefs and values that are reference and displayed (Bhuyan, 2008), how they say it (the rhetorical strategies employed, the pauses, interruptions, deflections)(Park, 2006) and a tracking of the context in which the statements are offered (Gubrium and Holstein, 1997; Foster, 2009). This consideration of differing modes of interpretation and meaning making rather than insisting on a coherency of interpretation, opened up an inter-textual play that revealed both patterns and inconsistencies (Lather, 2006). In addition, I followed Park’s (2008) use of Jacques Derrida’s strategy of “double reading” for the analysis of text based materials. This is a close reading strategy that allows for a writing of both formally inscripted intended meanings (the first reading) and a second reading that goes back over itself, retraces the steps of its own logic to bring the aporia (or slippages) that occur in the text (and the act of reading) to attention. The point of deploying the strategy was not to illuminate, but rather to make apparent the irresolvable tensions, and incongruities – the ‘vouloire-dire’ within what the text was saying and what I was saying of the text, despite what it was attempting to perform or claim of itself (its rhetorical promise of delivery) (Derrida, 1981; Culler, 2008; Park, 2008). Moreover, the analysis was attentive to the ways in which meaning was mobilised and enacted across “different social contexts” (DiAngelo cited in Bhuyan, 2008), and the inter-textual references (to genres of film, to print or television media)(Bahktin, 1986; Fairclough, 1992) and the extra-textual events that were referenced to make images and interpretations meaningful (Fairclough, 1992).

(ii) Semiotic Interpretation and Reading for Image Symptom: In addition to accounting for the methodological questions posed about the efficacy of images in their cycles of production, circulation and reception, I also employed analytical strategies loosely adapted from a Social Semiotics approach to reading visual images (Kress & van Leeuwen; 1996; van Leeuwen, 2005). A social semiotic approach allows for the generation of new conceptual insights (Culler, 1985), and permits windows into the ways in which representational systems coalesce around conventions, and socially inscribed moral and behavioural imperatives (Hall, 2009). According to this more sociologically generated rereading of Saussurean linguistic semiotics (Hall 1997), a semiotic system is comprised of a “set of codes” or rules that connect “signs” to each other in a comprehensible and normativising way so as to inform social interaction (a sign is the arbitrary uniting of the concept of what is being referenced or the signified (e.g., the concept of “dog”), and the medium for transmitting this quality or the signifier (e.g., the sound “dog”). Visual modalities are understood to have a complex
relationship to their referent; borrowing from Piercian semiotic formulation (van Leewen, 2005), distinction is made between indexical signification (e.g., a footprint where there is a causal relationship, or trace of a relationship between representational form and referent), symbolic signification (a linkage between referent and its visual representation is established stabilized through social convention; e.g., the Soviet hammer and sickle) and iconic modes of signification (where there is a suggestive or perceived material resemblance that stands in place of the referent – e.g., wisps of white pigment to connote clouds). Importantly, the analysis assumes that semiotic systems are informed through relations of power, and as such play out on both a formal or systemic level (i.e., what is signaled as readily available, mandatory, commonplace, best practice, and how do these modalities get deployed in different social and cultural contexts?) and in more tactical (de Certeau, 1984) or covert ways (i.e., the micro-practices in which these codes are taken up, “bent” out of shape, or re-worked to subvert the normative power that images wield) (van Leeuwen, 2000; 2005). According to this functionalist framing of the work of images, a tremendous amount of social capital is required in order to shift the structuring of such codes, a structuring that aligns the efficacious properties of images to their disciplining and coercive functioning in the realm of the social (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001). The aim of this methodology, in sum, is to consider how social relations operate through visual symbolization and how these “resources” (or codes) are historically generated and recycled, picked up, are inter-textually referenced with other modalities, and used to create representational meaning in specific domains. Attention in the analysis is paid to: (i) images’ representational meaning - places, postures, objects, expressions, gestures located in the visual field are read as standing in for, or act as signs that reference cultural associations, values, meanings, concepts, etc. These signs can be read denotatively (a first layer of meaning corresponding to everyday depiction and what is “matter of fact” (a recording really, of “experiential factuality” that allows for a type of visual framing or referencing of what the producer intended the audience to see), and connotatively (a second layer of meaning condensed or displaced in the image that once deciphered, can reveal the mechanisms that normativise power relations, generate stereotypes and reproduce ideological functioning (Barthes, 1973, 1977). The image is also read for its narrative meaning, with emphasis placed on the dynamic and interactive “social events” taking place within the space of the image. Vectors, as a visual tool to distill “narrative” arcs and flows, are deployed to trace relationships between the subjects of the composition and their relationship to the visual space of the image, the relationship between subjects (and objects), the direction of a gaze, and to
assess body positioning and gesture for indication of passivity, dominance, and agentic behaviour.

