TRACING THE INVISIBLE BORDERS OF CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP:
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL WORK WITH NONCITIZENS

CHIZURU NOBE-GHELANI

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN SOCIAL WORK
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

February 2019

ABSTRACT

This thesis interrogates the notion of citizenship as a social good through critical analysis of Canadian social work with noncitizens. Drawing on multidisciplinary scholarship—critical border scholarship, Indigenous studies, critical race studies, settler colonial studies, affect theories, and Foucault's notion of power—I consider both the historical and contemporary contexts in which social work with noncitizens has become invested in Canadian citizenship. My thesis addresses the co-constitutive dimension of border and citizenship and proposes the concept of "inner borders" to elucidate the ways in which inclusionary and exclusionary functions at the territorial border are internalized within the nation-state. I theorize social work as a site of inner border making where the boundaries of national membership and belonging are drawn through everyday practices of inclusion and exclusion.

Weaving together interview data with social workers, policy analysis on immigration and citizenship changes, and historical analysis of border making, I conduct three strands of analysis of border making in social work that attend to: (1) entangled histories of the settler colonial project, immigration, and social work; (2) the contemporary context of neoliberalism and its relations to social work with noncitizens; and (3) affective relations involved in social work with noncitizens. My research findings reveal that the discourse of civility is fundamental to border making in Canada. The discourse of civility was foundational to the settler colonial project, which relied on the discursive construction of Indigenous peoples as uncivilized vis-à-vis civilized European settlers. The discourse of civility functioned not only to legitimize the violent land dispossession by Europeans but also as a mechanism to govern the internal lives of members of Canadian society, whereby whiteness, Britishness, and masculinity were defined as the ultimate standard of progress and orderliness. Early social work played a key role in

reproducing the discourse of white civility as it emerged and developed as the professional helper. The examination of contemporary social work with noncitizens reveals that, though different in its expression, the discourse of civility continues to shape the standard script of Canadian citizenship, demarcating the boundaries of national membership and belonging. However, the manner in which the discourse of civility works on, through, and within contemporary social workers is contingent and complex. My study highlights some of the ways in which the discourse of civility operates in constructing the multiple forms of inner borders in social work with noncitizens.

DEDICATION

To my baachan who lovingly raised me

To my love and comedians, Shachin and Ayan, who inject the humour in my life

To mother nature who never fails to inspire me

Matsuoka, who acted as chair at the oral defense and provided me with valuable feedback. I also want to thank her for her ongoing support throughout the PhD program.

Over the years, I was extremely fortunate to gain supportive mentors at York University and beyond. Dr. Susan McGrath was extremely generous in providing me with an incredible research experience at the Centre for Refugee Studies. Thank you for being simply a wonderful person whom I can always count on. Special thanks also go to Dr. Maurice Poon, Dr. Sarah Maiter, Dr. Luanne Good Gingrich, Professor Alina Marquez and Dr. Sasha Bagley for providing me with invaluable support throughout the program.

My lengthy PhD resulted in many tears but also invaluable friendship. My heartfelt thanks go to my thesis twin sister, Anh Ngo. Since the first year of the PhD program, you have shown me what kindness looks like in action. We went through many ups and downs together, even sharing our wonderful supervisor and the experience of motherhood. You are truly a gem and I am so fortunate to have had you on my side in this journey. Although this part of our journey is ending, I hope to share many more joys and struggles for years to come.

I also want to thank other members of our cohort, Dalon Taylor and Nimo Bokore, for creating a warm and caring environment to critically engage with each other. I have learned so much from each one of you. Beyond my cohort, I gained special PhD friends. Marisa Barnhart, thank you for being my de facto counsellor and being so wonderful. Maria Bernard, thank you for always being happy to engage with numerous discussions on Foucault and sharing challenges with parenting. Julia Janes has been an incredible support in every possible way. You are my hero. Jenn Kujath, thank you for your struggle, love and appreciation of the complexity that the world holds. I will always be on that journey with you. Sangyoo Lee, thank you for inspiring me with your strength, kindness and wisdom. I will be cheering you on. Brenda Polar, thank you for

reminding me that the PhD is not a marathon and always being so insightful. Outside the social work program, Johanna Reynold has been my bestie. Thank you for always being there for me whenever I needed a good laugh and someone to vent to.

I want to express my profound gratitude to my friends outside academia. Special thanks go to Jackie Gakumba, and her beautiful daughter, Umi. Jackie, you never cease to amaze me with the patience, generosity and compassion you extend to all the people in your life. I am so lucky to have you in mine. Sincere thanks are due to my dear friend Anahita Azrahimi for being a witness of this journey and not giving up on our friendship; Nancy Dutra for introducing me to the healing energy of music; Amber Prentice for being such a wonderful caregiver to Ayan; and Allie Dennis for being my first mom friend.

I want to thank my wonderful editor, Julie McGonegal, who tirelessly and eagerly worked on this project. I also want to thank Ailsa Bristow for reminding me of the joy of writing. Deep gratitude goes to Suzanne Thompson who gently guided me to accept my PhD journey.

To my family in Japan: It took a long time to finish my doctoral degree, but it is finally done! To my parents Takao and Kotsuru Nobe, thank you for always encouraging me to pursue what I wanted in my life. You've taught me the value of education since I was young, and for that I am very grateful. To my grandma, Hanami Fujita, thank you for raising me with all your love. I will be back to visit you soon. You shall live long. To my brothers, Ryusuke and Takamori, I look forward to hanging out with you when I am back. 博士号を取るのは、たくさん時間がかかりましたが、やっと終わりました。お父さん、お母さん、いつも私のやりたいことを応援してくれてありがとう。教育の大事さは、小さい頃から教えてもらって、感謝しています。ばあちゃん、育ててくれてありがとう。もうすぐ帰ってくるから

ね。長生きしてください。隆介兄ちゃん、隆盛兄ちゃんまた帰ってきた時は、よろしくお願いします。

I want to thank my in-laws Ramila Ghelani, Navin Ghelani, and Amit Ghelani for all their prayers and unending support over the years. A special thank-you goes to my late grandmother-in-law, Santokben Mohanlal Kotecha, who lived 100 years of her life to its fullest. You were a kind soul who welcomed me from day one. Jai Shri Krishuna Baa.

Finally, deepest thanks go to my partner in life, Shachin, and our beautiful, funny son, Ayan. They deserve to be celebrated for this achievement as much as I do. Shachin, from the beginning of this PhD program, you have been my biggest and loudest cheerleader. When things were difficult, you always reminded me that we are in this together. You have never failed to believe in me through the ups and downs. Thank you for being so generously supportive all these years. I am proud that we survived this tough, tough journey together.

Ayan, just as the song goes, you are my sunshine. You came into our life in the midst of the PhD program, and you are the greatest gift we could have ever asked for. Your gorgeous smile, infectious laughter and brilliant silliness have shined a light in even the darkest moments. And it is because of you that I can continue to envision the path towards a world that is caring to all beings. I love you to the moon and back and all around mother earth.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The proliferation of global migration has challenged the notion of citizenship as an ideal form of democratic belonging and inclusion. Yet, our investment in citizenship as a social good remains tenacious and pervasive. This thesis interrogates this investment in the Canadian context, locating social work with noncitizens as an analytical site. I contend that it is through the investment in citizenship that border making has been facilitated in settler colonial Canada. The territorial border emerged out of Indigenous land dispossession and has functioned to filter the different migrant bodies in the pursuit of the settler colonial project. I assert that the border practice is not of the past nor does it simply take place at the territorial edge; it continues to operate in contemporary Canada and is reproduced internally within the Canadian nation-state. I trace the border making processes in the context of settler colonial Canada and theorize social work as a site of inner border making where the boundaries of national membership and belonging are drawn and negotiated via historical and globalized social relations of power.

My research inquiry began with the need to understand how we, as social workers, negotiate and make sense of the contradictions we face in our work with noncitizens. That is, how do we navigate the gap between what we aspire to do (i.e., treat everyone equally regardless of their immigration status) and what we are obligated to do as professional helpers (e.g., work within eligibility criteria, follow organizational protocol, etc.), particularly as we have witnessed growing anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric under the previous federal Conservative government in Canada led by Stephen Harper? As a former community social worker who worked extensively with migrant communities, I struggled with this tension. All the organizations I worked for offered services, albeit in a limited capacity, to everyone regardless of

1

their immigration status. However, the multiple-sourced funding structure complicated the eligibility for different services, which then made it harder to open all the services to noncitizens. Overall funding to community organizations was becoming scarce under the previous Conservative government, which was in power between 2006 and 2015. These circumstances created greater competition for funding, which led to community organizations having to prove the importance of their existence based on the number of eligible service users (i.e., people who have permanent residency or Canadian citizenship). Fewer resources became available to serve noncitizen migrants, not only at the organizations where I was working, but also at other service providers that we were referring our clients to. Sometimes we managed to devise creative solutions to continue the services to noncitizen migrants. Other times, we failed to provide any service at all. When I was placed in the situation of denying or limiting services to noncitizen migrants, I felt trapped and blamed Harper's Conservative government, which was growing increasingly hostile to migrant communities.

After I stopped working professionally with migrant communities to focus on my doctoral studies, I continued to witness ongoing changes in immigration and citizenship policies under the Conservative government. My disappointment and frustration towards these government policies grew in the face of the government's overt anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric. However, my blaming of the government began to concern me once I became familiar with Michel Foucault's notion of power. Foucault (1980) has argued that power is not a property of institutions or domination but a circulation of practices: "the state, for all the omnipotence of its apparatuses, is far from being able to occupy the whole field of actual power relations" (p. 122). Thus, while I had identified the Conservative government as the source of all evil and a target for blame, it was not the only place where power was held. It is in this context that I

expand my analytical gaze to different sites of power relations, namely our own everyday social work practice with noncitizens. I propose that social work with noncitizens provides a rich analytical site to interrogate the investment in Canadian citizenship and what it produces.

Research question

My key research question is this: How are inner borders constituted and sustained in social work with noncitizens? My analysis draws on in-depth interviews with social workers who have worked with noncitizens in the city of Toronto, a historical analysis of border making in Canada, and an analysis of policy documents relating to immigration and citizenship policy changes.

I have taken a multidisciplinary approach to this research inquiry. Weaving together perspectives gleaned from Indigenous, critical race, settler colonial, critical border, affect, and poststructural thoughts, this thesis highlights both the historical and contemporary power relations at play in border making that demarcate the boundaries of national membership and belonging in Canada. Critical border scholarship has enabled me to conceptualize the border as more than just the territorial edge of a sovereign nation-state; it has allowed me to capture the processes and practices that move beyond and within the nation-state in concert with global power relations. Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonialism scholarship shapes my understanding of Canadian citizenship as a colonial and racial construction whose claim of universal inclusion is built on the erasure of Indigenous lands and communities as well as racial violence. Poststructural theories, particularly Foucault's notions of discourse, power, and subject, directed me to methodologically examine how social workers' interview narratives manifest broader power relations as they position themselves as professional helpers for noncitizens. Affective theories expanded my analysis of discursive practice to the affective dimension of

social workers' narratives and allowed me to examine how emotions are also generated through broader power relations. Intertwining these theoretical insights with an analysis of social workers' interview narratives, histories of border making, and immigration and citizenship policies, this thesis challenges the notion of Canadian citizenship as a social good through an analysis of "border making" processes. I trace border making by attending to

(1) the entangled histories of settler colonial projects, immigration, and social work,

(2) the contemporary context of neoliberalism and its impact on social work practice with noncitizens, and

(3) the affective experience of social work with noncitizens.

My research findings reveal that the discourse of civility is constitutive of Canadian citizenship and is fundamental to border making in Canada. The discourse of white civility (Coleman, 2006) was foundational to the settler colonial project, which relied on the discursive construction of Indigenous peoples as uncivilized vis-à-vis civilized European settlers. The discourse of white civility functioned not only to legitimize the violent land dispossession by Europeans but also as a mechanism to govern the internal lives of members of Canadian society, whereby whiteness, Britishness, and masculinity were defined as the ultimate standard of progress and orderliness (Coleman, 2006). Early social work played a key role in reproducing the discourse of white civility as it emerged and developed as the professional helper. The examination of contemporary social work with noncitizens reveals that, though different in its expression, the discourse of civility continues to shape the standard script of Canadian citizenship, demarcating the boundaries of national membership and belonging. However, the manner in which the discourse of civility works on, through, and within contemporary social workers is contingent

4

and complex. My study highlights some of the ways in which the discourse of civility operates in constructing the multiple forms of inner borders in social work with noncitizens.

Defining key terms: Inner borders, noncitizens, civility, settler-citizen, Indigenous peoples and Turtle Island

For the purpose of introduction, I provide a brief explanation of the key terms I utilize in this thesis. These terms will be elaborated in subsequent chapters when and where it is appropriate.

Inner borders

Drawing on critical border scholarship that reconceptualizes borders as processes and multidimensional rather than as static and neutral lines that divide international territories on a map (Balibar, 2002; Bauder, 2011; Johnson et al., 2011; Parker et al., 2009), I propose the concept of "inner borders" to elucidate the ways in which inclusionary and exclusionary functions at the territorial border are internalized within the nation-state. I contend that territorial bordering practices operate through historical and globalized power relations, and these power relations continue to operate within the nation-state, demarcating national membership and belonging. In other words, the border follows migrants even after they cross the territorial edge of the nation-state (Balibar, 2002; Khosravi, 2007). Migrants are differently included in and excluded from the sphere of Canadian citizenship within the nation-state, in the same manner that they are filtered at the territorial border. Furthermore, inner borders are reproduced and sustained within the nation-state at multiple sites. Social work, despite its commitment to human rights, social justice, anti-oppressive practice, and its oppositional stance to anti-immigrant and refugee rhetoric, is one such inner border-making site. This thesis highlight different ways in which inner borders are reproduced and sustained at the site of social work with noncitizens.

Noncitizens

While "noncitizens" may appear to be an uncontested term meaning "those who are not citizens," there exists a serious challenge in this definition, which I explicate in chapter 3. For the purpose of this introductory chapter, I offer a simple explanation of what I mean by "noncitizens". My use of "noncitizens" carries both empirical and theoretical significance. Empirically, "noncitizens" refer to migrants who lack the full immigration status that would allow them to stay permanently in the country of their residence (i.e., permanent residency or citizenship status). In Canada, these individuals include those who are considered legal (e.g., refugee claimants waiting for a decision, temporary workers), illegal (e.g., rejected claimants, expired visa holders), or undocumented (e.g., people without identity documents).

I also use "noncitizens" theoretically to indicate a figure who is produced via social relations of power. As Nail (2015) puts it, "a figure is not a fixed identity or specific person but a mobile social position. One becomes a figure when one occupies this position. One may occupy this position to different degrees, at different times, and in different circumstances. But there is nothing essential about a person that makes the person this figure… A figure is a social vector or tendency" (p. 16).

Conceptualizing a noncitizen as a figure is particularly useful given the fluid, multiple, and complex social relations that produce "noncitizens". It enables me to attend to the diverse discursive, material, and affective work at play in constituting the "noncitizen" vis-à-vis the term "citizen". In this way, a "noncitizen" is not determined merely by their lack of legal membership in the Canadian nation-state but is constituted through the particular script of Canadian citizenship. By employing both the empirical and theoretical significance of "noncitizen," this thesis aims to elucidate how social work with noncitizens becomes a micro-operational site of

inner border making, where the boundaries of national membership and belonging are drawn and negotiated via globalized social relations of power.

Civility

Etymologically speaking, the term "civility" originates from the French word *civilité*, meaning "status of citizen" and Latin word *cīvīlitāt-* or *cīvīlitās*, meaning "relating to citizens" (Oxford English Dictionary Online, 2018.). The linkage between civility and citizen subject is carried on in contemporary usage. The Oxford English Dictionary (2018) lists the definitions of civility as "the position or status of being a citizen", "civil order, orderliness in a state or region", and "good citizenship." In this way, the concept of civility is often collapsed within an idealized characterization of citizenship. In other words, civility becomes synonymous with a standardizing ideal for good citizens. In his discussion of "white civility," Coleman (2016) contends that whiteness came to be tethered to notions of civility as Canada established itself as a sovereign nation-state. This linkage between whiteness and civility has been confirmed and normalized via various discursive and material practices historically, exalting the white subject as "the citizen" (Thobani, 2007). Although I rely heavily on Coleman's concept of "white civility", my research extends his work and concept in that I elucidate how the historically produced discourse of white civility continues on and intersects with other emerging discourses in Canadian border making, particularly in the context of social work with noncitizens. I show that the discourse of civility informs a particular script of Canadian citizenship that shapes the boundaries of national membership and belonging.

Settler-citizens

I propose the concept of "settler-citizens" to indicate the settler coloniality embedded in Canadian citizen subject. As Indigenous, settler colonial and critical race scholars

have argued, Canadian citizenship is a colonial construction, which is premised on the erasure of Indigenous lands and communities (Alfred & Tomkins, 2010; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Mackey, 2002; Sharma

, 2006; Simpson, 2014; Thobani, 2000, 2007; Walia, 2010). I propose that the Canadian citizen subject is constituted by and constitutive of the settler colonial project, and social work has been a key player in producing a settler-citizen subject as the field has emerged and developed as professional helper. Linking with the concept of civility I introduced earlier, I further contend that the discourse of white civility was fundamental to the production of the settler-citizen subject.

Indigenous peoples

In this thesis, "Indigenous peoples" refer to First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples who are original inhabitants of the land now known as Canada. Indigenous peoples have been historically constructed as uncivilized vis-à-vis civilized European settlers. I understand that my use of "Indigenous" can be homogenizing as there exists vast differences within these communities. However, addressing the diversity among Indigenous peoples and different ways in which they have been treated by the settlers and the Canadian government are beyond the scope of this study. Keeping in mind its limitation, I opt to use Indigenous peoples for this thesis.

Turtle Island

Turtle Island is a term used by many Indigenous communities, particularly by Anishinaabe when referring to North America (Lavallée & Poole, 2010). I use "Turtle Island" when I want to emphasize the Indigeneity of the land, while I use "Canada" when I highlight the coloniality of the land. Given that the focus of this study is an analysis of the colonial and racial

construction of Canadian citizenship, I primarily use the term "Canada" in referring to Turtle Island.

Context: Global migration, changing immigration and citizenship policies, and production of noncitizens

Over 20 years ago, Giorgio Agamben stated, "The novelty of our era, which threatens the very foundations of the nation-state, is that growing portions of humanity can no longer be represented within it" (Agamben, 1995, p. 115). This situation is more prevalent today. Indeed, the past few decades have been characterized by significant increases in global migration. In 2017, the United Nations estimated that approximately 258 million people live outside their country of birth, up from 220 million in 2010 and 173 million in 2000 (United Nations, 2017). Globally, the number of people who were forcibly displaced increased by more than 50% in the span of five years, totalling 65.6 million people by the end of 2016 (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2017). There are 150.3 million migrant workers worldwide according to estimates in a 2015 report by the International Labour Organization. A significant increase in global migration has demythologized the classic national–state–territorial trilogy as the natural social and political form of the contemporary world (Brambilla, Laine, Scott, & Bocchi, 2015); accordingly, there has emerged a critical question of how to envision membership, rights, and belonging beyond national borders.

In their influential work *Age of Migration*, Castles and Miller (2009) suggest that while the phenomenon of migration has been a constant throughout human history, contemporary migration has taken on new meaning owing to its global scope, centrality to domestic and international politics, and considerable economic and social consequences. Scholars have examined the proliferation of global migration and provided a variety of explanations.

Conventionally, migration is explained from a functionalist perspective: people are inherently attracted to better material conditions (Simmons, 2010). The classic push–pull theories (people are pushed out by economic hardship and pulled in by economic opportunity) and neoclassical theories (higher wages attract migrants from regions where wages are low) are examples of the functionalist view of migration (Castles & Miller, 2009). Critics of the functionalist perspective on migration have argued that individual motivation and desire to pursue better material conditions do not explain how broader historical and structural conditions have led to migration (Castles & Miller, 2009; Simmons, 2010). Several critical scholars have probed how the interdependent forces of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism have created complex conditions that advance mass displacement and migration across the world (Stasiulis & Bakan, 2005; Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013; Thobani, 2007; Walia, 2010, 2013). The legacy of colonialism laid the conditions for political instability, which then led to armed conflicts causing mass migration from the global South (Walia, 2010, 2013). Contemporary Western military imperialism in the Middle East and North Africa has escalated the number of armed conflicts, resulting in migration flows. Capitalism, in classical and contemporary form, destroys land-based subsistence cultures based on a model of private property, production for profit, waged labour and private ownership of the means of production and distribution (Walia, 2013). During the time of Industrial Revolution in late eighteenth-century England, the farmers were displaced from their farmlands and forced to migrate to cities and work for wages in growing privately owned industries (Walia, 2013). Contemporary globalized capitalism intensifies these processes of dispossession and impoverishment for the majority of the world's populations through transnationalization of capital, products, labour and governance, while producing a transnational class of capitalists who own the majority of the world's wealth (Walia, 2013).

Global capitalism is sustained through Western-led global governance, which induces migration flow. For example, the structural adjustment programs imposed by international organizations (i.e., the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund) have led to an alarming growth in unemployment, underemployment, consumer prices, and disparities in wealth in the global South (Stasiulis & Bakan, 2005). Multilateral agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) have functioned similarly. For example, NAFTA created the conditions that led small-scale corn and pig farmers in Mexico to lose their business because of massive imports from the United States (Walia, 2013). Consequently, the Mexican farmers were forced to seek employment away from their homes, sometimes away from their country of origin. These Western-led economic policies have had a significant impact on the migration flow from the global South to the global North.

Despite their involvement in driving displacement and migration, governments in the global North have implemented a wide range of border control measures. Since 9/11, global security discourse has led to the militarization of borders, stricter surveillance along border regions, and biometric border control at the territorial border (Reynolds & Hyndman, 2015). Bilateral agreements, such as the Safe Third Country Agreement between the United States and Canada, have also effectively closed the border to asylum seekers. Border control also takes place beyond the territorial border, such as at the visa office or airport counter of the transit country. Within the nation-state, the use of detention and deportation has become normalized as tools to deter unwanted migrants (Goldering & Landlot, 2013; Silverman 2014)

The contemporary border control regime functions not simply to deter unwanted migrants, but also to differentially include wanted migrant labourers. Many governments in the global North have resurrected temporary worker programs and revamped visa and entry criteria

as a way to manage migration in general and restrict permanent immigration (Goldering &

Landolt, 2013). Temporary worker authorization is also used to determine the suitability of

potential immigrants for longer term employment and settlement. Goldering and Landolt (2103)

contend that the temporary entrance categories offer a solution to the challenges of limiting

citizenship and controlling migration.

The temporary workers program is set up in a way that takes advantage of the inequality

produced via global capitalism. It fulfills the labour needs of the global North for less cost.

Many migrants from the global South seek employment opportunities through temporary

workers programs in the global North because they struggle to make ends meet in their countries

of origin. For example, many participants in the Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Workers

Program (SAWP), who spend eight months a year working in Canadian farms, lost their jobs in

agricultural sectors largely due to Western-led economic policies such as NAFTA and structural

adjustment programs. Every year, about 30,000 agricultural workers come to different farming

communities across Canada from rural areas in Mexico and the Caribbean (Hennebry, 2008).

The SWAP is structured in a way that keeps the workers "permanently temporary" as it does not

allow the participants to pursue permanent residency in Canada, even though many participants

return to the same communities year after year, sometimes for more than 25 years (Hennebry,

2008).

Canada's Caregiver Program[1] is another example of how the governments in the global

North, including the Canadian government, take advantage of inequality produced by Western-

led policies to fulfill their labour needs. The largest sourcing country of Canada's Caregiver

---

[1] The Caregiver Program is previously known as the Live-in Caregiver Program. The name of
the program was changed to the Caregiver Program after the federal government removed the
requirement to "live-in" in 2014.

Program participants, the Philippines, for example, has been affected by the structural adjustment programs that led to growing unemployment. In response, the Philippines has adopted a labour export policy since the mid 1970s, and exporting labour has become a way for the Philippines not only to address unemployment but also to generate oversea remittances to pay down debts (Stasiulis & Bakan, 2005). On the Canadian side, the Caregiver Program is meant to address the labour shortage in caregiving labour, without creating the policies and programs for affordable childcare, elderly care and care for high medical need individuals. Though the participants in the Caregiver Program can apply for permanent residency after two years, the new changes in the Caregiver Program in 2014 has made it difficult for the participants to transition to permanent residency by imposing new language and licensing requirements and a quote for the number of permanent residency spots given each year (Tungohan, 2016). In addition, due to the fact that the work permit is tied to the employer, the Caregiver Program creates precarious conditions in which participants must face a significant power imbalance between themselves and their employers. In this way, the inequality created by global capitalism (which prompted many migrants to leave their birthplace) is reproduced internally in the countries they migrate to through temporary foreign workers programs such as the Seasonal Agricultural Program and the Caregiver Program.

The immigration and citizenship policy changes that took place between 2008 and 2015 are reflective of the ways in which the Canadian immigration regime facilitates global inequality. In 2008, the Conservative government began to introduce numerous changes to federal immigration and citizenship policies, reflecting the global tendency to control migration and limit permanent immigration status through the convergence of restrictive migration and citizenship policies. The details of these policy changes will be discussed in chapter 5, but for the

purpose of this introductory chapter, I include a brief overview here. Under the leadership of

Stephen Harper, the Conservative government (2006–2015) approved Bill C-50 in 2008, which

included a series of amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA, 2001).

Most notably, Bill C-50 granted legislative authority to Canada's Minister of Citizenship and

Immigration to issue instructions establishing priorities for the categories of applications that

would be processed (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2008). More specifically, the Minister

was granted sole discretion to limit the number of applications processed, accelerate some

applications or groups of applications, and return applications without processing them with

regards to the economic migration program and the Parents and Grandparents Sponsorship

Program (Alboim & Cohl, 2012). The Budget Implementation Act of 2012 (Bill C-31) further

gave the Minister the authority to issue ministerial instructions to other areas of the immigration

system, such as family sponsorship applications, permanent and temporary resident applications,

and applications for work permits and study permits (Alboim & Cohl, 2012). This increase in the

Minister's authority expedited the process of making policy changes in the immigration and

citizenship system. Consequently, the Conservative government introduced changes that affected

all three streams of immigration (economic, family class, and humanitarian), the rule for

obtaining citizenship, and temporary entry as a foreign worker, international student, or visitor

(Alboim & Cohl, 2012).[2]

The effects of immigration changes under the Conservative government can be observed

in statistics. While economic immigrants have accounted for the majority of immigration

populations since the mid 1990s, the number of persons admitted under economic immigration

---

[2] Some immigration and citizenship policies from the Conservative era have been repealed by the current Liberal government. For example, the measure of Conditional Permanent Residency was repealed in April 2017.

grew steadily during the Conservative era, reaching 66.6% in 2010, while the number of persons admitted under the family class and humanitarian category decreased, going down to 21.5% and 8.8%, respectively, in 2010 (Statistics Canada, 2015). Among the numerical changes under the Conservative government, the most notable is the growth in the number of non-permanent residents. It almost doubled between 2006 and 2014 from 428,645 to 799, 305 (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2015). Among non-permanent residents are temporary foreign workers, international students, refugee claimants, and Ministerial permit holders. At the turn of the twenty-first century, temporary foreign workers, international students and refugee claimants each accounted for about a third of all non-permanent residents. However, the number of persons admitted under the work category grew rapidly in subsequent years, reaching 58% in 2012, while the number of refugee claimants decreased significantly to 14% in 2012 (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2015). While the numbers do not project the whole picture of immigration policy changes under the Conservative government, they provide a glimpse of what the policy changes attempted to achieve and how they affected migrant populations differently.

Scholars and advocacy groups have criticized many aspects of these policy changes, including the emphasis on short-term labour market needs, the lack of evidence-based policies, the retreat from traditional democratic processes, and the creation of a less welcoming environment for immigrants and refugees (Alboim & Cohl, 2012; Canadian Association for Refugee Lawyers, n.d.; Canadian Council for Refugees, 2008; Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants, 2011). As I discuss in chapter 5, a key characteristic of the Conservative government's policy changes was the creation of several forms of exclusion within Canada's national borders. New policies have created an increasingly complex system of stratification, with differential access to civil, economic, and social rights that are dependent on a person's

mode of entry, economic status, and country of origin (Alboim & Cohl, 2012; Bhuyan, Osborne,

Zahraei, & Tarshis, 2014; Goldring & Landolt, 2013). Consequently, an increasing number of

noncitizens are living with precarious legal status (Goldring, Berinstein, & Bernhard, 2007;

Goldring & Landolt, 2013). Noncitizens face numerous challenges and barriers in accessing

critical services such as health care, public education, social services, housing, and employment

insurance (Berinstein, Nyers, & Wright, 2008; Goldring, Berinstein, & Bernhard, 2009; Nyers,

2008, 2010; Sidhu, 2013; Solidarity City Network, 2013).

Moreover, a growing number of noncitizens were subjected to detention during the

Conservative era. With the introduction of Bill C-31, the Protecting Canada's Immigration

System Act, the Canadian government formalized its use of mandatory immigration detention

(Silverman, 2014). Under C-31, the Minister of Public Safety may designate a group of migrants

(i.e. two or more) as "irregular arrivals" if they are suspected of participation in human

smuggling or trafficking or criminal organization and "terrorist" groups. If they are deemed as

"irregular arrivals", they are mandated to serve a one-year period of detention. After they are

released from detention, they must wait five years to apply for permanent residency, even if they

are deemed as persons in need of protection by the Immigration and Refugee Board (Silverman,

2014). The migrants are held in detention in dire conditions; there is no limit to the length of

time people can spend in immigration detention; approximately one third of immigration

detainees are held in prison; migrants with psychosocial disabilities or mental health conditions

can be placed in immigration detention centres or maximum-security provincial jails where they

may have little access to treatment, and there is no formal mechanism for immigration detainees

to lodge complaints (Global Detention Project, 2018). According to No One is Illegal -

Vancouver Coast Salish Territories (n.d.), the Canadian government detained 87,317 migrants

without charges between 2006 and 2014. The use of deportation also became more prevalent during the Conservative era. The number of migrants removed from Canada grew steadily from 12,617 in 2006 to 18,921 in 2012 (Canadian Border Services Agency, 2008, 2014).

The exact number of noncitizens who live without full immigration status is extremely hard to estimate for many reasons, including changes in immigration status over time, the lack of data on noncitizens leaving Canada, and the lack of data on noncitizens living with no immigration status (e.g., undocumented migrants, expired visa). The most recent data from Statistics Canada (Government of Canada, 2018) states that there are 973,826 nonpermanent residents as of 2018. This number does not account for people without any legal status. Some studies have indicated that there are between 200,000 and 500,000 people living in Canada without any legal status (Hudson, Atak, Manocchi, & Hannan, 2017; Berinstein, Nyers, & Wright, 2008; Goldring, Berinstein, & Bernhard, 2007; Sidhu, 2013; Solidarity City Network, 2013). Despite not having an accurate count of noncitizens in Canada, what is clear from the research is that a growing number of people have limited access to rights and entitlements in this country. Accordingly, social workers are faced with the challenge of how to navigate and make sense of an overdetermined power imbalance structured through the nation-state framework.

Relevance of this research

Despite the development of an international human rights system, noncitizens worldwide face challenges and discrimination precisely because of their legal status (Goldring & Landolt, 2013). Indeed, despite the suggestions made by postnation advocates such as Soysal (1994) and Benhabib (2004), a comprehensive human rights system of entitlements that transcends the model of citizenship premised on the sovereignty of the nation-state has not been actualized. On the contrary, recent trends in migration control worldwide suggest that national citizenship

remains the predominant rights-mediating institution, and nation-states continue to play a key role in determining the deservingness of rights and entitlements.

Marginalization based on immigration status is often normalized because noncitizens are always and already imagined as figures outside the boundaries of national membership and belonging. The normalization of marginalization based on immigration and citizenship status is also prevalent in social work. Unlike other social relations of power, such as race, class, gender, sexual orientation, (dis)ability, etc., the issue of immigration and citizenship status is rarely talked about when considering social hierarchies. While social work with noncitizens may seem as though it matters only to those who work in the immigration and settlement sectors, social workers encounter noncitizens in many different arenas that intersect with social work, including in health, education, mental health, and child welfare. For example, the case of 24-year-old Abdoul Abdi speaks to how social workers in child welfare become implicated in pushing noncitizens into great precarity. Abdi, originally from Somalia, came to Canada at the age of six, along with his sister and aunts. Soon after his arrival, he was placed in foster care by the Nova Scotia Department of Community Service. Abdi was moved through numerous foster care placements, during which time no one applied for his Canadian citizenship. The lack of Canadian citizenship status had a detrimental effect on him as he pleaded guilty to criminal charges in 2014; he was deemed inadmissible to Canada according to Bill C-43: the Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act of 2013. (I will discuss this bill in more detail in Chapter 5). Though the federal government eventually dropped the case to deport Abdi in July 2018, this case sheds light on how the child welfare system and social workers not only failed to address the needs of noncitizens but also became complicit in the possible deportation of noncitizens (Williams, 2018).

The lack of awareness of conditions surrounding noncitizens was reiterated by one of the participants who works in child welfare: "Honestly, I do not even know who is a citizen or not, until the immigration status becomes an issue. There is a section for immigration status for intake form, but most of the time, it is not even filled out. I guess we sort of assume that everyone is the same (in terms of legal status)? I mean, we are all here, right?" As Abdi's case demonstrates, this assumption or lack of understanding about immigration and citizenship issues can have a significant effect on noncitizens.

Indeed, despite the proliferation of global migration in recent years, few studies in the social work literature directly address issues concerning noncitizens. Consequently, when social workers on the ground face challenges and contradictions in their work with noncitizens, they have little understanding of how their everyday social work practice is constituted by and constitutive of broader social relations of power. This lack of understanding also leads to the under-theorization of how and if we, as social workers, can resist our complicity in reproducing the settler colonialist, racialized, neoliberalist script of Canadian citizenship.

The lack of attention paid to noncitizens in social work scholarship can be attributed to social work's tendency to think of the nation-state as the natural sovereign entity for recognition and redistribution of rights. I concur with Kumsa (2015), who addresses social work's tendency to adhere to the nation-state framework: "[s]ocial work hangs on to the skirt of its birth mother, the nation-state, and follows her as she follows market interests and roves through the world… Social work needs to wean itself from its mother's breast and chart its own paths within and beyond the nation-state" (p. 161). The implications of social work's reliance on the nation-state framework are: (1) the continued invisibility of the marginalization and inequality affecting

noncitizens; (2) the legitimization of the nation-state as a reference point for addressing injustice; and (3) the erasure of colonial and racial histories that underlie the nation-state framework.

This thesis challenges the coherence and legitimacy of Canadian citizenship structured via the nation-state framework. I invite a critical inquiry of how we think about membership, rights, and belonging beyond the national border as we witness the tensions and convergence between global migration flows and nation-state sovereignty. This question has implications not only for social work but also for broader social justice movements and social policy.

Organization of chapters

My thesis is organized into seven chapters. This introductory chapter has contextualized the study and provided a brief discussion of its main theoretical concerns and significance for social work.

In chapter 2, I present the theoretical entry points of this research inquiry. I begin by discussing the conventional way of understanding citizenship as democratic inclusion and belonging. Drawing on Indigenous, settler colonial, and critical race scholarship, I critique this conception and propose to reframe Canadian citizenship as intimately related to the civilizing project of settler colonialism that simultaneously erases Indigenous peoples and disciplines the racialized Other. I bring in critical border scholarship to consider the proliferation of border-crossing activities and explore the possibilities for extending the settler colonial and critical race analysis of Canadian citizenship. Drawing on literature that reconceptualizes the border as more than the territorial edge of the nation-state, this study situates social work as a micro-operational site of border making, where the boundaries of national membership and belonging are drawn and negotiated via historical and globalized relations of power.

Chapter 3 discusses this study's research methodology. I discuss how I adopted Foucauldian discourse analysis. I then describe the research design—in-depth interviews, historical analysis, and analysis of policy documents. I elaborate on the practical steps I took and some of the challenges I faced during the research inquiry.

Chapter 4 historicizes social work's investment in Canadian citizenship and its role in border making. I begin by grounding the border as a colonial construction that shapes not only the territorial edge of the Canadian nation-state but also the inner boundaries of national membership and belonging. Attending to the entangled histories of settler colonialism, immigration, and social work, I trace the historical making and remaking of Canada's national borders. Drawing on the existing literature, I attend to the historical events and policy developments related to border making and elucidate how the logic and practices of territorial border making extend into internal activities such as those in the field of social work. I assert that the key to Canadian border making is the discourse of white civility (Coleman, 2006). As social work developed itself into a field for the professional helper, it played a key role in preserving and fostering the borders of white civility to nurture settler-citizens who embody the settler-colonial logic and spirit. Although by no means a complete account of Canadian border history, this chapter historicizes the contemporary construction of Canadian citizenship as being grounded on the dispossession and erasure of Indigenous lands, people, and culture and provides a historical context demonstrating how contemporary social work with noncitizens continues to be a site of inner border making.

Chapters 5 and 6 provide an analysis of contemporary social work with noncitizens. In chapter 5, I examine the changing nature of the border and its relationship to social work with noncitizens in a neoliberal era. I begin by locating the changing nature of the contemporary

border within the historical continuum of settler colonialism. I suggest that the contemporary Canadian border facilitates both global capitalism and settler colonialism by differentially including migrant bodies according to neoliberal rationality. After highlighting contemporary changes in the nature of the border, I further discuss the features of neoliberalism and how it intersects with the historical discourse of white civility, producing new expressions of civility in the contemporary era. Drawing on the existing literature, policy analysis, and interview narratives, I examine how inner borders are drawn via neoliberal restructuring of the welfare system, complex intergovernmental arrangements of social rights, and immigration and citizenship policy changes. I then move on to the micro-production of border making and examine how the changing nature of the national border is manifested in everyday social work with noncitizens. I attend to how social workers negotiate and make sense of the challenges they face under the neoliberal restructuring of the immigration and citizenship system. To make sense of exclusionary and inclusionary practices towards noncitizens as they struggle to navigate a highly complex immigration system and funding structure, as well as the effects of neoliberalism in the social worker's place of work, I demonstrate some of the ways in which the discourse of neoliberalism works on, through, and within social workers. I demonstrate how social workers reproduce neoliberal logic even as they critique it, which obscures and conceals their own complicity in the inner border making of the Canadian nation-state.

In chapter 6 I address the affective experience of social work with noncitizens. I examine how the inner borders that shape the boundaries of Canadian citizenship are invisibilized and sustained through emotion, particularly through the feeling of empathy. Drawing on critical theories of affect and emotions, I conceptualize empathic expressions of social workers as the prevailing site where we can witness the working of historical and globalized social relations. I

contend that empathic feelings invisiblize the inner borders embedded in social work with

noncitizens and function to sustain the morality and innocence of social work and the Canadian

nation-state. To support this argument, I present data from interviews, attending to various

historical lines of empathic feeling of differently positioned social workers. I trace the concrete

ways in which the feeling of empathy circulates and "sticks" as we navigate through

exclusionary practices towards noncitizens. I interrogate how pain and suffering become a

central discursive practice in social work with noncitizens and how these discursive practices

function to position the social work subject and Canadian nation-state as the site of innocence

and morality. While social workers imagine empathy to be integral to minimizing the unequal

power relations embedded in social work with noncitizens, these empathic feelings become a

blinder to our complicity in inner border making within the Canadian nation-state.

The concluding chapter provides a summary of this thesis and my reflections. I discuss

the key learnings from this study and implications for social work education and practice. I also

discuss some of the limitations of this study and close by "speaking" to the participants.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL ENTRY POINTS—RETHINKING CITIZENSHIP AND BORDERS AND SITUATING SOCIAL WORK AS A SITE OF INNER BORDER MAKING

Introduction

The modern order of citizenship—in which population is divided and distributed between territories and sovereigns, and in which rights depend mostly on national membership within territorial polities—does not reproduce itself naturally. (Walters, 2002, p. 288)

Sometimes noisily and sometimes sneakily, borders have changed place. Whereas traditionally, and in conformity with both their juridical definition and 'cartographical' representation as incorporated in national memory, they should be at the edge of the territory, marking the point where it ends, it seems that borders and the institutional practices corresponding to them have been transported into the middle of political space. (Balibar, 2009, p. 109)

I begin with these two quotations about citizenship and borders to signal the theoretical entry points of this thesis. Drawing on William Walters' articulation that the modern order of citizenship does not reproduce itself naturally and Étienne Balibar's (2009) assertion that borders play a central political function, I undertake to denaturalize citizenship and borders as static entities and examine how they are co-constituted and function in the everyday micro-practice of social work with noncitizens. As Bosniak (2006) argues, the automatic correspondence commonly presumed between citizenship and the nation-state is unfounded: "Citizenship's intimate relationship to the nation-state is not intrinsic but contingent and historical" (p. 5).

Accordingly, it is important to examine the processes in which citizenship becomes coupled with the nation-state framework. Informed by Indigenous, critical race, settler colonial, and critical border scholarship, I examine the process by which citizenship in Canada is intimately related to the civilizing project of settler colonialism that simultaneously erases Indigenous peoples and disciplines the racialized Other. Further, I examine how the discourse of white civility has played a key role in settler colonialism, not only in the violent dispossession of land but also as a mechanism to govern the internal lives of Canadians. Weaving together Indigenous, critical race, settler colonialism, and critical border scholarship, this thesis highlights both the historical and contemporary power relations at play in border making that demarcate the boundaries of membership and belonging in Canada.

Before I continue, I must clarify my naming of different academic disciplines and scholarship, particularly that of Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial scholarship. Considering the point made by Lawrence and Dua (2005) that anti-racist scholarship has often failed to attend to the experiences of Indigenous dispossession in its theorization, as well as Kauanui's (2016) assertion that "[S]ettler Colonial Studies does not, should not, and cannot replace Indigenous Studies" (para. 4), I understand Indigenous studies, critical race studies, and settler colonial studies to be interrelated but distinct sets of scholarship. Indigenous studies centre the question of indigeneity, focusing on how Indigenous peoples negotiate, contest, and resist colonial power; critical race studies centre the question of race, focusing on how racial logic operates at different levels of society; and settler colonial studies centre the analysis of settlerhood and the inner workings of settler colonialism. Jafri (2017) makes an important point when she asserts that the analysis of settler colonialism can facilitate epistemological violence by centering non-Natives. In my analysis, I draw on each body of scholarship to consider

Indigenous experience and resistance, the operation of racial logic, and the working of settler colonialism in relation to border making in Canada.

I begin by discussing the habit of citizenship romanticism (Bosniak, 2006), namely the idea that citizenship represents an ideal state of democratic belonging and universal inclusion. I discuss the temptation of this idea, how it has been historically produced, and how it has become coupled with the nation-state framework. I then turn to Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial scholarships to reconceptualize Canadian citizenship as a colonial and racial construct. Next, I discuss critical border scholarship as a way to complement the Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial reading of Canadian citizenship and attend to how the boundaries of Canadian citizenship are constituted by and constitutive of globalized relations of power. I highlight how borders become a key tool in the governance of national membership and belonging, not only at the territorial edge of the nation-state but also beyond and within. This theorization of borders situates social work as a site of inner border making.

Citizenship Theories: The habit of citizenship romanticism

Welcome! It took courage to move to a new country. Your decision to apply for citizenship is another big step. You are becoming part of a great tradition that was built by generations of pioneers before you. Once you have met all the legal requirements, we hope to welcome you as a new citizen with all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Canada has welcomed generations of newcomers to our shores to help us build a free, law-abiding and prosperous society. For 400 years, settlers and immigrants have contributed to the diversity and richness of our country, which is built on a proud history and a strong identity.

Canada is a constitutional monarchy, a parliamentary democracy and a federal state. Canadians are bound together by a shared commitment to the rule of law and to the institutions of parliamentary government.

Canadians take pride in their identity and have made sacrifices to defend their way of life. By coming to Canada and taking this important step toward Canadian citizenship, you are helping to write the continuing story of Canada. (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012, p. 3)

This passage comes from the introductory section of *Discover Canada*, the Canadian citizenship guidebook (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012). Designed to assist an individual as they prepare for the Canadian citizenship test, the guidebook provides the potential citizen with an idea of what it means to be Canadian. As stated, becoming a Canadian is not simply about "meeting all the legal requirements" but about "becoming part of a great tradition that was built by generations of pioneers before." Canadians-to-be are invited to embody this 400 years of history of "welcoming newcomers" as well as to contribute to the "continuing story of Canada" as a "free, law-abiding, and prosperous society."

While this passage only communicates the official version of Canadian citizenship, it is indeed a standardized script that many Canadians take as common sense. I am familiar with this script of Canadian citizenship, and in fact was an active participant in upholding and reproducing it. When I was working with migrant communities, one of the tasks I took on was to organize a citizenship study group. I prepared the study materials and recruited Canadian volunteers to help clients prepare for their citizenship tests. I understood, back then, that gaining citizenship status was the ultimate form of integration and that helping clients with this process was a worthy cause. Whenever one of our clients would pass the citizenship test, we would treat it as a

celebratory occasion, as if their struggles were finally over. Seeing our clients happier than ever gave meaning to my work.

As an immigrant myself, the thought of applying for Canadian citizenship was always looming in my mind. Yet I never took the step to do so, even when I became eligible to apply many years ago. Then, when I became pregnant, I had the sudden urge to apply for Canadian citizenship. All of a sudden, I believed that Canadian citizenship would provide me with the stability and safety I would need to raise my unborn child. I went ahead and applied, passed the Canadian citizenship test, and declared allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, whom I have never met or cared to know. Soon after, I was declared a Canadian citizen.

I begin the discussion of citizenship with these stories because they are reflective of my own habit of citizenship romanticism, a tendency that was also apparent in many of the social workers I interviewed for this study. While many social workers, myself included, were critical of Canadian immigration and citizenship policies, we still regarded the gaining of Canadian citizenship as undeniably positive. This conviction is what Bosniak (2006) called a habit of citizenship romanticism. This romanticism articulates citizenship as an ideal state of democratic belonging and inclusion. In following sections, I examine how this romanticism has taken centre stage in our understanding of citizenship, what it produces, and what it erases.