Establishing Trustworthiness and Reflexive Accounting for the Generation and Interpretation of the Data: As is appropriate for interpretive strategies (both discourse analysis and semiotic readings of images) and in-line with the chosen conceptual frames through which interpretive findings are framed and understood, several strategies were employed to ensure the credibility of the research process and findings, including the following: prolonged engagement through participant observation, reflexive note taking, in-depth interviews and casual conversations to help gain a more complex understanding of junctures, repetitions, and disruptions that take place in the processes of image production and circulation; analytic triangulation (the use of different analytical/interpretive frames to capture the ethical, moral, economic and aesthetic dimensions of social service trafficking in modes of the aesthetic; data triangulation (utilizing an array of both visual and discursive data collected in the two case studies– please see above) (Blake and Jack, 2008; Padget, 1998); and finally, leaving an audit trail of raw data collected throughout the research initiative to ensure transparency of the various reading engagements. In addition, research findings have received a critical airing with three audiences thus far (as of June, 2012): In April, 2012, I presented some of my findings to a gathering of community artists, city bureaucrats and community agency workers/administrators working involved in the Graffiti Transformation Project. I presented preliminary research findings for Case 1 to two academic audiences in March of 2012, and casually to youth workers at the Spot in April, 2012. A more formal process of revealing findings to partnered agencies will follow throughout the summer months, 2012.

(1a) Interview Guide for In-depth Interview with the creators of the “Give a Way Out – Youth” Campaign (Publicus Toronto - art director Ken Fothergill and copywriter David Savoie; Director and photographer who shot the advertisement - Mark Zibert; Director of Community Impact Committee United Way)

1. Tell me about your experience working with the “Give a Way Out – Youth” campaign?

Prompts:
How did the idea for doing the video and related print media come up?
What was the process for coming up with ideas about content, its style?
What were the campaign’s goals, objectives; what role did you have in defining the creative and content direction?

What messages were you trying to convey; what look, style and genre were you going for and why?

What were your artistic aims? What were your social aims?

Were you thinking of specific visual references (like movies, videos, music videos when you were creating the piece)?

What were the main features of the video that you wanted to have?

Who was the video made for?

How did you caste the characters? What features were you looking for in the youth? Who didn’t make the cut?

How did you decide which of the youth in the back alley would be given a “way out”? And why soccer as the “way out”?

How much did the United Way play in shaping the directions of the campaign? Were your hands free? Were there discussions as you developed the production?

How does this work fit with other works that you have created (i.e similarities and continuities)

After watching the video together:

1. What are your experiences of rewatching the film?
   Prompts:
   Do you see anything in the video that you hadn’t noticed before?
   What do you feel about the youth being represented in the video? What about the central character?
   What emotions came up when you were watching the video?
   What do you think the video tells you about you, the watcher of the video?

2. Do you think the campaign is successful? Why or why not? Would you do things differently? How and in what ways?

(1b) Interview Guide for In-depth Interview with United Way Personnel
1. Can you tell me about the campaign, why it was produced, where it has traveled, and what effects that you think it is having?

Prompts:
How did the idea for doing the video and related print media come up?
What messages were you trying to convey?
How does the video and related print media fit with the current goals/objectives of the United way in its understanding of the most pressing/relevant issues confronting youth (and which youth in particular)?
Who was the video made for?
What values is it conveying? How do you feel about that?

After watching the video together:

1. What are your experiences of rewatching the film?
Prompts:
Do you see anything in the video that you hadn’t noticed before?
What do you feel about the youth being represented in the video? What about the central character?
What emotions came up when you were watching the video?
What do you think the video tells you about you, the watcher of the video?
Were there other visual images that you recalled (like movies, videos, music videos…) when you were watching the video

2. Do you think the campaign is successful? Why or why not? Would you do things differently? How and in what ways?

CASE 3
(2a) Interview Guide for In-depth Interview with Youth Workers and Community Artists at The Spot and ArtStarts; other community groups including bureaucrats, police, politicians, other community agencies.

**Template (questions modified to suit context)**

1. Could you tell me about the work that your agency does with youth?
   Prompts: 
   Does your agency use the words “at risk”, “priority neighbourhoods”. What do these words mean to you?
   To what extent would you say your programming is determined by funders? In what ways? And what ways is it not? Do you think similarly/differently about the issues that concern youth, society?
   What do you think is the reason why your agency does arts/new media based work with youth (objectives/goals)? Can you give examples.
   What is the process for making murals. Are there set “goals and objectives? How are these determined and by whom? What about content? Do you have input into what the youth produce. Are their guidelines?
   What influences do youth draw on to make their murals
   What images of youth does your agency use in its own campaigns, on its websites. Who decides this? Would you choose different images?

2. Do you identify with the community(ies) that you work with? In what ways do you? Don’t you? Ambivalences?

(2b) Interview Guide for In-depth Interview with the youth producers of community murals connected to the Graffiti Transformation Project

1. Tell me about your experiences working on the murals?

Prompts:
How did the idea for doing the mural come up?
How did you come up with ideas about content, its style (a question about process)?
Did you have any goals about what you wanted the video to be about? Were you given direction by workers (what did they say? Did you pay attention to that? Do you think you had freedom to create what you wanted to create??
What messages were you trying to convey; what look, style and genre were you going for and why?
Were you trying to send out a social message (describe)?
Were you thinking of other movies, videos, music videos when you were creating the piece? In what ways?
Who was the mural made for?
How does this work fit with other works that you have created (i.e similarities and continuities)

Do you think the murals are successful? Why or why not? Would you do things differently? How and in what ways?