The politics of citizenship romanticism

While scholars have pointed out the contentions surrounding the term "citizenship," in a general sense, citizenship in the Western tradition is about membership and belonging, both of which are manifested in the form of legal status, rights, political participation, and identity (Bosniak, 2006). This conception of citizenship is historically rooted in the early Athenian and Roman understanding of membership (Bosniak, 2006; Iacovetta, 2006; Pocock, 1992). While the

Athenians approached citizenship as the practice of collective self-governance, the early Romans approached citizenship as the protection of the sanctity of individual rights and autonomy and the state's responsibility to ensure those values through law (Bosniak, 2006; Iacovetta, 2006; Pocock, 1992). Scholars have argued that these early conceptions of citizenship—Athenian and Roman—took shape as the political ideology of the republican and liberalist traditions, respectively (Benhabib, 2005; Bosniak, 2006; Iacovetta, 2006). From the liberalist tradition, citizenship is understood to be a matter of legal status and entitlement of rights. From the republican approach, citizenship is understood as the right to active political engagement (Bosniak, 2006).

Revolutionary movements in Europe and the Americas further played a key role in linking these early conceptions of citizenship to the modern nation-state and the discourse of human rights (Benhabib, 2005; Bradburn, 2010; Brubaker, 1989; Esser, 2006). Two revolutions, the French and the American, gave birth to the ideal of the modern nation-state—an independent state with a written constitution ruled in the name of a nation of equal citizens (Wimmer & Feinstein, 2010). While each revolutionary movement had different geopolitical contexts, both were fueled by economic and political dissatisfaction and the ideals of the Enlightenment— liberty, equality, and the rights of man. The revolutions were aimed at political transformation from monarchy to republic. In the process, the status of the individual changed from subjecthood—understood to be a feudal status of perpetual allegiance and inferiority—to citizenship, representing a "modern" status of equality and freedom (Ramsay, as cited in Bradburn, 2010).

In spite of the liberalist ideals of liberty and universal equality put forward by these revolutions, the emergence of the sovereign nation-state framework and accompanying

citizenship status did little to improve the lives of the majority (Agamben, 1998; Arendt, 1973; Bosniak, 2006; Holston & Appadurai, 1996; Iacovetta, 2006; Zolberg, 1983). In fact, the universal aspiration for equality under the revolutions only took into consideration a segment of the population, namely white, European, and propertied males (Holston & Appadurai, 1996). As Hartman (1997) puts it, "[m]anhood and whiteness were the undisclosed, but always assumed, norms of liberal equality, although the Civil Rights Act of 1866 made this explicit in defining equality as being equal to white men" (p. 118).

Racial, gender, and class politics were evident in the exclusion of slaves, women, nonwhite subjects, and paupers from human rights protection under the newly established citizenship regime. Holston and Appadurai (1996) contend that "the ideology of universal equality arises because members of this referent group (white, European, propertied, male) have never had to assert their difference, but only their equality, to claim citizenship. From the perspective of the rest who are excluded, this assertion looks like one of difference, not equality" (p. 193).

Further, as Arendt (1973) pointed out, the notion of human rights laid out in the French Revolution's "Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens" was grounded in the assumption of homogeneous national community; thus, "human" equaled "citizen"—someone who had membership in a sovereign nation-state. Since nation-states came to possess the sovereign right to decide who was included and excluded as a part of their national community, the citizenship regime in fact functioned to legitimize the formal delimitation of the citizenry, and the institutionalization of political rights was accompanied by the legal rationalization and ideological accentuation of the distinction between citizens and foreigners (Brubaker, 1989, p. 30). Holston and Appadurai (1996) further argued that as nation-states came to establish

citizenship as the identity that subsumes all other identities in the name of a "universal citizen," local stratifications and privileged statues are eroded in favour of equal rights (p. 113).

Despite the inequality inherent in historical conceptions of citizenship, the notion of citizenship as a status of equality and freedom conferred by the nation-state framework continues to shape contemporary understandings of citizenship. For example, T.H. Marshall, one of the most influential scholars of contemporary citizenship, defines citizenship as "a status bestowed on all those who are full members of a community. All those who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed" (1950, p. 28). Marshall was most concerned with what citizenship entails and argued that citizenship accumulatively evolved through social struggles over rights—"civil rights in the eighteenth, political in the nineteenth, and social in the twentieth" (p. 14). The civil component established the rule of law and equality before the law by acknowledging individual freedoms. Civil rights included rights such as freedom of speech, the right to own property, the right to justice, as well as the freedom to choose one's employment. Marshall asserted that the right to employment of choice corresponded to the needs of the capitalist labour market. The development of the political component followed in the nineteenth century as the drive for greater equality grew. Political rights promised the right to active participation in the political community, such as the right to free election. Finally, the social component came about in the postwar context and is often associated with the emergence of the welfare state. Marshall explained that social rights would mitigate the inequality brought about by capitalism by providing basic welfare to the nation-state's citizens, arguing that increasing wealth combined with the development of the welfare state would address class inequalities. He saw each stage of evolution as moving citizens towards universal equality, placing the attainment of social rights as the highest degree of integration of

an individual into society. Marshall argues that each component of citizenship rights was articulated through the establishment of institutions such as the courts of justice, parliament, councils of local government, and the education and social services systems. These state institutions play a key role in the redistribution of the civil, political, and social components of citizenship rights.

In a strong critique of Marshall, Baines and Sharma (2002) contended that Marshall's reading of the historical evolution of these rights was inaccurate precisely because he failed to acknowledge that the rights he claimed were achieved in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries were not in reality available to the majority of people. In the time periods examined by Marshall, slavery for Indigenous, Black, and Asian peoples was widespread, and the rights of women and people of colour were withheld. Young (1995) similarly addressed the gap in Marshall's theorization, arguing that the reference point of his citizenship's version of universality was typically conceived not merely as referring to "everyone," but more specifically to "everyone the same," that is, white, European, propertied, and male. As Marshall developed his conception of citizenship, centering the experience of the white European propertied male, he failed to acknowledge how citizenship is differently applied to people along the lines of social relations such as race, gender, and class. Further, Marshall's theorization of citizenship heavily relies on the links between rights and state institutions, legitimizing the nation-state as the provider of citizenship. Accordingly, membership in the nation-state is naturalized as the prerequisite for attaining citizenship rights. Thus, the universal equality Marshall's theorization of citizenship claims to achieve is not unconditional, but is limited at the national boundary of membership.

The idea that rights and entitlements shall be limited to members of the nation-state is central to the theorization of citizenship by American political theorist Michael Walzer (1983). Similar to Marshall, Walzer understands that membership status leads to a set of rights and entitlements, but emphasizes its exclusivity—that these rights and entitlements shall be limited to particular members of the political community. His insistence comes from his theorization of distributive justice, such that it has to be contextualized within particular nations and societies, not developed in universal abstraction. For Walzer, membership in itself was the primary good that we distribute, and it is only through admission and refusal of people that membership can be distributed. Grounding membership as the primary good for distribution was important for Walzer: "for it is only as members somewhere that men and women can hope to share in all the other social goods—security, wealth, honour, office, and power—that communal life makes possible" (p. 63). Walzer regarded the existing political community as forming a fundamental unit for redistributive justice: "the idea of distributive justice presupposes a bounded world (i.e. political community) within which distribution takes place: a group of people committed to dividing, exchanging, and sharing social goods, first of all among themselves" (p. 31).

Walzer argued that the capacity of the political community to act as an efficient unit of production and distribution is linked to its political identity with a particular culture of shared social meaning worth preserving. Because of the linkages between distributive justice and political collective identity, the protection of territorial integrity is important for Walzer. And accordingly, he understands admission control as the collective right of existing members of the society. Walzer states, "[A]dmission and exclusion are at the core of communal independence. They suggest the deepest meaning of self-determination. Without them, there could not be

communities of character, historically stable, ongoing associations of men and women with some special commitment to one another and some special sense of their common life" (p. 62).

Thus, Walzer understands admission control as the prime site of citizenship making in which existing members engage in the political processes of producing collective identity. The admission control of members—potential citizens who would have access to rights and entitlements—is a fundamental form of collective self-determination. For Walzer, the exercise of admission control is something that unites the existing members in a political community. By including and excluding potential members, the existing members further deepen their collective identity and thus entrench the value of citizenship. What strengthens citizenship then is not only internal cohesion but also determination of who does not belong.

Walzer's theorization provides critical insight into how Canadian citizenship is built on exclusion based on what bounds existing members of Canadian nation-state—"some special commitment to one another and some special sense of their (national members') common life" (p. 62). It directs me to examine what constitutes this special bond among national members, how this bond functions to demarcate the boundaries of national membership and belonging, and what the bond excludes and erases.

To further this analysis, I draw on Charles Lee's (2016) conceptualization of citizenship as a cultural and material script that regulates the human experience. Lee (2016) explains the citizenship script as "a materially scripted way of life—that is, as a standardizing and domineering cultural script of citizenship brought into being by European capitalist modernity to govern how human subjects ought to live and participate as 'proper' citizens in different realms, such as the political, the economic, the gender binary, and life itself" (p. 38). Lee clarifies that

"this standardized citizenship script is… cultural not in the ethnocultural terms but in the ideological-cultural sense, wherein a cultural hegemony of citizenship is articulated and interpellated in the sphere of everyday discourse and institutions as common sense and materialized into a way of life. The script is thus not merely cultural but material, as it is linked to material rewards, entitlements, and protections and is lived by human subjects. It is also inflected by biopolitical calculation, since it induces and fosters particular modes of individual corporeal bodies and mass social bodies toward the normative reproduction of liberal social life." (p. 44)

Lee further argues that the citizenship script is utilized by liberal democracies as an essential tool of surveillance and control to ensure the continuity of their life cycle. In its production of liberal citizenship, the script produces normality (proper citizens) and the abject (abject subjects) as mutually constitutive relations (p. 38).

Similar to Lee's argument, Anderson (2014) suggests that citizenship within the nation-state is shaped not only by legal status but also by the community of value, which is populated by "good citizens," who are "imagined law-abiding and hard-working members of stable and respectable families" (p. 3). Anderson asserts that the "good citizen" subjects are constructed in opposition to the "failed citizen" subjects, who "are imagined as incapable of achieving, or failing to live up to, national ideals" (p. 4). Drawing on Lee and Anderson's work, I suggest that the standardizing script (Lee, 2016) and community of values (Anderson, 2014) that demarcate the boundaries of Canadian citizenship are produced through the discourse of civility. For example, the passage from the citizenship study guide I introduced earlier represents how Canadian citizenship is built on the discourse of civility. The emphasis on law—"legal requirements," "law-abiding," and "rule of law"—points to the orderliness required for civilized

Canadians, while the glorified version of history and "continuing story of Canada" suggest the perceived temporal progress the Canadian nation-state has made over the years. Moreover, the complete erasure of Indigenous peoples illustrates how the discourse of civility erases the violent land dispossession that Canadian citizenship is built on. I suggest that it is through the discourse of civility that Canadians are bounded together and how we come to take such a citizenship script for granted. To articulate this point further, I now turn to Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial readings of Canadian citizenship.

Colonial and racial constructions of Canadian citizenship

Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial theorists have long argued that Canadian citizenship is founded on the ongoing colonization of Indigenous land, people, and history (Alfred & Tomkins, 2010; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Mackey, 2002; Sharma, 2006; Simpson, 2014; Thobani, 2000, 2007; Walia, 2010). Citizenship in Canada originated in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, transforming Indigenous insiders into aliens in their own territories while simultaneously transforming settler outsiders into Canadian citizens (Thobani, 2007). This point is further discussed in chapter 4, but I provide a brief discussion here. While the violent colonization project has been underway since the first contact between settlers and Indigenous peoples (e.g., intentional transmission of smallpox disease) (Lawrence, 2002), an aggressive settler colonial project took shape in concert with the emergence of the Canadian nation-state. Through a wide range of policies and legislation—Act for the Gradual Civilization of Indian Tribes (1857), Civilization and Enfranchisement Act (1859), Dominion Lands Act (1872), Indian Act (1876), Peasant Farming Policy (1889), and the Numbered Treaties (1871–1921)—Indigenous lands, resources, and populations were systemically appropriated (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Coleman, 2006; Furniss, 1999). The Indian residential school system

was further designed to erase Indigenous languages, culture, and spiritual practices. The violence legislated through these policies and institutional practices were aimed at eliminating Indigenous peoples and their land-based relationships to assert the sovereignty of the Canadian nation-state on Turtle Island. It is in this context that Alfred and Tomkins (2010) articulated the colonial nature of Canada as follows: "the invasion, seizing control and exploitation of Indigenous land and populations by successive generations of non-Indigenous peoples, and the institutionalizing of this situation into a form of government and law define what is called 'colonialism' in Canada" (p. 3).

Essential to the settler colonial project was the discourse of civility, in which Indigenous peoples were constructed as uncivilized vis-à-vis civilized European settlers (Coleman, 2006). Thobani (2007) asserted that Indigenous peoples have come to be constituted as the "Other" in relation to white Canadians, or what she called the "exalted subjects." Historically, the Europeans perceived Indigenous peoples as "uncivilized," "not fully human" non-Christians with no recognizable legal system, and thus lawless. In this way, Europeans were able to erase Indigenous peoples from the landscape, stripping away their humanity. She contended that, "the sovereign institutionalized the subjugation of Aboriginal peoples, and the nation's subjects, exalted in law, were the beneficiaries of this process as members of a superior race" (p. 61). Such presumed racial superiority, Thobani (2007) argued, was then extended to immigration policies that continued to produce a racialized structure of citizenship. Thobani (2007) succinctly summarized the nature of Canadian citizenship: "Canadian citizenship emerged with the clear intention to produce racial divisions among the populations within the territorial bounds of the nation-state, divisions which remain significant to this day and which continue the project of all racial states to produce national/racial homogeneity in the face of actual heterogeneity" (p. 102).

Razack (2002) has similarly contended that Canada, as a white settler society, was established on and continues to be structured by a racial hierarchy. In the national mythologies of Canada, Indigenous peoples were presumed to be mostly dead or assimilated, and Canada was believed to be "developed by hardy and enterprising Europeans settlers" (p. 3). People of colour were scripted as late arrivals who came to Canada long after much of the development had occurred. These mythologies justified the positioning of European settlers as the original inhabitants who were entitled to the rights and entitlements of citizenship. Razack (2002) further contended that such national mythologies were deeply embedded in contemporary laws and social practices and thus continue to reproduce racial hierarchies in Canada.

Bannerji (2000) has also asserted that a racial hierarchy continues to structure policy changes around multiculturalism in Canada and has worked to organize the identity of white Canada. She has stated that the federal government's policy on multiculturalism was produced as a way of managing diverse immigrant demographics. It was a "coping mechanism for dealing with an actually conflicting heterogeneity, seeking to incorporate it into an ideological binary which is predicated upon the existence of a homogeneous national, that is, a Canadian cultural self with its multiple and different others" (Bannerji, 2000, p. 37). Multicultural policy has functioned to reduce immigrant communities to the position of ethnic Others marked only by "symbols of religions [or] so-called tradition" that must be tolerated by white Canada (Bannerji, 2000, p. 45). Bannerji (2000) has further argued that such an emphasis on symbolic identities allowed the state to disregard larger questions of social justice, unemployment, and racism.

These scholars point to how Canadian citizenship is founded on whiteness and the continuation of the settler colonial project. Through the lens of Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial scholarship, Canadian citizenship does not represent the conditions for universal

equality, democratic inclusion, or social justice claims, but rather functions to erase and reproduce settler colonial histories and practices. These bodies of scholarship disrupt the habit of citizenship romanticism and elucidate how the dynamics of invisibilized settler colonialism and racial hierarchy mark the organization and institution of Canadian citizenship. Drawing on this scholarship, my thesis examines how the discourse of civility has operated to demarcate national membership and belonging in Canada and how it is reproduced at the ground level of social work practice with noncitizens.

Setting the border as the analytical focus and concept

In addition to Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial scholarship that addresses the colonial and racial foundations of Canadian citizenship, I have drawn on critical border scholarship to consider recently intensified border-crossing activities and how global politics influence the construction of Canadian citizenship.

When I began this study, I did not intend to use "the border" as a key concept. My original intention was to address racial and colonial politics as fundamental to the nature of Canadian citizenship. Yet, as I proceeded with my data analysis, I realized the limitation of this approach in that Canadian citizenship is not simply produced via internal race and colonial politics but also via globalized social relations of power. Furthermore, internal and external politics do not seem to have clear boundaries between them. To address this issue, I had to shift my attention to where internal and external politics meet, and accordingly, "the border" became a useful conceptual framework. By setting my analytical gaze on the border, I am able to gain a deeper understanding of the tensions between global forces and nation-state sovereignty, and what these tensions mean to social work practice as we experience it in the context of work with

39

noncitizens. To further articulate the relevance of critical border studies to my study, I will explain how I use critical border theory and what I mean by the border.

Centering the border in citizenship discourse

Since the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) that ended the Thirty Years' War in Europe and instituted an international system that recognized the territorial sovereignty of nation-states, borders have been essential to the assertion of legal territorial boundaries between one country and another (Ritzer, 2010; Okhonmina, 2010). Yet, in the era of economic globalization, the significance of borders has been questioned (Ritzer, 2010). The growing global economic flow has been identified as one of the primary threats to the autonomy of nation-states. Ohmae suggested in the 1990s that nation-states would not be able to control the growing flow of the global economy, predicting a borderless world (as cited in Ritzer, 2010, p. 142). Strange similarly addressed the decline of the nation-state resulting from technological and financial changes (as cited in Ritzer, 2010, p. 142). In addition to global economic flow, the autonomy of the nation-state as well as the significance of borders are being challenged by other factors such as the advancement of information technology, the transnational migration of people, the global network of criminal activities (e.g., drug trafficking, "terrorist" organizations, money laundering, etc.), and the emergence of supra-state regions such as the European Union and the African Union (Ritzer, 2010; Okhonmina, 2010).

Despite the growing liquidity and multidirectional flows brought about by globalization in the last few decades (Ritzer, 2010), the proliferation of border talks in recent years suggests that borders remain significant to global politics. Since the launch of his presidential campaign in 2016 and subsequent win, U.S. President Donald Trump has continued to boast that he will build a wall at the U.S.–Mexican border. The news of migrants risking their lives by travelling across

the Mediterranean in an attempt to cross the European border has become a daily occurrence. More locally, a growing number of refugee claimants from the United States are trying to cross the Canadian border in response to the growing hostility towards immigrants and refugees in American politics. What these border talks reveal is how the border is invoked not merely as a geographical boundary, but as "a political expression of national sovereignty, a juridical marker of citizenship status, an ideological trope for defining terms of inclusion and exclusion" as well as "a powerful site of rhetorical invention" (DeChaine, 2012, p. 1).

In her book *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*, Wendy Brown (2010) examined the global tendency of wall building along national borders and suggested that contemporary acts of walling can be read as responses to waning state sovereignty: "It is the weakening of state sovereignty, and more precisely, the detachment of sovereignty from the nation-state, that is generating much of the frenzy of nation-state wall building today. Rather than resurgent expressions of nation-state sovereignty, the new walls are icons of its erosion" (p. 24). As transnational flows of people proliferate and global capitalism takes over the sovereignty of the nation-state, walls are built to counter the increased anxiety posed by the numerous threats accompanying these transnational flows—e.g., people, capital, ideas, goods, violence, etc. Yet, as Brown argues, these walls do little to intercept or deter the most potent threats of our time, such as biochemical and drone warfare, internet hacking, global climate changes, the vicissitudes of financial capital, etc. Consequently, she calls the walling of national borders a failed performance of nation-state sovereignty. Yet, as a visible physical marker of sovereign power, the wall still plays an important role in circulating a (false) sense of security as well as the state and human desire for sovereign order.

As the border gains territorial, political, juridical, ideological, and rhetorical significance in contemporary politics, I concur with Balibar's (2009) argument that "borders and the institutional practices corresponding to them have been transported into the middle of political space" (p. 109). This is not to minimize the effect of globalization or to celebrate the return of the nation-state, but rather to point out how the border holds and even articulates the growing tensions between globalization and nation-state sovereignty in contemporary politics (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013). As Benhabib (2005) puts it,

> The irony of current political developments is that while state sovereignty in economic, military, and technological domains has been greatly eroded, it is nonetheless vigorously asserted; national borders, while more porous, still keep out aliens and intruders. The old political structures may have waned but the new political forms of globalization are not yet in sight. We are like travellers navigating an unknown terrain with the help of old maps, drawn at a different time and in response to different needs. While the terrain we are travelling on, the world-society of states, has changed, our normative map has not. The growing normative incongruities between international human rights norms, particularly as they pertain to the "rights of others"—immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers—and continuing assertions of territorial sovereignty are the novel features of this new landscape. (p. 672)

At this historical juncture, the border is constitutive of and constituted by the tensions as well as the convergence between global flows and nation-state sovereignty. This point is important because the relationship between global flows and nation-state sovereignty has not always been antagonistic. Indeed, global flows and nation-state sovereignty have often worked together to shape the political conditions that include some bodies and exclude others. In this

way, the border not only delimits the legal territorial boundaries of nation-states, but also shapes human experience. Accordingly, the border is a contested site where the important questions of citizenship regarding membership, belonging, and rights become salient.

What is a border? Where global and national meet

Given that I centre the border as my key analytical concept and the focus of this thesis, I must begin with a fundamental question at the onset: What is a border? This seemingly simple query has been central to critical border scholarship. A border, in the most conventional sense, is understood to be the line that separates one sovereign territory from another on a map. From this definition, we typically understand borders as purely territorial, static, and neutral. However, this image of borders is reproduced discursively (e.g., through school geography lessons and political rhetoric, such as that of U.S. President Donald Trump) as well as materially (e.g., through regulations and controls such as customs, passport control, security screening, etc.). Through these discursive and material practices, we experience the border even though we do not see the actual lines as we would on a map. For example, although we "know" we cross the border as we proceed through a series of activities associated with border crossing (e.g., passport control, customs, security screening, etc.), we do not literally see the line separating two national territories. The borders that we see depicted on international maps are also subject to change through conflict, war, and political negotiation. In other words, borders come to life through a wide range of discursive and material practices.

If we were to accept that the border is a social construction, then it would lead us to argue that the border cannot be conceptualized as a static or neutral or merely geographical entity. Accordingly, it is important to understand how the border is constructed. Critical border scholars have contended that we should shift our attention from "border" to "bordering," attending to the

process of border making, not just the outcome of bordering (e.g., division between one country and another, us and them, insider and outsider) (Newman, 2006). The transition from the concept of the border to that of bordering enables us to view borders "as dynamic social processes and practices of spatial differentiation" (Brambilla et al., 2015, p. 15). Thus, the primacy of reconceptualizing borders as processes lies in the ability to go beyond a habit of dichotomous inside–outside thinking and instead attend to the ongoing negotiation and contestation embedded in border making.

The work of Étienne Balibar furthers the concept of bordering and borders as processes. In his key text "What is a Border?" Balibar (2002) argues that the border is overdetermined. What Balibar means is that "no political border is ever the mere boundary between two states" but always "sanctioned, reduplicated and relativized by other geopolitical divisions" (p.79). Rumford (2014) explains that the border separating West Germany and East Germany during the Cold War is an example of overdetermination, as it was created through Cold War politics and global division beyond Germany. The borders in East and Southeast Asia (e.g., Korean Peninsula, Vietnam) during the Cold War are also examples of overdetermination in that global geopolitics were reduplicated, resulting in violence in East and Southeast Asia. In her study of border control regimes in postwar Japan, Morris-Suzuki (2010) reminds us that "Border politics are neither national nor international politics, but always both at once. Borders have two sides, and what happens at the frontier post is influenced by forces from both sides, though in some times and places the power on one side may be far greater than the power on the other" (p. 6). Similarly, Bosniak (2006) asserts that what counts as part of the "inside" or "outside" is enmeshed in the global geopolitical order. In other words, seeing borders as processes involves

seeing how "the global is not merely situated 'out there' but is also located, increasingly, within national borders" (Bosniak, 2006, p. 7).