3. What did you like most about participating in GTP. What didn’t you like?

4. Have your friends, family members seen the work. What do they think?
INFORMATION AND LETTERS OF INFORMED CONSENT (Template)

Study Title: The Aesthetics of Social Work: Tracing image economies of “youth at risk”

Principle Investigator: Rory Crath, PhD Candidate
Factor-Inwentash School of Social Work
University of Toronto
(416) 922-6361
rory.crath@utoronto.ca

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Charmaine Williams
Associate Professor
Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work
University of Toronto

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the “work” of visual images and visually based media produced by social service agencies (either by clients or by the agency) in possibly promoting or inhibiting the social health and wellbeing of disenfranchised youth. Moreover, the study will provide insight into the mechanisms through which social services make sense of and articulate the social health needs of youth subjects and communities deemed at risk, and alternatively how youth clients make sense of their own health needs and the needs of their communities through the creation of their own visual representations.

Participation: If you agree to participate in this study you are asked to critically think about your experience in helping to create the media campaign – Way out Youth. You will be asked to reflect on (a) the process of creating the campaign – what were it’s goals and objectives, what was your participation in helping to define the goals and objectives; (b) the campaign’s content (the messages that you were trying to convey, the look or style, references); (c) what you hoped the campaign
would achieve; (d) what you feel and think about the youth being represented in the campaign; and (e) and how you feel about yourself when you watch the campaign; (f) the successes and failures of the campaign and why. We will be talking about your feelings and attitudes about the campaign. You will also be shown the campaign and asked critically reflect on it. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to sign a consent form, and participate in an interview that will last 1 hour. The interview will be tape recorded and I may make notes in a field notebook. Participation in the interview, together with willingness for your voice to be recorded during the interview will be voluntary, anonymous and confidential. Interviews will take place in a place and at a time specified by the interviewee.

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You are not required to participate. If you decide to participate, you may change your mind at any time, and withdraw at any time. There are no consequences for deciding not to participate, or to withdraw. You may also make a decision to have all or parts of your data (audio recordings or written evaluation) withdrawn at any time without consequence. If you have any questions about the process, or your specific involvement, you may contact us as outlined below.

Confidentiality and anonymity:
All of your responses and contributions in the interview will be completely anonymous in the study. Identifying information shared about your participation in the campaign during the data collection period will be confidential. Your name or any other identifying information will not appear on the transcribed data. Any reports, presentations or papers that would use information that you provide will contain no identifying information and will not use your name. The transcripts of the audio recording will be labeled with a code instead of your name. All audio files will be destroyed after they have been transcribed and verified. Your name and other identifying information will be kept in a locked file at the Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Worker and only will have access to that information. All data stored on the computer will be password protected and encrypted. You may request that your contributions be destroyed at any time. We acknowledge that given the nature of the study, that confidentiality can only be maintained if there is agreement amongst participants to maintain confidentiality about their own responses when in conversation with colleagues and others associated with the campaign.
Potential Risks/Discomforts and Benefits: There are no significant risks or negative consequences anticipated with your participation in this study. There is however, a small chance that during the course of the interview, you might experience mild discomfort that results from new insight or a challenge to previous ways of understanding. If this happens, you have the right to stop or interrupt your participation in the interview, or to have your contributions not recorded. We hope that the interview will provide a space for you to be able to retrospectively reflect on the campaign that you helped design and to think critically about its impact. Further, it is anticipated that the interview might act as a catalyst for further dialogue around these concepts within the agency itself. There may be indirect benefit as well. Information that you offer may help workers and agencies provide better, more informed and reflective service delivery and redesign policies according to these findings. Upon completion of the data analysis, you will receive a copy of the research findings and the researcher will welcome your comments and answer any questions.

I. Contacts and Questions
You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later about the research study and/or your rights, or wish to report any harm or injury as a result of this study, please call Rory Crath at 416.922.6361 or email rory.crath@utoronto.ca If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Director of Health Sciences Ethics Review Officer, Ethics Review Office, University of Toronto, by telephone 416-946-3389

J. Voluntary Nature of the Study
If you decide to participate, you are free to stop participating at any time. There will be no consequences to you withdrawing from the discussion group.

K. Statement of Consent
I have read the above. I know I may leave the study at anytime without any consequences after signing this form. I may choose to stop answering and/or talking in the discussion at any time without any consequences to me. I understand that
My signature below indicates all of the following:

• I am eligible and agree to participate in the study.

______________________________________________    _______________
Signature of participant       Date

Name of Participant:

I confirm that I have explained the purpose and nature of this study and have answered the ques-
tions of research participants before they consent to participate.

Name of investigator       Signature       Date