Walia (2013) articulates the overdetermined nature of the border through what she calls border imperialism. Border imperialism refers to the ways in which the border "extends and externalizes the Western rules beyond its own boundaries through the matrix of racialized empire and neoliberal capitalism" (p. 75). Like other scholars, Walia (2013) argues that the politics of the border is not simply a matter of any single state, but rather is linked to global systems of power. Her contribution lies in her emphasis on the histories of colonization and slavery. Through her concept of border imperialism, Walia (2013) elucidates how borders are overdetermined through unequal global politics in which Western interests have historically dominated. She asserts that borders are constituted by and constitutive of "circulations of capital and labour stratification in the global economy, narratives of empire, and hierarchies of race, class and gender within state building" (p. 73). Accordingly, the analysis of border imperialism elucidates "the role of Western imperialism in dispossessing communities in order to secure land and resources for colonial state and capitalist interests as well as the deliberately limited inclusion of migrant bodies into Western states through processes of criminalization and racialization that justify the commodification of their labour" (p. 36–37).

Johnson et al. (2011) similarly address how the border shapes and is shaped by the global geopolitical order and nation-state building project. They contend that while border making is enmeshed in the global geopolitical order, it is also "rooted in historically contingent practices and discourses that are related to national ideologies and identities" (Johnson et al., 2011, p. 63). As a result, "the site of the border is… not only the borderland but also the complex nation-building process and nationalist practices that can have material manifestations" (Johnson et al.,

2011, p. 63). The connection they make between the global geopolitical order and nationalist practices provides an important insight into border making in contemporary Canadian social work.

Where is the border? Social work as a site of inner border making

As I examine the process of border making, I see borders in motion. Accordingly, it is important to discuss the location of these borders. Where is the border presently and where is it moving? Balibar (2002) states that "some borders are not located at borders at all" (p. 84). He labels borders as having a heterogeneous nature, meaning that borders function wherever selective controls are to be found. In this way, borders can extend beyond the territorial edge of the national border and seep into the national territory through what Sassen (2005) would call disaggregation of the border. Sassen (2005) explains how mundane places and practices can constitute the border. For example, when a bank executes a money transfer to another country, it becomes a site for border-regime enforcement. The body of an immigrant can also constitute a border itself because the body is both the carrier of much of the regime and the crucial site for enforcement (p. 2).

In Canada, Arbel (2016) argues that the federal government has redesigned its borders through a series of domestic measures, bilateral agreements with the United States, and international agreements with other states, all of which are designed to combat terrorism, enhance security, collect and share biometric data, facilitate trade and travel, and manage migration. The implementation of these measures can take place in multiple locations far from Canada's territorial boundary line. Accordingly, the border is extended to both territorial and extraterritorial locations and is applied differently to different groups of border crossers. Reynolds and Hyndman (2015) have similarly argued that the Canadian government has

externalized and multiplied border practices to preclude potential asylum seekers from coming to Canada. They have traced the externalization and multiplication of the border back to the Multiple Borders Strategy, an approach espoused by the Canada Border Services Agency and introduced in 2003. They contend that the Multiple Borders Strategy conceives of the border not merely as a territorial boundary of a geopolitical line between the United States and Canada but rather as any point at which the identity of the traveller can be verified. It is defined as follows:

> [t]he strategy strives to 'push the border out' so that people posing a risk to Canada's security and prosperity are identified as far away from the actual border as possible, ideally before a person departs their country of origin. Admissibility screening occurs prior to the arrival of an individual in Canada or after they have entered the country in order to ensure that those who are inadmissible do not enter or cannot remain in Canada.
>
> (Arbel & Brenner, cited in Reynolds & Hyndman, 2015, p. 45)

Through the Multiple Borders Strategy, the border comes to be enacted through airline liaison officers, visa requirements, and biometric screening—far removed from the territorial boundary line of Canada—against anyone who is deemed a risk to Canada's security and prosperity (Reynolds & Hyndman, 2015). Reynolds and Hyndman (2015) assert that the externalization and multiplication of borders have been instrumental in precluding the arrival of asylum seekers at the Canadian border. In 2013, Canada dropped to sixteenth place as a destination for asylum seekers, from second and third place in 2008 and 2009, respectively (Reynolds & Hyndman, 2015).

In addition to the externalization of the Canadian border (Reynolds & Hyndman, 2015), I suggest that the Canadian border is also moving inwards. As I have discussed elsewhere, the tendency to exclude migrants within the Canadian nation-state was a prevailing feature of the

new policies introduced by the Conservative government under Harper. This exclusion shifted the bordering processes further inward by extending precarious immigration status to those who had more secure status, such as permanent residents (Nobe-Ghelani, 2017). As I will demonstrate and theorize in my subsequent analyses, the internalization of the border also takes place away from the policy level. Bhuyan's (2012) analysis of service delivery by organizations working to prevent violence against women and Villegas's (2013) analysis of health care workers both attend to how social service providers play the role of gatekeeper in producing varying degrees of access to rights and entitlements in the city of Toronto. Collectively, these studies demonstrate how borders continue to "exist where and whenever non-status immigrants attempt to access social services" (Berinstein et al., 2006, p. 9).

As the border moves into the internal lives of Canadian society, however, it becomes normalized and invisible. It is in this sense that Balibar (2002) argues that "borders cease to be purely external realities" but rather transform into "inner borders," which are "invisible borders, situated everywhere and nowhere" (p. 78). My thesis aims to illuminate this invisibility by taking up social work as a site of inner border making that demarcates the boundaries of national membership and belonging in Canada.

Inner border making and boundaries of national membership and belonging

In addition to the overdetermined and heterogeneous nature and characteristics of borders, Balibar (2002) contends that borders are polysemic. In other words, borders do not have the same meaning to everyone. The border is a flexible institution and functions to both exclude and include (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013). This polysemic quality can be easily identified by examining how border control regimes operate differently on individual bodies as well as by inspecting the discourses on security, legitimacy, and the social relations of race, gender, and

class. For example, a racialized refugee claimant would be subjected to a higher level of security screening at the border compared with a white Canadian male who is a business traveller.

Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) have discussed how the border becomes a social method of division and multiplication that articulates and facilitates globalized social relations along the lines of race, gender, and class. They point to the interrelated material and ideological work done by bordering practices. In the context of the U.S.–Mexican border, DeChaine (2012) argues that the territorial border functions in the rhetorical production of civic unity in the United States. He identifies the narrative and figural representation as a central element in border formation in which identity and difference are created. Giroux (1992) has similarly contended that "the category border signals in the metaphorical and literal sense how power is inscribed differently on the body, culture, history, space, land, and psyche. Borders elicit a recognition of those epistemological, political, cultural, and social margins that distinguish between "us and them," delineate zones of terror from locations that are safe, and create new cartographies of identity and difference" (Giroux, 1992, p. 23). These studies elucidate the ways in which the logic of territorial bordering practice permeates the internal life of the nation-state and functions to produce identity and difference.

A decisive way to identify the polysemic nature of the border within the territory of a nation-state is to examine how migrants are differentially included in the spectrum of Canadian citizenship. While an overtly racist immigration system is no longer acceptable in modern liberal democracies, bordering practices that marginalize particular bodies are still key to Canadian citizenship (Anderson, Sharma, & Wright, 2009; Razack, 2000; Sharma, 2002, 2006). Goldering and her colleagues (2007, 2009, 2013) have attended to the multiple pathways, forms, and trajectories of noncitizenship and illegality in Canada, demonstrating that an increasing number

of migrants live with different degrees and gradations of immigration and citizenship status. The literature on noncitizenship provides important insights about how migrants are differentially included in the spectrum of Canadian citizenship. In their study of migrant women workers, Stasiulus and Bakan (2005) have shown how citizenship is negotiated between differentially empowered individuals and the state via social relations of race, gender, and class as well as in the broader international context of globalized markets and hierarchies among states. Similarly, in her study of migrant workers, Sharma (2006) examined the tendencies of exclusion within the context of the nation-state system of global apartheid. She argued that unlike past forms of apartheid that were premised on legally enforceable race-based distinctions, global apartheid functions by organizing multiple but separate legal regimes and practices for differentiated groups of people within the same place. The effect of such an inclusion–exclusion framework of global apartheid is the establishment of a hierarchical system of citizenship in which access to benefits and entitlements is instead based on categorizations of more and less deserving migrants through naturalizing classed, gendered, and racialized exclusions to national membership (McDonald, 2009, p. 72).

Drawing on their work, my research examines how social work as a site of inner border making takes part in demarcating the boundary of Canadian citizenship through inclusionary and exclusionary practices. While previous studies on borders have extended their analytical sites beyond geographical borders, the majority of these studies have focused on policy and structural analysis, with less attention being paid to micro-level operations of border making. Without undermining the importance of that type of structural analysis, this thesis takes the position that structural conditions "are not predetermined forces operating in the absence of human agency. Citizenship rights, and the denial of those rights, are negotiated in a global nexus of human

relations where various interests, ideas and practices are enacted, and come into conflict in contested arenas" (Stasiulis & Bakan, 2005, p. 63).

The micro-process of border making: Foucault's theories of power and subject

For my micro-level operations of border making, Foucault's (1980, 2003) theorization of power and subject making is crucial. As stated in the introduction, Foucault understands power not as domination but as social practice that circulates everywhere and in everyone. He explains the tenacity of power as follows:

> What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is quite simply the fact that it doesn't weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the entire social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression. (1980, p. 119)

Foucault understands power as not simply repressive but also productive, and in fact it is the productive function of power that gives its tenacity. In *Subject and Power*, Foucault (2003) articulates the productive nature of power and subject making:

> This form of power that applies itself to immediate everyday life categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he must recognize and others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power that makes individuals subjects. (130)

Foucault (2003) further explicates that human beings become subjects through three modes of objectification: scientific classification, dividing practices, and subjectification. The first mode of objectification, scientific classification, refers to the process in which scientific "facts" and categorization objectify the subject. The status of science produces "objective" knowledge

51

about the subject, thus objectifying life itself. In other words, scientific classification is the

practice that turns the body into a thing, an object. An example can be found in the Diagnostic

and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) in

which individuals are categorized into different types of mental disorders according to

"objective" knowledge.

The second mode of objectification, the dividing practice, refers to the process in which the

subject is either divided in himself or divided from others. The dividing practice draws lines

between the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, and the criminals and the "good boys."

Foucault's (1965) *Madness and Civilization* demonstrates how the divisions between the mad

and the sane, and the sick and the healthy, were confirmed not simply through the labelling of

social groups but also through spatially separating social groups that exhibited difference. The

dividing practices are justified through scientific classification (the first mode of objectification).

For example, the classification of diseases and the associated practices of clinical medicine in

early nineteenth-century France, the rise of modern psychiatry and its entry into hospitals,

prisons, and clinics throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, all contributed to modern

forms of dividing practices (Foucault, 2003). Through dividing practices, individuals are turned

into subjects that objectify them as the mad, the sick, the deviant, etc. Accordingly, the dividing

practices function to divide a society within a society.

The third mode of objectification, subjectification, refers to the process in which the human

being turns him or herself into a subject. This mode of objectification functions differently from

the previous two modes in that the person is active in self-formation (Foucault, 1984). Unlike the

previous two modes of objectification where the person was subjected to someone or something

(through scientific classification and dividing practices), the mode of subjectification involves

self-identity, conscience, and self-knowledge, which are mediated through broader cultural norms.

Foucault's discussion on power and subject making is important to this study as I attend to how social work as helping profession and academic discipline has historically taken up scientific classification, how social work participated in dividing practices, and how social workers formed themselves as particular subjects through broader cultural norms. In other words, Foucault's theorization of power and subject making enables me to elucidate how we make ourselves professional helper through our participation in dominant and normalizing discourses and practices. I propose that social work is a rich analytical site because we tend to understand our profession and academic discipline as opposed to dominance. Understanding how power operates in social work with noncitizens provides insight into micro-level operations of border making—how the borders of national membership and belonging are constituted through everyday social work practice.

Border making through affect

My analysis of the micro-process of border making extends to its relation to affective conduct. Affect is also a site of the subject-making process, as well as a dividing practice and subjectification. Accordingly, I want to suggest that thinking about affect and attending to feelings provide an entry into a deeper understanding of how the border works—how it is drawn, reconfigured, resisted, and invisibilized. After all, the border is a site of various affective experiences. We experience a wide range of emotions at a territorial border, from the fear induced by perceived or actual threat to our survival to the anxiety of being interrogated and rejected. We can also experience excitement about the good times we might encounter upon

reaching the destination, relief upon being granted permission to cross the border, the comfort of being "home," and even confusion about where we belong. The divergent affective reactions we experience at the border speak to what Balibar would call the polysemic nature of the border, which is to say that borders do not have the same meaning for everyone. For those who are deemed "legitimate," border crossing can, for the most part, elicit pleasant feelings, while for those deemed illegitimate, border crossing can elicit the converse. At the same time, deeming some bodies legitimate and others illegitimate is also facilitated through affective experiences. We deem some bodies legitimate because we feel safe and comfortable. On the other hand, we deem other bodies illegitimate because we feel threatened or suspicious. The judgment of legitimacy and illegitimacy is not simply a matter of carrying appropriate travel documents or having formal citizenship. In other words, we know that long before a traveller's arrival at the border, some bodies are supposed to provoke a feeling of safety or suspicion. Thus, the affective experience we have at the territorial border does not emerge naturally or innately but is "entangled with historical, cultural, social and political norms and conventions" (Zembylas, 2015, p. 147). I further argue that this affective experience continues to take place beyond the territorial border of the nation-state. In other words, the affective border exists within the nation-state, delineating the border of Canadian citizenship at multiple levels of social life.

For my analysis of inner borders and affective conduct, I attend to the feelings expressed during my interviews with social workers. I view the feelings expressed by social workers as both discursive practice and affective experience. Derek Hook (2006) discusses "prediscursive" racism and contends that discursive analytical approaches may not be adequate to understanding racism in its bodily, affective, and presymbolic dimensions. Accordingly, he draws on Kristeva's theory of abjection to examine how racism is routed through the logic of the body and its

anxieties of distinction, separation, and survival. By addressing the relationship between personal and broader systemic racism, Hook examines how discourses of racism are always locked into a relationship with "prediscursive" processes (that is bodily, affective, and presymbolic). Similarly, Sara Ahmed (2004) theorizes affective experience as social practice. She asserts that emotions only exist within the intermediary space between the psychic and the social, as well as the individual and the collective. By working in this intermediary space, emotions align individuals with communities by creating social relationships that designate the rhetorical terrain of the nation and define who we relate to as proximate and as distant (Ahmed, 2004). This theorization of affect frames my examination of the relationship between inner borders and affective conduct, which I take up in chapter 6.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I laid out the theoretical entry points through which I pursued my inquiry. Drawing on literature that denaturalizes citizenship and the border as static entities of the nation-state, I extended the theoretical insights from this work to an analysis of the micro-processes of border making in social work with noncitizens. I began by discussing the habit of citizenship romanticism—namely that citizenship represents an ideal form of universal inclusion and democratic belonging. I attended to how this romanticism was historically produced and became coupled with the nation-state framework, and examined how it only served the interests of dominant national groups. I further examined how the historical linkage between citizenship and the nation-state is sustained in our contemporary conception of citizenship, thus normalizing exclusion based on national membership and belonging. I discussed how citizenship is built on exclusion based on what bounds the existing national membership, and argued it is the discourse of civility that demarcates the boundaries of national membership and belonging in Canada. To

further articulate this point, I turned to Indigenous and critical race readings of Canadian citizenship. I asserted that Canadian citizenship is built on the civilizing project of settler colonialism that simultaneously erases Indigenous peoples and disciplines the immigrant Other. I brought in critical border theories to extend the Indigenous and critical race readings of Canadian citizenship to elucidate the interplay between global geopolitics and national politics. I drew on the idea of the border as a process and practice, situating social work as a site of inner border making where the tensions and convergence of global geopolitics and nation-state sovereignty are played out to demarcate the boundaries of Canadian citizenship on the ground. I introduced Foucault's theories of power and subject as well as affect theories to direct my micro-analysis of border making. In the next chapter, I further discuss the importance of attending to the micro-process of border making and explicate how I conducted my analysis.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH PROCESS

Introduction

This research takes up Foucauldian discourse analysis to examine how social work with noncitizens becomes a site of inner border making via historical and globalized social relations of power. The temporal focus of this research is 2008 to 2015, the time period during which a major policy shift took place in the immigration and citizenship arena under the Conservative government of Stephen Harper. My primary data set comes from in-depth interviews with social workers who have worked with noncitizens in the city of Toronto. During the interviews, I asked social workers about the challenges and contradictions they face in everyday practice as they navigate an increasingly complex arrangement of social rights for noncitizens. I attended to how social workers make sense of their inclusionary and exclusionary practices with noncitizens. I complemented interview data with an analysis of policy documents as well as a historical analysis of border making via the existing literature and examined how social workers' narratives are produced via broader social relations of power.

This chapter begins with a discussion of how I understand Foucauldian discourse analysis and how I used it in this research. I then describe the research design of this study—the process of conducting in-depth interviews, how I incorporated historical analysis, and how I conducted the analysis of policy documents.

Foucauldian Discourse Analysis: Examination of power relations

In the broadest terms, this thesis is a study of the power relations embedded in social work with noncitizens. Drawing on Foucault, I understand power not as a top–down relationship or a possession but rather as social relations that circulate. I conducted this analysis of power

relations employing Foucault's notion of discourse.

In "Two Lectures," Foucault (1980) noted the intimate relations between power and discourse:

In a society such as ours. . . there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. (p. 93)

Discourse, according to Foucault, consists of structures of knowledge that are always acting to create certain meanings and identities in particular historical and spatial moments (Fairclough, 1992; Chambon, 1999; Wong, 2002; Gee, 2011). Discourse provides parameters for what can be known, said, and thought (Chambon, Irving, & Epstein, 1999). Thus, discourse is not merely a medium of communication or a group of statements that one might utter, but practices that "systemically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). Foucault's understanding of discourse attempts to overcome the traditional distinction between language (what one says) and practice (what one does) (Hall, 2001). The ways we talk, write, and think about particular objects and people are not a "true" representation of reality but a historical construction, one that becomes available in particular moments and localities. Thus, writing is not merely writing but rather "one way of disguising the awesome materiality of so tightly controlled and managed a production—a systematic conversion of the power relationship between the controller and the controlled into mere written words" (Said, 1975, p. 16). Foucault saw discourse as "violence which we do to things, or in any case as a practice which we impose on them; and it is in this practice that the events of discourse find the principle of their regularity" (Foucault, 1981, as cited in Mills, 2003, p. 55). The statements one utters are

produced in an ongoing discursive stream, whereby the preceding statements build on the context of previously expressed statements. Ongoing statements have to respect the set of rules inherent in the context of preceding statements (Diaz-Bone et al., 2007). Thus, discourse regulates and constrains what we can say or think about particular objects or people.

Discourse also defines subject framing and positioning—who it is possible to be and what it is possible to do. In other words, discourse works on and through people to produce not only particular kinds of subjects, but also the actions they engage in and the feelings they experience (Bansel, Davies, Gannon, & Linnell, 2008). Because discourse regulates and constrains what one can say, a speaking subject is obliged to think and express within narrowly confined discursive limits to claim authority and legitimacy. When a speaking subject, for whatever reason, does not or cannot stay within the discursive framework, she is deemed incomprehensible in or deviant from the social world in which she lives.

Drawing on the work of Foucault, Butler (2005) explained that while narratives were sites where subjects attempted to make themselves understandable, the "I" in their narratives never belonged to the individual subjects but was automatically caught up in a realm of social power relations. The "I" was bound by the norm, and in seeking to narrate itself truthfully, it was used by the norm itself. Similarly, Scott (1991) decentred the "I" in experience, arguing that experiences should be considered discursive constructs rather than indisputable points of reference:

> Experience is at once always already an interpretation and something that needs to be interpreted. What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straightforward; it is always contested, and always therefore political… Experience is in this approach, not the origin of our explanation, but that which we want to explain. (p. 797)

Macias (2012, 2015b) further elaborates that it is not only the speaker who is implicated in the production of truth and subject but also the listener, "who hears the statement and *makes perfect sense* of it" (2015b, p. 230, emphasis original). The listener, like the speaker, enacts and adopts the discourse for their own self-making as well as for the regulation and discipline of others (Macias, 2012, 2015b). It is through this discursive practice that one becomes subjected to regimes of truth and tied to an identity position.

Several scholars have built on Foucault's understanding of discourse and have provided exemplary works that I used for this thesis (Badwall, 2013; Chapman, Hoque, & Utting, 2013; Coloma, 2011; Heron, 2007; Hook, 2001; Jager & Maier, 2010; Macias, 2012; Rossiter, 2001, 2005; Said, 1978; Tamboukou, 2013; Wong, 1999). What these works have in common is their acknowledgement that Foucault's concept of discourse is concerned more closely with knowledge, materiality, and power than it is with language. They pay particular attention to what is not said or not included in the texts, and how those unsaid or excluded things relate to power relations in larger cultural and historical conditions. Building on these previous works, the following points are presented as analytical guidelines to capture the following: a ruling discourse; resistance to ruling discourse; discursive strategies and techniques; constitutions of various subject positions; materiality of the discourse; and historicity of the discourse (i.e., relations to larger societal conditions). The following aims and objectives serve as guidelines that inform the analytical focus as I read and examine the interview narratives and policy documents:

- To examine discursive boundaries, limitations, and constraints (e.g., what is said and not said, what is possible to imagine and what is not);

- To attend to similarities and coherence as well as to multiplicities and

contradictions;

- To attend to opposing discourses (e.g., what or who is considered good or bad, legal or illegal, etc.);

- To attend to the shared presuppositions and theoretical frameworks that organize thought, representation, and categorization;

- To attend to how different actors (e.g., social work practitioners, government and policy makers, noncitizens) are positioned and how such subject positions function in different discursive contexts;

- To attend to how particular emerging discourses interact differently from one individual to another owing to their social locations and histories;

- To examine the historical conditions in which the statements are made;

- To examine how discourses inform the material conditions that shape social reality.

Drawing on these analytical guidelines and the theoretical frameworks that I presented in Chapter 2, I trace how social work with noncitizens becomes a site of inner border making via broader relations of power.

Research design

This research is primarily based on in-depth interviews conducted with social workers who have worked with noncitizens—migrants without full immigration status in the city of Toronto. In addition to participant interviews, I drew on an analysis of policy documents that are related to immigration and citizenship policy changes between 2008 and 2015. I also examined the history of border making in Canada based on the existing literature on the histories of the settler colonial project, immigration, and social work. The interviews, policy documents, and historical analysis were examined to understand the relationships between border making,

Canadian citizenship, and social work.

Geographically speaking, my local site is the city of Toronto. I focus on Toronto for the following reasons. First, Toronto hosts the majority of noncitizens living in Canada (Berinstein, Nyers, & Wright, 2008; Goldring, Berinstein, & Bernhard, 2007; Sidhu, 2013; Solidarity City Network, 2013). Second, Toronto has a specific relation to noncitizens, particularly nonstatus migrants: in February 2013, Toronto City Council declared Toronto a Sanctuary City, reconfirming the city's commitment to ensuring that all Torontonians, regardless of their immigration status, would be able to access city-run and city-funded services without fear (Solidarity City Network, 2013). Given that this event occurred at the very historical moment when a series of exclusionary policies towards migrants were introduced at the federal level, Toronto presents a contrasting sentiment towards noncitizens. Third, as someone who has worked with migrant communities in Toronto, I am most familiar with this particular local context. My Toronto work experience is beneficial not only practically but also theoretically, as a Foucauldian analysis of power demands that the analytical gaze be grounded in the specificities of a local context. Finally, Toronto has long claimed to be one of the most multicultural cities in the world. As discussed previously, a seemingly good and moral notion such as multiculturalism may obscure the problem of power and thus demands analytical attention.

In-depth interviews

The Foucauldian discourse analysis I discussed in the previous section provided me with a conceptual framework with which to read the interview transcripts and theorize the power relations embedded in social work with noncitizens. I treat narratives of individual social workers as "manifestations of discourse" (Macias, 2015b, p. 233) where we can witness the capillary form of power. Thus, the interview narratives were snapshots of much broader

discursive practices. While it is not possible to examine the complete picture of power relations through the interview narratives, they do provide an anchor where we can begin to see how global relations of power work on, through, and within individual social workers, and how we construct our stories of everyday experiences through socially accepted and available narratives while simultaneously defining our subject positions. Alvesson argues that interviewees follow "cultural scripts about how one should normally express oneself on particular topics" and, hence, the interview is "better viewed as the scene for a social interaction rather than a simple tool for collection of data" (as cited in Diefenbach, 2009, p. 880). Drawing on Alvesson, Diefenbach (2009) further suggests that interviewees, particularly those who have inherited socially privileged positions, are usually very aware of the necessity of political correctness and the danger of saying "the wrong things" (p. 881). The same could be said about social workers (whether they have inherited socially privileged positions or not) because we are trained to be socially progressive (a form of political correctness) and to do "the right things" as professional helpers, and saying "the wrong thing" would unsettle our identity as (critical) social workers. Thus, the interview is a site of disciplinary practice where the interviewees construct themselves as appropriate and comprehensible subjects through a socially accepted and available narrative.

I must point out that individual social workers, who bring their own personal biography to their work, relate differently to the cultural scripts, resulting in diverse, multiple, and fluid discourses being at play in the interview. The differentially positioned subjects have different relationships to the dominant cultural scripts, and thus have the opportunity to make themselves appropriate and comprehensive subjects through speech; this act is not equally available to those who are already in a marginalized position (see, for example, Badwall, 2016). I attend to the diversity of these narratives as well as to the moments when and how such normative discourse

is challenged or resisted.

I understood my role of research interviewer as implicated in truth making and the placing of interviewees in the subject position, as I asked, listened, and responded to the interview participants and made sense of what they said along with the existing cultural scripts. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) use the metaphor of the traveller for the interviewer:

> the interviewer–traveller wanders through the landscape and enters into conversations with the people he or she encounters… The journey may not only lead to new knowledge; the traveller might change as well. The journey might instigate a process of reflection that leads the traveller to new ways of self-understanding, as well as uncovering previously taken-for-granted values and customs in the traveller's home country. (p. 48)

This metaphor represents the idea that interview knowledge is not linear but is constructed through the interaction between interviewer and interviewee. Thus, the interviewer is always implicated in the interviewee's narrative. The metaphor of the traveller also points to the privileged position that interviewers inevitably occupy during the research process. The interviewer, as a traveller who is afforded a position to go on a research journey, is in control of steering the direction and outcome of this research.

Recruitment process and participants. I recruited interview participants by finding individuals who had completed post-secondary social work education (i.e., a bachelor's or master's degree in social work), since that is the minimum educational requirement needed to receive the designation of registered social worker in Canada as governed by the Canadian Association of Social Workers. Individuals who have completed post-secondary education in social work are exposed to certain values, such as human rights and social justice, through

educational materials and professional codes of ethics. Thus, understanding what the participants struggled with or what values they held onto in their practice would direct us to reflect on the social work profession and academic discipline as a whole, not just individual participants' values. I used the snowball sampling method for participant recruitment. As soon as I received approval from the ethics review committee (certificate No. STU 2015-134) in September 2015, I sent out the invitation letter (see Appendix A) via various listserv mailing lists. I also approached personal contacts (e.g., former colleagues, acquaintances). In addition, I attended various workshops that were related to my research and made an announcement to recruit potential participants. In many cases, the participants were recruited through the help of my personal and professional network.

In total, 22 individuals contacted me. Of those, I was not able to interview five individuals. Two of them did not have a social work education and thus did not satisfy the participant criteria I had defined. One individual did not respond after the initial contact. Another individual decided not to participate on the day we met for the interview, saying that she should have obtained approval from her supervisor. A few weeks later, she officially decided not to participate after her supervisor did not feel comfortable with her being interviewed. Another individual did not participate because of a scheduling conflict.

At the end, 17 people participated in the interviews, including myself. Initially, I opted not to interview myself; I did not think that the participants and I would share the same investment in the work with noncitizens because I was no longer a practicing social worker. Yet, as I engaged in the interview conversations with the participants, I found myself agreeing with many of the things they said. I became curious to see what I would say if I were to be interviewed. Heron (2007) used this method in her study of development workers to negotiate

the issue of accountability and power relations between researcher and researched. Given that my research was of a similarly critical nature, including myself as a participant and subjecting my narrative to the same critical gaze I used with the other interviewees seemed to be the ethical choice. I asked one of my colleagues who had an in-depth understanding of my research to conduct the interview with me.

An informed consent form was provided prior to each interview (Appendix B). To protect confidentiality, all participants' names were changed to pseudonyms; participants were given the option of choosing their own pseudonym (only two chose to do so). The participants' employers are not identified by name but are instead referred to by general categories (e.g., community health centre, school board, settlement organization, etc.). When the participants mentioned the name of a country, besides Canada, where they had close connections (e.g., where they had emigrated from or where they had significant experience), I changed the country to the region in which it is found (e.g., Guatemala would be changed to Central America).

Interviews took place between September 2015 and March 2016. The details of interview dates and the employment sectors of interview participants can be found in Appendix C. With one exception, all participants interviewed hold a master's degree in social work. All but one participant attained a social work degree from a Canadian university. Most are practicing social workers (two of them are on maternity leave), and three of us are currently working on a doctoral degree. Participants had experiences in a wide variety of fields—education, community health, HIV/AIDS, mental health, the shelter system, community law, the settlement sector, refugee resettlement, refugee advocacy, employment services, social services, and hospice settings. Some of these work settings adopted an open-door policy, meaning that access to their services is provided to anyone regardless of their immigration status, while other work settings

offer limited services to noncitizens according to requirements from their funders. Having participants from diverse workplaces helped me to see how social workers manage the different types of restrictions and challenges resulting from particular institutional settings.

While the focus of my research was on the work life of social workers, it was also important to attend, via their personal biography, to the multiple subject positions they occupy. For many social workers, their personal and professional lives are intimately intertwined. Many social workers referred to their own experiences of marginalization and oppression as motivation for entering the social work profession. For this reason, I decided to ask the participants to fill out the biographical information form (Appendix D), though not everyone filled it out. Yet, I had to consider how I would treat this information. Following my theoretical focus on the subject formation (as opposed to the individual subject), I treated their biographical information not as the essence of their social identity, but rather as subject positions that are constituted by multiple discursive practices, which then constitute participants' experiences. In the analysis I have presented in this thesis, I chose to "name" their biographical information when it was presented as being important to the discursive construction of their experiences. For example, many social workers who had immigrated to Canada often referred to themselves as "immigrants" or "refugees," and this sense of self was explained as crucial to their work with noncitizens. Similarly, some social workers referred to themselves as white when they talked about their encounters with nonwhite people. Many participants named their professional identity as a social worker when they explained their core values and guiding principles (e.g., "As a social worker, I believe that all people deserve the same"). Attending to the discursive moments when social workers enacted their social identity helped me to trace how social workers negotiate their multiple subject positions in the context of everyday work with noncitizens.

Interview process. Prior to the interview, an interview guide was prepared according to the theoretical and methodological framework I had laid out (see Appendix E). Originally, I was interested in the discursive practices of human rights—a key discourse I had expected would be operating in the work of social workers with noncitizens. When I was working in the field, I, like many of my colleagues, held on to the value of human rights as I navigated a complex system while working with noncitizens. I considered universal human rights to be essential in advocating for the rights of my noncitizen clients. However, as I had the opportunity to reflect on my work through critical scholarship (Agamben, 1998; Arendt, 1973), I came to see the danger and impossibility of human rights as applied to noncitizens in the context of the nation-state framework. An international body is unable to enforce legally and morally the protection of noncitizens in a sovereign nation-state because the state only recognizes the rights of citizens, not the human being in general. This led me to ask: In the regime of the nation-state, what does the discourse of human rights do? What is legitimized? Who is included and excluded?

To explore these questions in the context of social work with noncitizens, I asked the questions with regard to their social work background, their human rights values, and their experience working with noncitizens (challenges and success stories) during the time of the significant immigration and citizenship policy changes between 2008 and 2015. I chose a semi-structured format to allow new questions to be brought up and at the same time ensure a focus on the theme of human rights. I conducted the interviews at sites that were convenient and comfortable for participants. Each interview lasted between 50 and 90 minutes.

Despite the original focus on human rights, I was not able to get my interviewees to talk much about them; even when they did, the conversation went no further than the mention of human rights as an important value. As I asked prompting questions, I came to see that while

human rights were the key value of my own work with noncitizens, the participants discussed different (though similar) values as their grounding in their work with noncitizens—equality, humanity, "we are all human," social justice, anti-oppression, etc. Accordingly, I expanded my perspective to account for how the varying values that individual social workers hold on to become a discursive blinder that keeps them from seeing how we are all implicated in border making. As I broadened my analytical lens, I attended to how individual social workers discussed their values—how they came to hold a certain value, and how that value was helpful in their everyday work. Opening up my analytical lens this way helped to facilitate the interview process. Further, it allowed me to see that, though different in expression, the values held by social workers are similar to my understanding of human rights, which is that everyone has equal and inalienable rights. The common thread in these differently expressed values is social workers' emphasis on our sameness as human beings. Chapters 5 and 6 pick up on two key expressions of social workers' values—equality (chapter 5) and humanity (i.e., "we are all human") (chapter 6)—and examine how they become a discursive blinder that keeps us from seeing our complicity in inner border making.

As I embarked upon the recruitment and interview process, I had the opportunity to think more deeply about the nature of social work with noncitizens. First, "social work," despite its appearance of being a straightforward category, is a contested term. Social work is conventionally understood as covering a wide range of helping professions. I had to think about how to draw "the border" of social work to be able to productively conduct the research. As I mentioned earlier, I set out the recruitment criteria for interview participants to include those who had completed post-secondary social work education (i.e., bachelor's or master's degree). While this was a strategic decision, it also excluded a number of people who could have

participated in the study. Two people who approached me but had not undertaken social work education did in fact have extensive experience with noncitizens. One of the interview participants also recommended that I speak to her colleagues who had social services diplomas, for although they did not have social work education, they would have deep insights about working with noncitizens in a relevant setting. According to this interviewee, her colleagues, unlike "social workers," were far more knowledgeable about noncitizens because they were noncitizens themselves. Her insight was incredibly useful because it gave me the opportunity to think more deeply about the interviewee criteria I had set as well as to consider the accessibility of the education required to become a registered social worker. Considering the cost of post-secondary education, acquiring the designated title of social worker remains inaccessible to many, including noncitizens. Expanding the interviewee criteria would have undoubtedly led to deeper insights about working with noncitizens in a human services environment as well as expanded the participants' diversity. Yet, I had decided to include participants with social work degrees only to ensure that my focus would remain on social work itself, not on noncitizens.

Second, similar to "social work," the term "noncitizen" is slippery. When I was in the field, there was no valid reason for me to come up with an overarching term to capture the complexity and diversity that surround the life of these migrants. If necessary, I would primarily describe them according to the immigration status assigned to them—refugee claimants, visa holders, undocumented, etc. But in the context of my research, I did not feel that these terms were sufficiently theoretical because they did not capture the overall conditions that excluded these migrants from the nation-state framework.

I wanted to find a term with both theoretical and empirical significance. Existing scholarly discussions on noncitizenship demonstrate the complexities embedded in categorizing

this diverse group of people. Terms such as illegal, bogus refugees, unauthorized, and alien are often used in political and popular discourses. Scholars who have examined immigration and refugee laws and policies have criticized the use of such terms, arguing that they not only inaccurately describe the social phenomenon but also evoke negative emotional reactions and judgment. Nyers (2010), for example, talked about how a person could not be illegal: "only their actions could contravene existing law: The charge of illegality is meant to undermine the moral character of certain types of migrants… The term "illegal" implies a breaking of the legal order, a violation of rule following norms of behaviors, and an intention to commit a wrong" (p. 135).

Similarly, De Genova (2002), Dauvergne (2008), McDonald (2009), and Wright (2013) shifted the emphasis away from the individuals and attended to the laws and policies that make some people "illegal." Bauder (2013) emphasized the need to acknowledge the legal and institutional processes that have acted on migrant bodies and suggested the term "illegalized migrants" to describe people who were and are excluded by nation-states. Canadian activists and community organizations often use the terms "nonstatus," "sans papier," or "undocumented" (see, for example, Sidhu, 2013; Solidarity City Network, 2013). Goldring et al. (2007) have argued that while these terms have brought attention to underexamined populations, "each of [them] reinforces a binary categorization of immigrant and refugee legal statuses that distinguishes those with lawful legal status from those without it" (p. 1). In addition, Goldring et al. (2007) have proposed that while unauthorized border crossings have formed the main pathway to unlawful status in the United States, immigration and refugee policies in Canada have created different modes of and pathways to illegality. To capture the multiple forms of irregular status and illegality produced in Canada, these authors instead proposed the use of the term "precarious migrants." They describe the advantage of using this term as follows:

This framework allows us to locate processes of irregularization and/or the legal

production of illegality that generate precarious immigration status within a broader

analysis of the political economy and cultural politics of citizenship, in which downward

pressures on citizenship become normalized through cultural representations that

contribute to the hegemonic, but necessarily incomplete, project of producing migrant

illegality, worker flexibility, and responsible and deserving citizens. (p. 7)

Goldring et al.'s (2007) theorization of "precarious migrants" seems to capture the

conditions that exclude migrants from the nation-state framework. But as I tested the

appropriateness of this term with some colleagues who work in migrant communities, I was told

that the term did not speak to them and that it was too theoretical. After consulting with

practitioners in the field, and much consideration, I decided to use "nonstatus migrants" at the

participant recruitment stage and came up with the following description:

"migrants who do not have the legal status that would allow them to stay permanently in

Canada. These individuals include those who are considered legal (e.g., refugee claimants

waiting for decision, temporary workers), illegal (e.g., rejected claimants, expired visa

holders), or undocumented (e.g., people without identity documents)."

Understanding that the term "nonstatus migrants" was still limited, I was diligent in

explaining and describing what I meant by "nonstatus migrants" during the interview process. As

I proceeded with the interviews, I realized that the explanation and descriptor of "nonstatus

migrants"—meaning "migrants without full immigration status"—was more empirically accurate

and useful in opening up the interview process. Therefore, I began to use the phrasing "migrants

without full immigration status." But when it came to the theorization of my data set, I once

again faced the same problem. While the term "migrants without full immigration status" was

more empirically accurate than any other terms I had considered, it lacked theoretical

significance in that it did not capture the broader social relations (not simply legal status) that

exclude migrants from the nation-state framework. As I went further into the data analysis and

realized that the conditions in which migrants become excluded from the nation-state framework

were constitutive of and constituted by the sphere of Canadian citizenship, I finally decided on

"noncitizens." "Noncitizens" is not without its limitations; when used empirically in the

Canadian context, "noncitizens" would technically include permanent residents who do not have

Canadian citizenship but have the rights and privileges granted to citizens.

It became helpful for me to think about "noncitizens" not simply as an empirical term but

as representative of theoretical figures. As cited in my introductory chapter, Nail (2015) explains

that a figure is

> not a fixed identity or specific person but a mobile social position. One becomes a figure
>
> when one occupies this position. One may occupy this position to different degrees, at
>
> different times, and in different circumstances. But there is nothing essential about a
>
> person that makes the person this figure… A figure is a social vector or tendency. (p. 16)

Conceptualizing the noncitizen as a figure is particularly useful given the fluid, multiple,

and complex social relations that condition the lives of noncitizens. Attributing this meaning

enables me to attend to the diverse discursive, material, and affective works at play in

constituting the figure of the noncitizen.

Interview analysis: All interviews were tape-recorded with the permission of

participants. As soon as I ended each interview, I made the reflexive notes to record the initial

impression of interviews. I transcribed the interview as soon as possible in order to stay close to

the dynamics of the interview process and entered the interview transcripts into NVivo. After the

transcription, I highlighted the interview conversation patterns that caught my attention—

repeated expressions, rhetoric, positioning of self and other, binary constructions (e.g. good vs.

bad, privileged vs. underprivileged), narrative shifts in stories the participants told, and

heightened emotionality as expressed in their tone of voice as well as my own emotional

reactions to interview interactions. When I finished all the interviews and transcriptions, I first

came back to the parts of interview narratives and interactions that initially caught my attention. I

sought to see if there were any common threads or stories among these interview narratives and

interactions. I then zoomed out my analytical gaze by re-reading each interview narrative

numerous times according to the analytical guidelines I set out earlier (see pages 51–52). As

stated earlier, my intention was to capture the following: a ruling discourse; resistance to ruling

discourse; discursive strategies and techniques; constitutions of various subject positions;

materiality of the discourse; and historicity of the discourse (i.e., relations to larger societal

conditions). Along with the multiple reading, I began the process of coding by assigning key

words and phrases (e.g. "critique of immigration policies," "success stories," "social work

values," "challenges in workplace," "funding," "eligibilities," "empathy/feeling for or with,"

"privilege," "I am an immigrant/refugee too," etc.). As I coded the transcripts, I was careful not

to be overly categorical as I wanted to examine the interview transcripts along with other data

sources. As I synthesized different data sets within the interview process (i.e. reflexive notes,

transcripts, coding, and emotionality of the interview process) and beyond (i.e. historical analysis

and policy analysis), I mapped out multiple ways in which individual stories and emotions,

including my own, are constructed through socially accepted and available narratives.

According to the theoretical focus of inner border making, I chose to let go of some analysis.

The final analysis of the interviews presented in this thesis (chapter 5 and 6) capture the most

significant ways in which contemporary social workers become implicated in inner border making by taking up the dominant discourses to make sense of their practice experience with noncitizens.

Historical analysis—Why study history and how I incorporated historical analysis

While my research is set in the contemporary period, I felt I needed to understand the interview narratives of social workers from a historical perspective as informed by Foucault and Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial scholarship. Foucault was interested in history not for its own sake but to understand how we arrived at our present situation and how we have come to accept certain practices as the norms of society (Mills, 2003). He states:

> I was interested in them [history]—in fact profoundly interested—because I saw in them ways of thinking and behaving that are still with us. I try to show, based upon their historical establishment and formation, those systems which are still ours today and within which we are trapped. It is a question, basically, of presenting a critique of our own time, based upon retrospective analyses.
>
> (Foucault in Simon 1971, p. 192)

In other words, Foucault used history as a means of critically engaging with contemporary phenomena to understand the genesis of present conditions. Heron's (2007) discussion of colonial continuities is insightful for considering the history of the present in the context of social work with noncitizens. Her study of Canadian women who participated in international development projects shows that their investment and desire to help Others "out there" were rooted in a bourgeois identity whose beginnings go back to the era of empire. She identified this phenomenon as the operation of colonial continuities "that have been modified over time in respect to their particular expression and yet are recognizable for their similarity to their original

75

colonial manifestations and effects" (p. 7). In her study, she identified the discourse of planetary

consciousness as one such colonial continuity in which Canadian or other Northerners come to

hold a sense of entitlement and an obligation to intervene for the betterment of the Other. She

suggests that race, while no longer overtly articulated, remains essential to the meaning and

functioning of these continuities of thought (p. 7). As was the case in the colonial era, today

when Canadian women participate in international development out of their concerns for the

well-being of the subjugated Other, they are resecuring the formation of a bourgeois identity in

the global arena. Heron's analysis demonstrates the enduring tenacity and constitutive strength of

the colonial continuities that govern contemporary practice in international development.

Heron's (2007) discussion of colonial continuities attends to the importance of considering

colonial history in the governance of contemporary citizenship practice. Similar to Heron (2007),

Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) and Thobani (2007) have elucidated how the governance of

contemporary Canadian citizenship is a continuation of settler colonial projects. Drawing on this

scholarship, I situate my analysis of border making in the historical context of settler

colonialism. At one point, I considered conducting archival research as a complementary activity

to data gained from in-depth interviews, but then realized that it would amount to an enormous

set of data owing to the multiple arenas of archives I would have to engage. I also wanted to

ensure that I gave sufficient attention to the interview data, which came from living social

workers who took time from their busy schedules to participate in the study. For these reasons, I

decided to remain focused on the interview narrative as the primary data source and to

incorporate the historical analysis via the existing literature, attending to three arenas of history

in Canada—the settler colonial project, immigration, and social work. Chapter 4 is dedicated to

the analysis of how these seemingly separate histories are intimately connected to border making

in Canada and how social work has been historically implicated in inner border making in a way that sustains the settler colonial project. The historical analysis conducted in chapter 4 provides the historical context in which contemporary social work with noncitizens is examined in subsequent chapters.

Policy analysis: What I read and how I read it

As data supplementary to the primary interview data and my historical analysis, I examined public documents relating to immigration and citizenship policies in Canada between 2008 and 2015. As discussed in the introductory chapter, the Conservative government of Stephen Harper was in power during this time. The Conservatives implemented a variety of changes to immigration and citizenship policies and revived neoconservative rhetoric that stoked anti-immigrant and anti-refugee sentiments (Macklin, 2017). Accordingly, these policy changes produced not simply territorial borders but also psychological borders against particular bodies. For this reason, I found it important to apply a Foucauldian reading when examining these policy changes not only to understand the content itself but also to see how these policy changes were justified and legitimized. The policy documents I examined include the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) and Citizenship and Immigration Canada texts (backgrounders, press releases, minister's speaking notes, annual reports, and reports on plans and priorities). The list of policy documents examined can be found in Appendix F. All materials are publicly available online.

In reading the texts, I paid particular attention to the ways in which each policy constructed particular migrant subjects. As I read, I asked the following types of questions: How do policies frame the particular migrant subject and the issues associated with the subject? What historical ideas about particular migrant subjects are present in the presentation of policy? What

subjects or issues are excluded, dismissed, or erased in thinking about Canada's integrity, safety, and security? What are the historical and contemporary global forces at play in the construction of particular migrant subjects?

I read these texts with and against the interview narratives and historical analysis. As I identified the dominant discourses at play in the policy documents, I read the interview narratives to see how the social workers I spoke with both resist and take up the dominant discourses in negotiating and making sense of the marginalization of noncitizens. These analytical methods were useful in examining the contradictory and contingent ways in which social work became implicated in border making. I wove together the analysis of the interview narratives and the policy documents primarily in chapter 5 to elucidate how the macro and micro levels of power relations intersect and shape the conditions for everyday social work with noncitizens. I must make one note regarding the time period I chose to focus on for this study. From 2008 to 2015, we witnessed significant change to Canada's immigration and citizenship policies. Furthermore, the effects of those policy changes on social work practice with noncitizens are the ones I am most familiar with, as during that time I worked as a community social worker with migrant communities. Accordingly, my critiques tend to focus on the policy changes made by Harper's Conservative government between 2008 and 2015. However, Harper's Conservatives are not the only party implicated in border making in Canada. While Trudeau's Liberal government, the government in power since November 2015, has repealed some of the restrictive immigration and citizenship policies that Harper's Conservative government had implemented, several bordering practices continue under the Liberals, such as those enforced through the Safe Third Country Agreement between Canada and United States.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I detailed the research process I undertook—the theoretical and conceptual grounding for this work, the practical steps I took as part of my research inquiry, and the challenges I faced. I employed Foucauldian discourse analysis as a method to examine the power relations embedded in social work with noncitizens. My research design included in-depth interviews with social workers, historical analysis of border making, and analysis of policy documents relating to immigration and citizenship policy changes between 2008 and 2015. I described the practical steps—how I conducted the in-depth interviews, how I conducted the historical analysis of border making, and how I read the policy documents. I discussed the theoretical, conceptual, and practical challenges I faced and the adjustments I made during the research process.

Drawing on the theoretical frameworks I presented in chapter 2 and the analytical guidelines derived from the Foucauldian discourse analysis I presented in this chapter, the subsequent chapters present the three strands of my border analysis: (1) the history of border making (chapter 4); (2) neoliberal effects on border making (chapter 5); and (3) affective relations in border making (chapter 6). Each chapter highlights how social work is implicated in inner border making in settler colonial Canada. While each chapter focuses on different strands of border making, what becomes clear is how differentially expressed notions of civility comprise the key discourse demarcating the borders of Canadian citizenship.

CHAPTER 4

MAKING OF BORDERS, MAKING OF SETTLER-CITIZENS: ENTANGLED HISTORIES OF SOCIAL WORK, IMMIGRATION AND SETTLER COLONIALISM

"Morning, ma'am."

"Good morning."

"Cecil tells me you and the boy are Blackfoot."

"That's right."

"Now, I know that we got Blackfeet on the American side and the Canadians got

Blackfeet on their side. Just so we can keep our records straight, what side do you come

from? […] Canadian side or American side?" asked the guard.

"Blackfoot side," she said.

(King, 1993, p. 135–136).

Introduction

Thomas King's short story "Borders" centres on a boy and his mother from the Blackfoot Nation who set out to visit his sister who has moved to Salt Lake City in the United States. An incident occurs at the U.S.–Canadian border when the U.S. border guard asks for their citizenship documents. The mother, being a proud Blackfoot, refuses to identify herself according to imposed colonial citizenship. Her refusal leads to her and the boy being stuck between borders, unable to either enter the United States or return to Canada. At the borderland, they spend their day at a duty-free store, and at night the mother tells a traditional story to the boy as they look at the stars in the sky. Eventually, the media arrives to cover their story. As they attempt to cross the U.S. border once again, the border guard asks for their citizenship

documents. The mother persistently repeats her answer, declaring that she is Blackfoot. This time around, however, they are allowed to cross the border into the United States.

King's (1993) story tells us about many things: the nexus between borders, citizenship and identity, the arbitrariness of colonial borders, and Indigenous[3] resistance to and refusal of settler colonialism. In a similar vein, Audra Simpson's (2014) ethnographic research among the Mohawks of Kahnawà:ke, a reserve community in what is now southwestern Quebec, details how Mohawks have refused colonial borders and citizenship, arguing that these refusals in themselves underscore their nationhood. Simpson gives examples of what she calls "Mohawk interruptus"—such as the Iroquois National Lacrosse Team's decision to use their Haudenosaunee passports to travel to a competition in the United Kingdom and the Mohawk people's assertion of their sovereign right to cross the border that predates the existence of the Canadian and U.S. governments. Simpson's work centres these refusals and challenges the legitimacy of the Canadian border while simultaneously demonstrating how border histories shape questions of identity, membership, and belonging in contemporary Canada.

I begin this chapter by discussing King's (1993) and Simpson's (2014) work because it directs us to face the fundamental character of the Canadian border—that is, how it is defined by settler colonialism. As fundamental as settler colonialism is to the Canadian border, not enough attention has been paid to how settler colonialism is constitutive of and constituted by the Canadian border. I suggest that placing settler colonialism in the foreground complicates and enriches our understanding of Canadian citizenship and the border and enables us to direct our

---

[3] As stated earlier I use "Indigenous" throughout this thesis rather than "Aboriginal" given that the term "Aboriginal" is a legal classification employed by the Canadian state. However, I use "Aboriginal" if the literature I refer to uses the term.

attention to its history. The questions I pursue in this chapter are: How did the Canadian border come to be and what role has social work played in border making?

To address these questions, the next section theoretically grounds border making as being fundamental to the settler colonial project. I discuss the betrayal, violence, and dispossession involved in establishing Canada's territorial border. I then discuss how the establishment of the territorial border was insufficient to legitimize the territorial dispossession of Indigenous lands and address the importance of inner border making. I address the global dimension of inner border making, arguing that it was produced through the global shift of colonial interests and representations of non-European Others, in which the bourgeois subject emerged as the standard of goodness and morality in opposition to a changing set of Others. I suggest that in Canada, the inner border has been maintained through the discourse of white civility (Coleman, 2006), which has shaped identity, membership, and belonging in the sphere of Canadian citizenship.

After laying out my theoretical approach to border making, I examine the histories of border making in Canada and their entanglement with the histories of settler colonialism, immigration, and social work. Foucault's approach to history is instructive in my analysis of border history. As discussed earlier, Foucault was interested in history not for its own sake but to understand its relevance today—how we arrived at our present situation and how we have come to accept certain practices as the norms of society (Mills, 2003). Foucault argued that the phenomena of the past have a profound impact on the present. Thus, for Foucault, history is not about the past but rather about the present. Drawing on Foucault's concept of a history of the present, this chapter traces the histories of Canadian border making in relation to social work to anchor my subsequent analysis of present-day border practices. In short, this chapter provides the

historical context in which contemporary social work continues to function as a site of inner border making of Canadian citizenship.

This chapter is based on the existing literature that examines the histories of settler colonialism, immigration, and social work. My purpose in this chapter is not to provide a comprehensive analysis of border history or the histories of settler colonialism, immigration, and social work. Rather, I intend to show how these seemingly separate histories are indeed intimately entangled with border making in Canada. I suggest that by understanding these entangled histories, we will gain insight into how the border is not merely about demarcating territory but also about identity, membership and belonging. I propose that the key to the emergence and maintenance of the Canadian border is the discourse of white civility (Coleman, 2006). Social work has played a key role in reproducing the discourse of white civility not simply by embodying it but also by instilling it in the Other to turn them into what I would call a settler-citizen subject. A settler-citizen is a subject position produced through the discourse of white civility, which disciplines their conduct according to the racialized ideals of progress and orderliness. This conception of the "settler-citizen" subject illuminates the formation of the white Canadian sovereign nation-state through settler colonialism. The "citizen" is the (white) "settler," thus Indigenous peoples and (nonwhite) immigrant Others are imagined outside of Canadian national membership and belonging. I argue that the production of the settler-citizen subject was crucial in legitimizing Indigenous land dispossession and confirming white settler Canada as a sovereign nation-state. It is through this production of the settler-citizen subject that social work emerged and developed itself as a field for the professional helper.

The national border, white civility, and the making of the settler-citizen subject

"We didn't cross the border, the border crossed us" is a popular chant in the migrant justice movement. It was originally used in the 1990s with reference to movements against California Proposition 187, a ballot initiative purported to deny public education, health care, and other public benefits to "unauthorized aliens" (Martin, 1995). While supporters claimed that Proposition 187 would save state resources (hence its other alias, the Save Our State (SOS) initiative), Garcia (1995) has argued that it was an attempt to save the state's racial identity from becoming increasingly nonwhite. In opposition to Proposition 187, migrants, many of them from the Latina/o communities, came together to resist racial exclusion with this slogan. The slogan encapsulates the historical event of land dispossession in which the United States redrew the U.S.–Mexican border as a result of the Mexican–American War of 1846–1848 (Cisneros, 2013; Fortier, 2015). With the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which marked the end of the war, the United States attained the territories that now constitute California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming as well as control of the territory's Mexican and Indigenous inhabitants, who became subjects of the United States (Cisneros, 2013). The slogan thus points to how colonial borders were imposed on Indigenous nations and communities by cutting through their lands. It is in this context that Chicana theorist Gloria Anzaldua (1987) asserts that the U.S.–Mexican border "es una herida abierta (is an open wound)" (p. 3).

While Anzaldua (1987) talks about the border as an "open wound" (p. 3) in the context of U.S.–Mexican relations, the same can be said of the Canadian border. As Indigenous, critical race, and settler colonial scholars have long argued, the "Canadian border" as a territorial edge of a national community came to life in the process of Indigenous land dispossession and genocidal projects. Fundamental to border making was recasting the land as property and a source of

capital, thereby destroying the Indigenous relationship to land from an epistemological, ontological, and cosmological perspective (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Long before the arrival of Europeans, Indigenous communities across the continent had developed complex social structures that were founded on their relationships with the land and Creator (Finkel, 2006). A diverse set of economic activities (such as hunting, agriculture and fishery) and political systems were in place, dependent on the geographical environments of the communities. Indigenous nations understood that the land was collectively cared for and not owned by a single nation, and this shared responsibility was maintained through treaties and agreements (Simpson, 2008). Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2008) explains how Gdoo-naaganinaa (Dish With One Spoon) between the Haudenosaunee and Nishnaabeg was premised on the mutual recognition of sovereignty and land-based ethics:

> Both political entities assumed that they would share the territory, that they would both take care of their shared hunting grounds, and that they would remain separate, sovereign, self-determining, and independent nations... our dish was meant to preserve their nationhood, protect their territory, and maintain their sovereignty. At the same time, both parties knew they had a shared responsibility to take care of the territory, following their own culturally based environmental ethics to ensure that the plant and animal nations that were so dependent on them carried on in a healthy state in perpetuity. Both parties knew that they had to follow their own cultural protocols for renewing the relationship on a regular basis to promote peace, goodwill, and friendship among the Nishnaabeg and the Haudenosaunee. (p. 38)

When Europeans began to arrive in what would become Canada, Indigenous nations extended their diplomatic principles to interactions with Europeans with the expectation that the

reciprocal relationship of peace, mutual respect, and mutual benefits would be maintained (Simpson, 2008). For example, the Two Row Wampum Treaty of 1613, or Guswenta, between the Haudenosaunee and the Dutch was intended to expand political relationships to include newcomers, codifying mutual respect between the Confederacy and these new settlers (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) explain the significance of the Two Row Wampum, or Guswenta:

> Rather than a written, legal document, the Guswenta consists of two parts: an oral history that explains the meaning of the treaty and a beaded belt that serves as the visual metaphor and physical embodiment of the agreement. The belt consists of long strings of wampum—beads made of shaped, polished shells. The pattern is two thick, parallel bands of purple running the length of the belt on a field of white. The purple bands represent the Haudenosaunee canoe and the European ship, travelling together on the river of life, present but never intersecting… Between the two bands of purple are three strands of white beads, a number chosen to represent the values of peace, friendship and respect that maintain the 'middle row' between the canoe and the ship. The two peoples—Haudenosaunee and Settler—are always in contact, connected by a respectful relationship and sharing of place, but also responsible for maintaining a respectful distance, neither seeking to control the affairs of the other. (p. 64)

Treaties such as Gdoo-naaganinaa and Guswenta clearly outlined the principles, protocols, and practices that settler people must abide by to mediate their belonging on Indigenous lands (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Simpson, 2008). Yet, as history has shown, the mutual respect and responsibility promised in these treaties have not informed how settler people relate to and live on Turtle Island. Instead, the Europeans dismissed the existing

community as the legitimate inhabitants and knowers of the lands. The settler myth of terra nullius, a claim that no communities existed prior to European arrival, enabled settler people to produce the story that Canada was discovered by courageous European explorers and later settled by hard-working European settlers who brought civilization and prosperity to a land full of wilderness (Coleman, 2006; Furniss, 1999; Mackey, 2002; Thobani, 2007). As the European settlers continued to assert their territorial occupation across Turtle Island, the settler myth that drove Indigenous land dispossession was transmitted throughout settler society (Kedar, 2003). Through this assertion and adjoining legal apparatuses, settler society positioned itself as superior to Indigenous peoples and as owners of the New World's lands and resources (Wolfe, 2006). With the deliberate aim of erasing Indigenous peoples from the land, Turtle Island was split up and dissected through border making to satisfy settler colonial interests.

While the establishment of the territorial border was crucial to the settler colonial project in Canada, I propose that it was equally important to demarcate the boundaries of national membership and belonging through inner borders. Critical border scholars have argued that borders are more than a territorial boundary; they are also figurative or ideological (Balibar, 2002; Cisneros, 2013; DeChaine, 2012). These figurative or ideological borders are produced through the discursive process of defining identity and belongingness (Cisneros, 2013). With the global shift of colonial interests, the claims of religious, racial, and cultural superiority by the European imperial powers were well established by the nineteenth century. This supposed superiority was used to justify various colonial and slavery projects in the Americas, including the intentional introduction of diseases such as small pox and tuberculosis and forced starvation (Furniss, 1999; Mackey, 2002).

Fundamental to the elevation of European imperial powers was the emergence of the bourgeois subject. Europe's transition from feudalism to liberal democracy facilitated class formation, making the bourgeois subject the new elite (Razack, 1998). Heron (2007) makes an important point that "the demarcation of middle-class identity was tenuous and shifting" (p. 28), and it was through the discursive dialectic circulating between colony and metropole that bourgeois identity was produced. The bourgeois subject developed an identity by affirming the differences between itself and a changing set of Others, be it the aristocracy, the working classes, racial others, women, or criminals (Heron, 2007; Razack, 1998). Thus, bourgeois identity was not simply about class but fundamentally about race, gender, and morality (Heron, 2007; Razack, 1998).

When Europeans actively began to pursue settler colonial projects in the Americas, the figurative border on which their bourgeois identity was premised became important. The narrative that the Indigenous Other was uneducated, uncivilized, non-Christian, and lawless justified the civilizing mission of colonialism (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Thobani, 2007). In Canada, Coleman (2006) identifies the settler colonial project as the pursuit of "white civility," an alleged project of peaceful and progressive settlement that brought civilization and order to the new society (p. 10). Through an analysis of popular Canadian literature from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Coleman (2006) traces the workings of white normativity and how it was produced and maintained through the discourse of civility in Canada. Coleman argues that Canadian white civility was meant to emphasize English Canada's connections to Britain as the motherland, thus distinguishing Canada from the United States. Yet, it had to function differently from the British version of civility as Canada positioned itself as a sovereign nation-state. Coleman contends that civility signifies "the temporal concept of progress

and moral–ethical ideal of orderliness" (p. 10). The discourse of civility sets up whiteness, masculinity, and Britishness as the ideals towards which all "Others" should progress. As Canada was beginning to form as a country, these concepts of civility were "demonstrated by cultivated, polite behaviour (most commonly modelled on the figure of the bourgeois gentleman)" (Coleman, 2006, p. 10). In this way, white civility was not simply about the quality a person or culture had but something that a person or culture *did*—a prime example of what Ruth Frankenberg has called "white cultural practice" (as cited in Coleman, 2006, p. 12).

Coleman's (2006) analysis surrounds four allegorical figures that repeatedly appeared in popular texts during the nation-building years—the Loyalist brother, the enterprising Scottish orphan, the muscular Christian, and the maturing colonial son. He traces how these allegorical figures represent a specific aspect of the official symbolic history of Canada; how the figure of the Loyalist brother often represents an explanation of why Canada exists as a separate entity from the United States; how the figure of the enterprising Scottish orphan becomes a central character to the conceptual foundation of the Canadian ideal of civility; how the figure of the muscular Christian produces a story of social progress and justice; and how the figure of the maturing colonial son symbolizes Canada as a youth that has recently emerged from its colonial dependency into an independent nation. Coleman (2006) examines how these figures constitute Canada's "fictive ethnicity," in which "a nation represents the narrative of its diverse peoples' past and future as if they formed a national community" (Balibar, as cited in Coleman, 2006, p. 7). These allegorical figures represent how the discourse of white civility functions and how it is fundamental to the production and education of the individual citizen, organizing a diverse population around the idealized profile of the English Canadian (Coleman, 2006, p. 10). Through the discourse of white civility, whiteness has been naturalized as the governing principle of

Canadian identity, thereby exalting white Canadians over both Indigenous peoples and nonwhite immigrants (Thobani, 2007). Coleman argues that "civility itself is a positive value that is structurally ambivalent. This is to say that at the same time that civility involves the creation of justice and equality, it simultaneously creates borders to the sphere in which justice and equality are maintained" (p. 9). The discourse of white civility set the perimeter around who is deserving of justice and equality; thus, the space of civility is bounded, and its borders are maintained by uncivil violence and unfair exclusion (p. 9).

While Coleman's (2006) discussion is grounded in an analysis of Canadian literary culture, it sheds light on how fundamental the discourse of white civility was to border making in Canada. The discourse of white civility functioned to justify the uncivil and violent dispossession of Indigenous lands as an inevitable and necessary project to bring progress and orderliness from the motherland to Canada. As the discourse of white civility legitimized and normalized the uncivil and violent dispossession of Indigenous lands, it positioned Canada as a liberal, modern, and civilized nation that was superior to the neighbouring United States and the motherland. Simultaneously, the discourse of white civility set the normative ideal for Canadian citizenship to effectively manage and organize a diverse population. Hence, the discourse of white civility was fundamental not only in establishing the territorial border but also in producing inner borders that shaped identity, membership, and belonging in the sphere of Canadian citizenship. In this process, the settler-citizen subject, a transport of the European bourgeois subject, emerged as the true Canadian citizen who not only holds the quality of civility but practices it. As I demonstrate next, social work was a key player in producing settler-citizen subjects. It is through the production of the settler-citizen subject that social work emerged and developed as a field for the professional helper in white settler Canada. I suggest that as social work participated in the

90

production of settler-citizen subjects, it also became implicated in inner border making through creating classifications, categories and eligibility requirements in social work practices—who is in and who is out, who fits and who does not, and who is deserving and who is not.   In other words, the establishment of the social worker as the professional helper was premised on inner border making.

The histories of Canadian border making: Entangled histories of social work, immigration and settler colonialism

In the following sections, I present a historical examination of Canadian border making. Building on what I discussed in the earlier section, my analysis of border history is conducted by looking at both territorial and inner border making. To do this, I examine the entangled histories of settler colonialism, immigration and social work. I chose to study these separate histories together because they highlight how the Canadian border is constructed via external and internal politics. Given the focus of this thesis on elucidating the role of social work in Canadian border making, I centre the social work history as an anchor when choosing specific time periods to examine. My border analysis of social work history focuses on three key stages of social work: 1) its emergence in the mid-nineteenth century; 2) its professionalization in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century; and 3) its expansion in the post-war period. These developments are examined along with the historical context and events pertaining to settler colonialism and immigration. By examining different stages of social work history, I elucidate how historical conditions and changing power relations of the time have shaped the engagement of social work in border making.

My analysis is limited to the histories of English Canada, particularly that of Upper Canada. The discussion is based on the existing literature on the histories of settler colonialism,

immigration, and social work. My purpose is not to provide comprehensive accounts of social work history or the histories of settler colonialism or immigration but to identify the centrality of white civility and illuminate social work's role in border making. My analysis suggests that through their work as professional helpers, social workers not only embodied white civility, but also worked to instill it in their clients. In this way, social workers became active participants in the production of the settler-citizen subject, and simultaneously created inner borders that delineated the suitability, deservingness and desirability of national membership and belonging to white settler Canada.

The emergence of social work

An earlier form of social work can be identified in the institutionalization of poor relief in the mid-nineteenth century. Scholars have argued that the institutionalization of poor relief took place in response to growing pauper emigration from England (Baehre, 1981a; Jennissen & Lundy, 2011; O'Connell, 2013). I revisit this historical account by considering the establishment of the territorial border that has led to pauper emigration and the institutionalization of poor relief. I begin by contextualizing the emergence of social work in the form of poor relief by examining how the Canadian territorial border was established through various wars among colonial powers and Indigenous land dispossession from the late eighteenth century to the early nineteenth century. I look at how the establishment of the territorial border has pushed the settler colonial project, which required a growing number of settlers to occupy Indigenous lands. I contrast the treatment of pauper emigrants from England with that of black immigrants from the United States to show how race played a role in territorial border management and the institutionalization of poor relief. I then look at how poor relief was not simply about providing

basic needs and materials to pauper emigrants but functioned to discipline pauper emigrants according to the discourse of white civility. As poor relief became institutionalized, the establishment of eligibility criteria became a standard practice, drawing an inner border between deserving poor and undeserving poor. The table below shows the historical context and events in which the earlier form of social work emerged as the institutionalization of poor relief took place in the mid-nineteenth century.

Historical context: Colonial wars		
Settler colonialism Indigenous land dispossession	Immigration Need for settlers	Social work Emergence of social work
- Royal Proclamation of 1763 - American Revolution 1775 - Treaty of Paris 1783 - Jay's Treaty 1794 - Establishment of U.S.–Canada border 1812	- Pauper emigration - Black migration - Emancipation Act of 1833 - Fugitive Act of 1850	- Growth of religious and voluntary groups - Institutionalization of poor relief - Engagement of upper and upper-middle class

Historical context: Uncivil wars and Indigenous land dispossession. As Europe's colonial interests moved from resource extraction (e.g., the fur trade) to settlement on Turtle Island in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the rivalries between the colonial powers and resistance against them by Indigenous communities shaped the transition from colonies to bounded nation-states (Adelman & Aron, 1999). The border was drawn and redrawn on Turtle Island through a series of wars between colonial powers as well as "treaties" between Indigenous communities and colonial powers. One of the key treaties was the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which was signed by King George II of the British Empire following the Seven Years' War that marked the transfer of colonial power from France to Britain (Lawrence, 2002; Stark, 2016). As a result, Turtle Island was divided by a line that separated "New England" and "Indian

93

Territory," and the treaty further proclaimed that no Indian territory was to be occupied or purchased without the consent of the Crown; consequently, the Crown would only purchase lands it deemed necessary (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015).

Although the Proclamation appeared to respect the Indigenous nations and sovereignty, it was more about protecting the British authorities against the growing size, power and independent attitude of settlers in the Thirteen Colonies (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). Alfred (2009) argues that the Crown gave the recognition of Indigenous nationhood and sovereignty only because it needed Indigenous alliances to confront the growing settler colonial interests in the Thirteen Colonies. Indeed, the land agreement set through the proclamation was frequently undermined as the colonial powers continued to fight over Indigenous lands. Following the Seven Years of War, the tensions between the British empire and colonialists intensified, which resulted in the American Revolutionary War of 1775.

The American Revolution brought about a major change to Indigenous–settler relations. The claim of national independence for the Thirteen Colonies from the British empire meant that the terms for land agreement set through the Proclamation were no longer deemed to be valid for the American republic, thus removing the restriction that was put on settler expansion (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). A growing number of settlers poured into the Ohio Valley at the wake of the revolution in order to pursue personal independence through private land ownership. Never than before, the lands of the Great Lakes became targets of European occupation (Adelman & Aron, 1999).

The War of the American Revolution ended with the Treaty of Paris of 1783 in recognition of the independence of the Thirteen Colonies from the British empire. The international boundary was set up through the Great Lakes and the rivers between them, ignoring

the land entitlements of Indigenous nations. As America continued on with its aggressive settlement projects westward, a series of conflicts took place between Americans and Indigenous communities along the Great Lakes. Eventually, the Battle of Fallen Timbers erupted in Ohio country where the American army defeated an Indigenous confederacy in 1794 (Adelman & Aron, 1999).

The defeat was marked with Jay's Treaty of 1794, in which the British forfeited the western posts south of the lakes to the United States (Adelman & Aron, 1999). While the third article of Jay's Treaty guaranteed the right of "the Indians dwelling on either side of the said boundary line to freely cross and re-cross with their own possession" (Wright, as cited in Taylor, 2002, p. 64), the Americans begun to impose the border. The new American commandant at Niagara, Captain James Bruff, stated during a council with the Six Nations: "Lines are fixed, and so strongly marked between us [the British and the Americans], that they cannot be mistaken, and every precaution taken to prevent a misunderstanding" (Taylor, 2002, p. 66).

However, the territorial border was once again in dispute when the War of 1812 broke out between the British empire and the American republic. The British and Americans once again sought allies with the Indigenous nations of the Great Lakes, but as the war ended with the Treaty of Ghent, both lost interest in them, viewing them as obstacles to economic development. The present-day U.S.–Canada border was formalized at the end of the War of 1812, dismissing the existing Indigenous nations across the imposed border (Adelman & Aron, 1999). The setting of the border prompted increased and more energetic interest from both the American republic and the British empire to expand across the continent (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p.11). The Americans continued to claim whole territories and sold the land in pieces to raise money for the navy, army, and state infrastructure (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). Similarly, the

British Empire, fearing that the Americans might try to claim territories free of British settlements, began to encourage westward and northward settlement, ignoring earlier recognition of Indigenous nationhood and political sovereignty, as well as the legal guarantees to land ownership and access set out in the treaties (Alfred, 2009; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). The surrender of land by Indigenous peoples accelerated after 1818, when Lt.-Gov. Peregrine Maitland (1818–1828) introduced a new scheme for acquiring land from Indigenous nations; instead of a traditional lump sum, the colonial government would pay annuities in perpetuity for the land (O'Connell, 2013). The government would then resell the land to development companies and settlers on credit, while the annual interest payments of the buyers would fund and maintain the scheme (O'Connell, 2013, p. 8). The colonial government and white elites pursued the extraction of large tracts of land thereafter and continued to add Indigenous territories to Upper Canada (O'Connell, 2013).

Pauper emigration and Black immigration. As the newly established territorial border pushed the settler colonial project through Indigenous dispossession, the growing need for settlers was apparent. The colonial government's need for settlers coincided with the social pauperization of the British labouring class back in the "mother country" (Baehre, 1981b). Following the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 and a series of poor harvests, British society witnessed growing political, economic, and social turmoil, all of which was the legacy of the Industrial Revolution, overpopulation, and mass unemployment (Baehre, 1981b; Nail, 2015). In this context, emigration to Upper Canada was encouraged to reduce poverty in Britain and provide an opportunity for the poor to gain the status not available to them back home (Baehre, 1981b; Nail, 2015; O'Connell, 2013). By the 1820s, the British settlement and pauper emigration schemes to Upper Canada were officially encouraged by Robert Wilmot-Horton, a member of

Parliament and undersecretary for the colonies. He proposed, in the name of colonial development, that 12 million British pounds be spent to expel one million paupers to the British colonies (Neil, 2015). Upper Canada was promoted as an ideal poor man's country where all emigrants would become landowners (Baehre, 1981b). The growing number of poor and middle-class emigrants, who began to arrive between 1829 and 1836, were mainly settled by the Canada Company, a creation of British investors who purchased two-thirds of the clergy reserves (Baehre, 1981b; O'Connell, 2013, p. 7).

Around the same time that British pauper emigrants settled in Upper Canada, the Black population steadily increased following the end of the War of 1812, when the Loyalists brought their slaves and freed slaves landed in Nova Scotia and Ontario (O'Connell, 2013). By the late 1820s, a number of Black communities were established across Upper Canada. Although the colonial government needed the settlers for territorial expansion and the leaders of Upper Canada took an abolitionist stance, the Black migrants were not welcomed with enthusiasm. They did not automatically become British subjects whose safety and freedom were guaranteed. Although the fugitive slaves were granted freedom and land if they worked as reliable military men, they did not receive the same benefits as white subjects (Winks, as cited in O'Connell, 2013). The antislavery rhetoric was often weighed against the growing number of Black settlers amid tensions with the American republic (O'Connell, 2013). When the Emancipation Act of 1833 abolished slavery in the British Empire, including upper Canada, a growing number of fugitive slaves crossed the border from the United States; yet they did not enjoy the freedom that was promised through the Act (Asaka, 2012). The same year the Emancipation Act passed, the Upper Canadian legislature institutionalized the fragility of Black immigrants with an act that provided for the extradition of "fugitive offenders from foreign countries," under which

individuals charged with "murder, forgery, larceny, or other crimes" could be returned to the original place of the alleged crime (Asaka, 2012; p. 221). Accordingly, slave owners roamed around Upper Canada to capture fugitive slaves, and fear of extradition permeated Black communities. To counter the threat of extradition, Black communities in Canada petitioned the British government, arguing that engaging in fugitive slave extradition was an act of aggression on state sovereignty. The petitioners appealed to British civility, maintaining that the absence of slavery in Canada was a British condition that should be maintained within its colonial boundaries, and thus any exertion of U.S. jurisdiction in Canada signified an infiltration of the border between British freedom and American slavery (Asaka, 2012, p. 224). However, the British government exhibited a passive stance on fugitive slave extradition and regarded fugitive slave extraditions as a legitimate bilateral system (Asaka, 2012).

An increasing number of blacks crossed the border after the United States Congress passed the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850. With this Act, the citizens in the United States were required to support slave owners to capture fugitive slaves, even in the free northern states. Fearing that their freedom was at risk, three thousand blacks crossed the border from the United States to Canada in one month following the introduction of the Act (Olbey, as cited in O'Connell, 2013, p. 15). The sudden growth of Black populations raised concern even for anti-slavery supporters (O'Connell, 2013). The Black communities faced discrimination in every aspect of their life—in schools, at churches, on public transportation, and in the labour market (O'Connell, 2013). Despite the self-image of Canada as a "'site for concrete solidarity' where metropolitan and Canadian abolitionists successfully lobbied administrators on behalf of cross-border runaways to prevent fugitive extradition to the United States" (Asaka, 2012; p. 220), racial ideology was fundamental to the ways in which Black migrants were treated in Canada.

The politics of slavery overrode the territorial border to transplant American racial tension into British Canadian politics, which led to most of the Black settlements in Canada being dissolved by the end of the 1850s (Brown-Kubish, 2004; O'Connell, 2013).

      Institutionalization of poor relief practice. The differential treatment of British pauper emigrants and Black migrants suggests that the territorial border functioned to determine the suitability and desirability of potential settlers according to racial ideology. This racial ideology constructed white pauper emigrants as deserving of help, and hence an institutionalized form of poor relief practice was established. Yet, white pauper emigrants were not entirely free from struggle. Indeed, many emigrants had poor health, with most of the resources they had brought from home having been spent by the time they arrived in Upper Canada (Baehre, 1981a). While land was given for free or cheaply to earlier emigrants upon their arrival, many of them lacked knowledge and skills in farming, making it impossible to cultivate the land (Baehre, 1981a). Believing that granting easy access to land had not led to its cultivation by these pioneer settlers or the improvement of pauper emigrants' lives, the British government urged the introduction of a new system for land grants in 1832 based on the logic of an agrarian–commercial capitalist economy (Baehre, 1981a). Under the new system, the land was no longer granted for free or cheaply but sold at auction to the highest bidder (Baehre, 1981a). The profit from the land sale was then to be used for the transportation of other British emigrants to Upper Canada, while poor settlers who were unable to afford land under the new system were to work for wages until they had enough money to purchase land themselves (Baehre, 1981a). The new system, however, was never completely implemented nor did it improve the lives of the poor, primarily because there was no stable employment available to them (Baehre, 1981a). A growing number of British emigrants in Upper Canada found themselves landless, jobless, and destitute.

Baehre (1981b) identifies the years between 1817 and 1837 as the time period when significant structural and ideological changes took place in the realm of poor relief practices in Upper Canada. Before 1817, no institutional mode of relief existed in Upper Canada, and individuals in distress were supported by families and community members or given occasional payment or support by district magistrates (Baehre, 1981b). As late as the 1810s, magistrates in charge of dispensing municipal aid in Upper Canada made little distinction between able-bodied persons in distress and the disabled (Finkel, 2006). However, such impromptu poor relief practice proved to be inadequate when a growing number of pauper emigrants began to arrive in Upper Canada. In Upper Canada, the British Poor Law system was rejected in the 1790s (Baehre, 1981b; O'Connell, 2013). Poverty at that time was considered an individual and family problem, not the responsibility of the government (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011; O'Connell, 2013). Owing to the absence of a poor law, religious groups and voluntary agencies became responsible for the welfare of the poor in Upper Canada; these groups later gave way to and coexisted with more institutional state-sponsored programs (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011, O'Connell, 2013). The first officially organized voluntary organization, the Society for the Relief of Strangers, was established in York (Toronto) in 1817.[4] The organization was modelled on a similar society in London, England, whose object was "to afford relief to Strangers who having no legal settlement in England are not entitled to parochial relief under the poor law" (Baehre, 1981b, p. 59). The Society was funded by individual subscriptions and church donations and responded to the needs of recently arrived pauper emigrants.[5] With an increase in pauper migration, a growing number of religious and voluntary agencies began to appear by the 1820s. As the demands on the

---

[4] A similar charitable society, the Kingston Compassionate Society, was also set up in Kingston that same year.

[5] The society later began to focus on poor relief for those who were sick and destitute in 1828.

religious and voluntary organizations grew, they began to receive funding from the municipal and provincial governments. A more centralized state-sponsored poor relief system was also set up with the establishment of the Emigration Temporary Asylum in 1828 and the House of Industry in 1837 (Baehre, 1981b, Finkel, 2006).

The poor relief practice was not simply about the benevolent act of providing basic needs and materials to pauper emigrants but functioned to shape their work habits, foster discipline, and promote morality according to the discourse of white civility (Baehre, 1981b; O'Connell, 2013; Pitsula, 1979). As poor relief became formalized and institutionalized, charity societies as well as institutional organizations made sure that the relief was given only to the "deserving poor"—"individuals of good moral character who were destitute owing to misfortune and not through any fault of their own"—not undeserving "paupers who were too lazy and morally degenerate to support themselves" (Pitsula, 1979, p. 36). Various ratings of morality accompanied the rejection or acceptance of such relief requests—the tidiness of one's appearance, the cleanliness of living conditions, alcohol consumption, sexual behaviours, and the level of self-respect and self-reliance of aid candidates (O'Connell, 2013). Baehre (1981b) asserts that despite the absence of the Poor Law Act in Upper Canada, its principles were still carried out through the organization of poor relief practices: the more centralized and permanent the poor relief system became, the stricter the eligibility requirements were. The type of relief was restricted to relief in kind; the able-bodied had to work for the relief, while the old, sick, and infirm were provided refuge at the House of Industry. Poor relief was used to combat the "evils" of pauperism like vagrancy, begging, vice and petty crimes; and pauper delinquent children were "educated" inside the House of Industry (p. 80). The inner border between "deserving poor" and "undeserving poor" became fundamental to the ways in which the poor relief system was

institutionally set up and practiced at the time, later influencing the ways in which the boundaries of national membership and belonging were imagined.

Making of the settler-citizen. Scholars have asserted that disciplining pauper emigrants through the poor relief system was the key mechanism laying the foundation for the emerging capitalist labour market in Upper Canada (Baehre, 1981b; Rooke & Schnell, 1982). Examining the development of the poor relief system against the backdrop of settler colonial histories, it can be argued that the disciplining of pauper migrants also functioned to produce a settler-citizen who conformed to the idealized profile of English Canadians. Fundamental to the making of the white settler-citizen was the discourse of white civility (Coleman, 2006). The key actors at the House of Industry—volunteer visitors who assessed relief eligibility—consisted of upper-class men from distinguished professions; participating in volunteer activities was regarded as a sign of class status, or "white civility" (Noble, 1979; O'Connell, 2013, p. 11; Pitsula, 1979). The discourse of white civility also governed the ways in which poor relief was delivered to children within the House of Industry. Rooke and Schnell's (1982) historical account on childhood and charity in nineteenth-century British North America revealed how the House of Industry used the apprenticeship as a form of poor relief for children: A "large number of children were placed out with *respectable persons* in the country" (emphasis in original) whereby they were removed "from the temptations and vices to which they are exposed in a large city." To encourage the habits of industry and sobriety that "will prepare them for usefulness and competency through life, the House of Industry received children whose parents and friends were unable to support them, placed them at school, and cared for and protected their morals and persons, until suitable country homes could be found" (p. 164).

The discourse of white civility was also indicative of the ways in which Indigenous peoples were constructed as inferior and uncivilized subjects in Christian missionary efforts. Morgan's (2016) analysis of the discourse of colonial missionaries working among Indigenous women and men in Upper Canada from the 1820s to the 1850s demonstrates how the efforts to Christianize and civilize Indigenous peoples involved the transformation of gender relations. The missionaries' efforts were aimed at turning the Indigenous women into "good housewives" and "fit mothers" while changing the Indigenous men from hunters into farmers; such roles were modelled on the gender, race, and class identities of the British white family. Morgan (2016) argues that imposing the European ritual of domesticity onto Indigenous gender relations reinforced those relations among the settler colonizers themselves. She asserts that "if even the 'degraded' and 'heathen' Natives of the colony had been able to renounce their way of life and embrace new ways of being a Christian man or woman, then they might inspire those white men and women who were already one step closer to Christian morality to serve as an example to Indigenous peoples, who were in desperate need of models to emulate" (2016, p. 102). The discourse of white civility created and sustained the conditions in which the violent acts of land dispossession and cultural genocide towards Indigenous communities were legitimized. This earlier form of social work was instrumental in confirming and propagating the discourse of white civility in the wider communities through poor relief practices and missionary work.

The professionalization of social work

The professionalization of social work took place in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, being attributed to the developments of the Charity Organization Society and the Settlement House Movement. By the early twentieth century, home visiting, hospital work,

immigration support services, poverty relief assistance, childcare, and day nurseries were established (Johnstone, 2018). In 1914, the first social work program was opened at the University of Toronto (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). The Canadian Association of Social Workers was formed in 1926 (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). I reframe these developments of social work history as part of broader nation-building projects at the time when Canada was consolidating its national border. I begin by discussing how the consolidation of the national border was critical to the assertion of sovereignty against the fear of American expansionism. I suggest that the national border was further consolidated when the Dominion of Canada formed a Confederation in 1867. I show how various colonial policies were implemented to erase Indigenous nationhood and destroy Indigenous relationships to the land in order to set up the conditions for further western settlement. As the Dominion of Canada pursued settlement, the growing need for labour was apparent. Yet, the inclusion of migrant labour was premised on keeping Anglo conformity intact. The introduction of a border control regime reflected this principle and functioned to exclude the racialized Other. I demonstrate how the activities of the Charity Organization Society and the Settlement House Movement similarly followed a racialized nationalist discourse, primarily to legitimize white civility as a standard of morality and goodness. I contend that social work as a new helping profession was instrumental in producing settler-citizen subjects who would contribute to the making of white settler Canada. In this process of settler-citizen subject making, social workers drew and relied on inner borders that delineated the suitability of national membership in white settler Canada. The table below describes the historical context and key events in which social work formed itself as the professional helper at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century.

Historical context: The American Civil War and expansionism		
Settler colonialism: Erasure of Indigenous nationhood	**Immigration: Border control regime**	**Social work: Professionalization**
• Reserve system 1850 • Gradual Civilization Act of 1857 • Gradual Enfranchisement Act in 1869 • Confederation 1867 • Indian Act of 1876 • Western settlement • Numbered treaties • Creation of the North-West Mounted Police • Establishment of the residential school	• Mass immigration from non-British European countries • Chinese labour migrants • Gentlemen's agreements between Canada and Japan • Continuous Journey legislation • Black Oklahoman immigration to Canada • Immigration Act	• Scientific benevolence • Charity Organization Societies • Settlement movement • Establishment of academic discipline • Rise of eugenics

Historical context: The American Civil War, American expansionism and the birth of Confederation.

The fear of American expansionism lingered on as the American Civil War (1861–1865) progressed. While there were several factors that led to the Civil War, slavery politics was one of the key elements (Boyko, 2013). The tensions caused by different attitudes and policies toward slavery between the northern states (the Union) and the southern states (the Confederate) reached their peak when newly elected President Abraham Lincoln took an anti-slavery stance. The southern states feared that the abolishment of slavery would affect their economy, which largely relied on slave-based plantations, and seven southern states seceded to form the Confederate (Boyko, 2013). As the war broke between the Union and the Confederate, Britain remained neutral, and by extension the Province of Canada (Ontario and Quebec) and the Maritime colonies of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland

were also neutral (Boyko, 2013). Despite its official stance, the public in British North America was divided. In fact, many were sympathetic to the Confederate despite its stance on slavery. There were many factors to taking the side of the Confederate, but one major factor was the Union's anti-Canadian, anti-British sentiment (Boyko, 2013). President Lincoln had appointed William Seward to his cabinet; Seward believed that Canada was destined to be part of the United States (Boyko, 2013). The need to strengthen the Canadian territorial border became more urgent when the Civil War ended with the victory of the Union, which made the threat of annexation more likely. In order to counter the threat of annexation, the British North American colonies—the Province of Canada (Ontario and Quebec), Nova Scotia and New Brunswick— came together to form the Dominion of Canada as a new Confederation in 1867 (Boyko, 2013).

The erasure of Indigenous nationhood. As a new Confederation with the ambition of further western settlement, the Dominion of Canada engaged in a variety of nation-building projects. The establishment of the Dominion of Canada was premised on permanent occupation of Indigenous lands. Even prior to Confederation, Indigenous nations were no longer regarded as allies but as interferences in the pursuit of further settlement. Accordingly, a number of policies were implemented to isolate and erase Indigenous nationhood and its relationship to the land. When Upper Canada and Lower Canada formed the Province of Canada in 1850, one of the first actions through the Robinson Treaty was to pass legislation that allowed for the creation of Indian reserves (Lawrence, 2003). This legislation reinforced the right of settlers to the entire land base by restricting "Indians" to specific territories within it while also loosely defining who could be considered an "Indian" (Miller, as cited in Lawrence, 2003). The Gradual Civilization Act of 1857 encouraged Indigenous peoples to embrace the concept of private land ownership

through the conversion of reserve lands into alienated plots upon enfranchisement (Lawrence, 2003). This Act was followed by the Gradual Enfranchisement Act in 1869, which gave the superintendent of Indian Affairs the power to determine access to Indian lands (Thobani, 2007). This Act also stipulated who could be considered a status "Indian." Accordingly, any Indigenous woman who married a white man would lose her Indian status and any right to band membership; only those who had at least one-quarter Indian blood would be considered status Indians (Lawrence, 2003). Soon after Confederation, various legislation and policies governing Indigenous peoples were consolidated into the Indian Act of 1876 in order to systemically facilitate the management of Indigenous populations and their relationship to the land (Thobani, 2007). The Indian Act set out the control of reserve lands and reorganized Indigenous nations through the imposition of band councils. By fragmenting Indigenous nations into smaller band groupings, the reserve system weakened the political power of Indigenous nations by furthering and institutionalizing the divisions within them (Thobani, 2007).

Following the Indian Act of 1876, continuing land acquisition was justified through land purchase agreements called Numbered Treaties. Between 1871 and 1921, the Dominion of Canada signed 11 treaties to formalize the settlement and resource extraction on land referred to in the present day as Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and the Northwest Territories (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015). The Numbered Treaties were framed as lawful land cession contracts and became a mechanism for Canadian nation-building projects as Canada began articulating a national identity through the creation and expansion of a bounded state (Stark, 2016, para. 9).

Stark (2016) contends that in addition to land dispossession through treaty making, the assertion of state jurisdiction over Indigenous peoples of the Canadian prairies was facilitated

primarily through the creation of the North-West Mounted Police (NWMP; 1873–1920). While

the contemporary political narrative suggests that the NWMP was set up to maintain peace and

lawfulness in the Canadian prairies,[6] scholars have noted the violent ways in which the NWMP

functioned as a tool of the settler colonial project (Mackey, 2002; Stark, 2016). As Stark puts it,

"The NWMP was a hybrid of military and law, deployed to ensure law preceded settlement,

promoting an image of protection for the settlers needed to carry out westward expansion" (para.

4). The NWMP also acted as a facilitator of assimilative policies, as they disciplined and

silenced Indigenous nations (Stark, 2016). When Indigenous communities defied and fought

against colonial policies and invasions through movements such as the Riel Rebellion, they were

framed as uncivilized, lawless, savage, and criminals through colonial legislation and became the

target of harsh punishments (Stark, 2016). Stark (2016) asserts that it was important for the

Dominion of Canada to frame the NWMP as lawful subjects while criminalizing Indigenous

peoples who resisted the colonial policies so that the Dominion of Canada could disguise its own

criminal behaviours.

The establishment of the Indian residential school system was built on and further

legitimized the construction of Indigenous peoples as uncivil and savage. In justifying the

government's residential school policy, Canada's first prime minister, Sir John A. Macdonald,

told the House of Commons in 1883:

> When the school is on the reserve the child lives with its parents, who are savages; he is
>
> surrounded by savages, and though he may learn to read and write, his habits and
>
> training and mode of thought are Indian. He is simply a savage who can read and write.
>
> It has been strongly pressed on myself, as the head of the Department, that Indian

---

[6] See, for example, the citizenship test guide.

children should be withdrawn as much as possible from the parental influence, and the only way to do that would be to put them in central training industrial schools where they will acquire the habits and modes of thought of white men. (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 64)

Casting Indigenous peoples as the savage and uncivilized Other in relation to civil "white men" through institutional practices such as the NWMP and the residential school system was critical to the settler colonial project and became foundational to the ways in which inner borders were drawn.

The **institutionalization of border control and the making of white Canada**. As western settlement took place through the dispossession of Indigenous lands, the Dominion of Canada needed more labourers. While the territorial invasions and colonial laws had legitimized its status as sovereign nation state, there were many signs that post-Confederation Canada was still fragile (Mackey, 2002). During the mid 1880s, the Dominion faced the Riel Rebellion, ongoing French resistance, the threat of American expansionism, and economic depression (Mackey, 2002). The Dominion was also unable to attract many immigrants, leading to slow western settlement (Mackey, 2002). The sense of fragility had to be replaced with the sense of national unity. It was in this historical context that the Canada First Movement emerged in 1868 (Mackey, 2002). The Canada First Movement was aimed at defining a distinctive Canadian nationality of "one people" based on shared traditions and similar racial characteristics (Mackey, 2002, p. 31). It was "grounded in the belief that Canada was a 'Britain of the North', a 'northern kingdom' whose unique and distinctive character derived from its northern location, its ferociously cold winters, and its heritage of 'northern races'" (Berger, as cited in Mackey, 2002, p. 30). The adjective "northern" represented the masculine notion of strength, self-reliance and

liberty, "a vision that concealed the brutality faced by destitute settlers" (O'Connell, 2013, p. 4).

Mackey (2002) argues that "this racialised 'Canadianness' was mobilized to create links between

Canada and Britain and other northern and 'civilised' nations, to differentiate Northern and

Southern peoples, and to distinguish Canada from the USA" (p. 30). The northern race discourse

functioned flexibly to include particular bodies and exclude others. For example, Indigenous

peoples, who have lived in a northern climate for centuries, were excluded, while the French,

despite the emphasis on the close link with British heritage in the Canada First Movement, were

strategically included, emphasizing their shared traditions and similar racial characteristics

(Mackey, 2002).

The northern race discourse became fundamental to how immigration and border control

policies were shaped in Canada. The first Immigration Act of 1869 was created with the

intention to actively recruit British immigrants, and thus contained few restrictions on

immigration.[7] When the government was unable to recruit sufficient British immigrants, it turned

to the recruitment of continental Europeans, but the persistent crop failures and lack of

employment opportunities in the Prairies discouraged immigration and settlement (Kelley &

Trebilcock, 2010). The lack of immigrants particularly became an issue when the Dominion had

to fulfill its pledge to build a transcontinental railway, which was a condition of British

Columbia joining the Confederation. The lack of a labour force meant that the railway company

had to turn to immigration elsewhere. An estimated 15,000 Chinese labourers were recruited for

the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway between 1880 and 1884 (Kelley & Trebilcock,

2010). After the railway was completed, Canada slowly began to see signs of economic

---

[7] The Immigration Act of 1869 primarily focused on ensuring the safety of immigrants during their passage to Canada and protecting them from exploitation upon their arrival (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010).

prosperity. By the mid-1890s, the increase in mining production and wheat production was evident, and there were growing employment opportunities, particularly in the Prairie provinces (Avery, 1975). Three million immigrants arrived between 1896 and 1914 (Palmer, 1990). Between 1901 and 1911, Canada's population jumped by 43%, and the percentage of immigrants in the country as a whole topped 22% (Palmer, 1990). People of non-British and non-French origin formed one-third of the population of the western provinces (Palmer, 1990). Many Central and Eastern Europeans were recruited as agriculturalists and industrial labourers, and were regarded as "stalwart peasants" who would play a key role in western settlement (Avery, 1975; Mackey, 2002).

Despite the increasing number of non-British immigrants, Anglo conformity continued to be the predominant ideology of assimilation in English-speaking Canada. Coleman (2006) argues that the popularized figure of the muscular Christian was central to westward expansion at the time of western settlement through mass immigration. The figure of the muscular Christian linked the image of masculinity (e.g., physical sturdiness and discipline) with moral rectitude and orderliness and re-secured the white, British male as the national norm in English-speaking Canada. As whiteness, masculinity, and Britishness remained normative ideals at the time of a diversifying demographic in Canada, immigrants who did not (i.e., could not) conform to the national norms were effectively marginalized. For instance, while the government and railway companies saw Chinese labourers as necessary actors in the construction of the railway, many politicians, white labourers, and residents of British Columbia were against their presence. Chinese immigrants were labeled as immoral, unsanitary, and unassimilable (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). Soon after the railway was completed, the hostility towards Chinese immigrants ballooned as West Coast cities became home to many impoverished and unemployed

111

Chinese. The government claimed no responsibility for them and instead began to close the border to Chinese immigration. The Chinese Immigration Act of 1885 introduced the head tax system, which aimed to restrict further migration from China (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010; Abu-Laban, 1998; Mackey, 2002; Thobani, 2007). Many continental Europeans endured dangerous working conditions and lived in unhealthy, unsanitary conditions without any government support (Avery, 1975). Indeed, as the immigrant population became increasingly diverse at the turn of the twentieth century, the Canadian public began to see this diverse group of immigrants as a threat to Anglo conformity (Avery, 1975; Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010).

As a way to "manage" the demographics of the population, a series of changes was introduced to border control and immigration policies. The Immigration Act of 1906 introduced a more restrictive immigration policy, expanding the categories of prohibited immigrants, formalizing a deportation process, and granting the government discretionary powers to make judgments on admission (Avery, 1975; Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). While the Immigration Act did not specifically restrict immigrants based on their culture, ethnicity, or nationality, it gave the governor in council discretionary powers to prohibit certain classes of immigrants (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). Soon after, in 1908, restrictions on Japanese immigration were introduced through a bilateral agreement between the Canadian and Japanese governments. The policy was implemented in response to a recent influx of Japanese labourers into British Columbia and a surge in anti-Asian sentiment in the province. Under the terms of the "gentlemen's agreement," the Japanese government voluntarily capped the number of Japanese immigrants annually arriving in Canada to 400 individuals (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). In the same year, the continuous journey regulation was introduced. The regulation stated that prospective immigrants travelling to Canada must arrive by a continuous journey from the country in which they were

natives or citizens on a through ticket purchased in that country. The regulation effectively closed the border to anyone travelling from Asian countries, since the main routes from Asia did not offer direct passage to Canada (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010).

Overt racism was institutionalized through the Immigration Act of 1910. A new provision allowed the government to prohibit the landing of immigrants "belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada, or of immigrants of any specified class, occupation or character" (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). Among the affected were Black Oklahoman farmers who attempted to flee increased racism in the United States. When several hundred Black Oklahoman farmers expressed an interest in coming to Canada, they were rejected based on unfit character and unsuitability to agrarian life in Canada West (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). In response to anti-Black sentiment spreading in Canada West, then Minister of Interior Frank Oliver drafted an order-in-council in 1911 that prohibited the landing in Canada of "any immigrant belonging to the Negro race, which race is deemed unsuitable to the climate and requirements of Canada" (as cited in Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010, p. 158). While then Prime Minister Laurier did not proclaim the order, anti-Black immigration policy was informally adopted. The policy was so effective that the number of Black immigrants to Canada fell from 136 individuals from 1907 to 1908 to seven individuals from 1909 to 1910 (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010).

The Immigration Act of 1906 and 1910 also expanded the list of categories of who was inadmissible. The prohibition applied to the following groups: the epileptics; the insane; individuals with impairments of sight, speech, and sound; those with contagious diseases; the destitute, impoverished, and anyone likely to become a public danger; those convicted of crimes of moral turpitude, prostitutes, and anyone involved in the procurement of prostitutes; and

political dissidents (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). The deportation provisions were also applied to these individuals. The 1906 Act specified that any individual that fell into one of the prohibited classes within two years of arriving in Canada was subject to deportation. The 1910 Act further tightened the process by expanding the grounds for deportation, extending the probationary period to three years after arrival. As the territorial border became consolidated via the institutionalization of border control and immigration policies, white settler Canada further legitimized its status as a sovereign nation-state.

The professionalization of social work. The territorial border that demarcated and defined the nature of white settler Canada had to be endorsed internally to be effective and viable. Social work played a key role in reinforcing the national territorial border within as it elevated its status from a volunteer-based activity to a profession between the 1880s and 1920s (Johnstone, 2016; Kunzel, 1993). While poor relief activities through the House of Industry and other charitable agencies were operated by volunteers, they received funding from the municipal and provincial governments. As the population grew significantly in Upper Canada, provincial spending on the voluntary sector also increased from $12,610, to be distributed among 16 charities in 1870, to $77,731.82, to be distributed to 72 charities in 1890 (Maurutto, 2003). As public funding increased, the colonial government became more interested in overseeing the activities of charitable organizations. A new system was put in place for allotment and management of the funds given to charities: a new cadre of inspectors was hired to monitor the internal operations of recipients; funding allotments were determined according to the type and amount of service provided by each charity; institutions in receipt of aid had to submit annual reports documenting all sources of revenues, including the amount received from private donations; local charities were to limit their mandate to service delivery; and eligibility and

funding structures would be determined by central bureaucracies (Maurutto, 2003). Accordingly, every aspect of their programs was subject to enumeration and scrutiny by centralized authorities (Maurutto, 2003). Charitable activities had moved from the private to the public domain.

It was in this context that the social work profession began to take shape. The Associated Charities, part of the broader Charity Organization Societies movement, was established in 1881 in Toronto, following examples from England and the United States (Pitsula, 1979). The market principles of efficiency, bureaucracy, and centralization were the key to this new movement (Maurutto, 2003). The members who engaged in the Charity Organization Societies saw private charities as individual, impulsive, and creating dependency. Consequently, they "denounced the 'indiscriminate alms-giving' of charity as unscientific and backward" (Valverde, 2008, p. 19). The key function of Charity Organization Societies, then, was to coordinate and organize the efficient administration of charity to the poor (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). Jennissen and Lundy (2011) suggested that this coordinated effort was not merely about providing efficient services but rather about avoiding the duplication of benefits to the poor. The members advocated secular, rational, and scientific charity and critiqued "sentimental benevolence in favour of more efficient, systemic philanthropy ruled by the head rather than by the heart" (Kunzel, 1993, p. 37). The inner border between deserving and undeserving constructed during the earlier years of poor relief practices continued on and the members acted as "friendly visitors" in poor communities to identify those who were considered the "worthy poor" and to encourage a change in their immoral behaviours (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011; Lee & Ferrer, 2014). Agnew has argued that Charity Organization Societies "was a clear example of a specific British social system which valued particular Victorian notions of culture and family that was transferred and instilled onto Canadian soil" (as cited in Lee & Ferrer, 2014, p. 4).

Along with the emergence of Charity Organization Societies, the establishment of the settlement house movement is often credited with the origin of the contemporary social work profession (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). Contrary to the Charity Societies Organization, the settlement house movement saw poverty not as an individual problem but a structural one (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). The key aim of the settlement house movement was social reform based on the ideas of equality and social justice. The first settlement house, Toynbee Hall, was established in the most impoverished area in London, and many settlement workers lived among members of the community to not only provide services but also act as role models (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). Jane Addams, who is often regarded as the pioneer of the settlement movement in the United States, visited Toynbee Hall in London and later established Hull House in Chicago in 1889 (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). Addams critiqued the charity model, arguing that "this approach simply encouraged a mock display of 'impossible virtues' while ignoring the actual experiences and values of poor families" (Agnew, 2004, as cited in Lee & Ferrer, 2014, p. 4). Mackenzie King, a future prime minister of Canada, visited Hull House. After spending time with Addams, he became a settlement house advocate in Canada (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011; Johnstone, 2016; Lee & Ferrer, 2014). Kongeter (2012) argued that along with the settlement movement that took place in England, Addams was influential in the establishment of the first set of settlement houses in Canada. The settlement house movement in Canada was closely linked to the country's changing demographics owing to immigration (Johnstone, 2016). One of the first settlement houses in Toronto, the Toronto University Settlement, was set up in St. John's Ward in 1910. The greatest number of the city's poor resided there, the majority of whom were non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants such as Jews, Italians, Asians and African-Americans (Johnstone, 2016).

White civility and eugenics. While different in the scope and aim of their activities, the Charity Organization Societies and the settlement house movement were instrumental in reproducing inner borders via the discourse of white civility and thus contributing to Canada's nation-building project. The key players in these movements were women from the middle and upper class who advanced their social status by virtue of being rescuers and professionals (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011; Johnstone, 2016). Engaging women in these activities was deemed acceptable as long as they participated in the construction of women in general as being guardians of the home and dependent on male protection (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011; Valverde, 2008). The idea of the white patriarchal nuclear family was prevalent and considered fundamental to preserving white civility (Johnstone, 2016). While women were active in these movements, men were highly representative in administrative roles (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). Johnstone (2018) asserts that white Canadian women who were involved in early social work were part of settler feminism; they incorporated liberal norms of conduct and believed that they represented valuable racial stock and were qualified to help those of lesser stock (p. 332). As they became involved in the management of unruly classes—Catholic francophones, peasants from Eastern and Southern Europe, and First Nations people—they participated in the governance and racial constitution of a white settler colony.

By the time social work was established as an academic discipline, the Charity Organization Societies and the settlement house movement began to merge as their activities converged and became more coordinated. Examining the historical conditions in which the first academic social work program was established in Canada, Chambon (2012) argued that one of the defining roles of the school of social work lay in the building of the nation. The new school of social work at the University of Toronto aimed to foster its own cadre of leaders and develop its expertise, and

117

it would no longer need to rely on importing leaders from other countries such as England or the United States (Chambon, 2012).

As social work became more institutionalized with the introduction of academic training, the discourse of eugenics emerged as foundational to early social work activities (Lee & Ferrer, 2014). Social work adopted the ideas of eugenics, which were strongly supported by the medical professionals who linked hereditarian concerns to public health issues (Johnstone, 2016). The discourse of eugenics further produced the classification and categorization in social work practices, solidifying the inner borders that delineated the fitness and desirability of national membership in white settler Canada. Wong's (2016) study on the mental hygiene movement in the early twentieth century found that the discourse of eugenics were fundamental to the development of the mental health field, which linked the notions of race and disability. Joseph (2015) articulates the discursive function of eugenics as follows: "[E]ugenics conflated the idea of race, genetics, biology, and social human hierarchy in ways that influenced fields of study, professions, and disciplines and embedded these ideas within policy and law (p. 25). The discourse of eugenics produced the figure of the deviant Other—Indigenous peoples and people of colour as well as what McClintock called other "degenerate classes"—"the militant working class, the Irish, Jews, feminists, gays and lesbians, prostitutes, criminals, alcoholics and the insane" (as cited in Lee & Ferrer, 2014, p. 6). As the discourse of eugenics became embedded in the field of social work, the members of both the Charity Organization Societies and the settlement house movement, whether based on their values of Christian morality or social equity, played a key role in reforming, training, or "Canadianizing" the deviant Other. Valverde (2008) makes an important point by arguing that moral reform was not just about transforming these deviant Others but also about reforming the population of Canada as a whole. As an idea, moral

118

reform was about reforming society and the nation-state and building the foundations for what was considered the future of prosperity and relative equality (Cook, as cited in Valverde, p. 17). Valverde (2008) further contends that "this was a project the state could not possibly have carried out; volunteer organizations played the starring role in the campaign to reconstruct the inner selves, and in particular the sexual/moral identity, of Canadians" (p. 32).

While social work played a key role in transforming the deviant Other into the settler-citizen subject, it also played a role in sorting out who could become one. For those who are deemed unfit or undesirable to become a settler-citizen, social work played a key role in disposing of them. Kelley and Trebilcock's (2010) historical analysis elucidated that social work institutions were instrumental in bringing about changes in the border control regime. As the number of immigrants increased in the early twentieth century, so did the demands placed on charities and municipalities. The growing number of immigrants who were ill and unemployed turned to the charities and municipalities for assistance, straining their already limited resources (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). In this context, these institutions began to report to the federal immigration authorities about individuals who were deemed too ill or poor. They also took a leading role in pressuring the government for more effective measures to remove those who were draining their resources, leading to the expansion of the deportation criteria introduced via the Immigration Act of 1906 and 1910 (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). Accordingly, instances of deportation rose dramatically after 1906 (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). Social work acted as an inner border agent who determined the suitability of immigrants for settler nation building projects. These accounts elucidate how social work's professionalization was not independent from but a part of the broader white settler nation-building project. Social work was instrumental

in drawing and consolidating inner borders by upholding the discourse of white civility as the field professionalized.

The expansion of the social work profession

The social work profession went through a period of expansion during the post-war era. As Jennissen and Lundy (2011) puts it, "the 1940s were the glory days of the profession; it was a time of hope for a new social order, a time of massive growth and continued demand for social workers, and a period of enthusiasm and optimism for the future of the professional association" (p. 80). In this section, I revisit accounts of the expansion of social work during the post-war period, considering the broader social contexts. I begin by discussing Cold War politics, the influx of Europeans after the war, the institutionalization of Canadian citizenship, and the expansion of the national welfare system. I suggest that these events and developments further consolidated Canada's national border. As postwar Canada saw significant demographic change through the opening of the border to an influx of European refugees, it was critical that inner borders that protected Anglo-Saxon heritage remained intact. I show how the institutionalization of Canadian citizenship and the national welfare system were not about universal application for social rights as is often imagined; rather it was designed to uphold a particular idea of the citizen based on the discourse of white civility. As social work elevated its professional status along with the expansion of the national welfare system, it was instrumental in maintaining and reproducing inner borders as it continued to embrace the discourse of white civility. The table below shows the historical context and key events in which the expansion of social work took place in the postwar era.

Historical context: Postwar period, Cold War politics		
Settler colonialism: Ongoing colonial polices	Immigration: Continuing white Canada policy	Social work: Expansion

- Incorporation of Indian Affairs into Citizenship and Immigration Canada
- Sixties scoop

- Mass immigrants and refugees from postwar Europe
- Citizenship Act

- CASW's role in establishing the welfare state
- Establishment of master's programs
- Integration of "newcomers"

Historical context: Cold War politics and changing demography. During the postwar era, Canada's national borders were further reinforced through the politics of the Cold War. Internationally, Cold War politics produced the border between liberal democratic nation-states and communist regimes. As the Canadian government aligned itself with other liberal democratic nation-states, Cold War politics also affected the ways in which inner borders were drawn within Canada. Unlike in previous years, where the inner borders were drawn explicitly in overtly racist terms, postwar Canada began to see the discursive functions of equality, human rights, and liberal democracy in disguising oppressive bordering practices. The oppressive practices were primarily operationalized through the institutionalization of Canadian citizenship and the establishment of the national welfare system.

The institutionalization of Canadian citizenship and the establishment of the national welfare system took shape as postwar Canada witnessed significant demographic changes. A combination of factors—including economic self-interest, labour shortages, international pressures, and pro-refugee lobbies—led to an opening to mass immigration from Europe (Kelley & Trebilcock, 2010). The immigration policy changed Canada from being a nation-state with more closed doors to one with open doors with the influx of European refugees after World War II and refugees from the Hungarian Revolution. Between 1946 and 1962, more than 2.1 million newcomers entered Canada (Iacovetta, 2006). Indigenous communities also saw their

populations grow. Despite reaching a low of 100,000 in 1900, the population of "status Indians" began a remarkable recovery, marking a growth of 18% by the late 1930s (Bohaker & Iacovetta, 2009). With an increasingly diverse Canadian population, Anglo-Saxon conformity was once again at risk.

The institutionalization of Canadian citizenship. It is in this context that the legal category of Canadian citizenship was first institutionalized. The Canadian Citizenship Act of 1947 was passed, establishing a distinct legal citizenship independent of Britain. Bohaker and Iacovetta (2009) argue that the establishment of Canadian citizenship was the follow-up to initiatives taken in the latter stages of World War II by Secretary of State Paul Martin Sr. and senior officials who had spent the war years managing, manipulating, and interning Canada's ethnic groups as well as mediating ethnic tensions between the country's majority and minority groups (p. 432). Martin Sr. saw the great benefit in promoting a Canadian citizenship defined in terms of a common set of values—democracy, freedom, and liberalism—with which a diverse population could be made to identify and support (Bohaker & Iacovetta, 2009, p. 432). Promoting this common set of values, however, did not mean that Canada was rejecting its Anglo-Saxon heritage. Indeed, the discourse of white civility continued to be operative in these seemingly universal values, in which the idealized profile of English Canadians remained central. Until the second Citizenship Act of 1977, passports still proclaimed that "A Canadian citizen is a British subject," and people of British citizenship could fast-track the naturalization process as well as gain the franchise long before becoming citizens (Parasram, 2010, p.8). Prime Minister Mackenzie King ensured that the 1947 Act preserved what the government saw as the "natural" ancestry of Canada "while offering a more liberal immigration policy for those who fit into the desirable category of potential Canadians" (Parasram, 2010, p. 8). Caccia argues that the

institution of Canadian citizenship served as the primary signifier of belonging to the Canadian community without reference to specific racial, religious, cultural, or linguistic characteristics while still upholding British and Christian values as the gold standard (as cited in Bohaker & Iacovetta, 2009). The 1947 Citizenship Act also established criteria for immigrants to ascend to citizenship, including: being at least 21 years old; having resided in Canada for five years; being in possession of good character; having adequate knowledge of French or English; having adequate knowledge of the privileges and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship; and finally, having the intention to reside permanently in Canada (Parasram, 2010, p. 9). Parasram (2010) contends that the last criterion, while difficult or impossible to enforce, tied territory and citizenship together and is suggestive of what parliamentarians in the 1940s saw as the natural path of immigration. I would add that this linkage between territory and citizenship is revealing of settler colonial logic in which Canadian citizenship rested upon permanent occupation of Indigenous lands. As Wolfe (2006) asserts, "territoriality is settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element" (p. 388). Thobani (2007) further contends:

> Citizenship emerged as integral to the very processes that transformed insiders (Aboriginal peoples) into aliens in their own territories, while simultaneously transforming outsiders (colonizers, settlers, migrants) into exalted insiders (Canadian citizens). The category citizen, born from this genocidal violence of colonization, exists in a dialectical relation with its Other, the Indian, for whom the emergence of this citizenship was deadly, not emancipatory. (p. 74)

The "deadliness" of Canadian citizenship for Indigenous communities is captured by Bohaker and Iacovetta's (2009) analysis of postwar Canadian citizenship. They demonstrate how ministry officials and their network of public and private groups and agencies aimed to erase

123

Indigeneity through the creation of a one-size-fits-all category of societal Canadian citizenship. As a follow-up to the 1947 Canadian Citizenship Act, the federal government strategically chose to combine its management of immigrant admission, reception, and citizenship with its Indian Affairs policies under the rubric of one new federal ministry, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. From 1950 until 1966, the Indian Affairs branch was located in the Department of Citizenship and Immigration's Canadian Citizenship Branch, where public officials constructed Indigenous peoples as "immigrants too" (Bohaker & Iacovetta, 2009). In this way, both Indigenous peoples and newcomers were constructed as outsiders who needed to adopt and conform to the dominant middle-class Canadian social and moral codes and pro-capitalist values if they wished to cross the inner border and be part of the allegedly civilized national family.

The expansion of the national welfare system. Thobani (2007) argues that the access to social programs as an integral right of citizenship came to be accepted as natural and normal in the 1940s. As discussed earlier in chapter 2, British sociologist T. H. Marshall was influential in affirming this idea. Marshall (1950) identified the institutionalization of the national welfare system as a hallmark of citizenship that guaranteed social rights, defining the membership of a political community and governing access to the benefits and privileges of national membership. In Canada, Leonard Marsh introduced the concept of the social minimum at the Canadian Conference on Social Work in 1950 as "the realization that in a civilized society, there is a certain minimum of conditions without which health, decency, happiness and 'a chance in life' are impossible" (Marsh, 1950, cited in Guest, 2003, p. 6). Marsh's concept of the social minimum laid the foundation on which Keynesian economic and social welfare policies were envisioned in postwar Canada.

The Keynesian welfare system expanded from the 1940s until the early 1970s and set up the scheme for distributing unemployment insurance, family allowances and improvements in health, welfare and workers' compensation in Canada (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). This time period is characterized by its centralizing tendency within Canadian social policy and programming in an effort to address the social welfare needs of Canadian citizens (Shier & Graham, 2014). The federal government began to take a more central role in social welfare provisions through income security programs such as the Unemployment Insurance of 1940, the Family Allowance program of 1944, the Old Age Security of 1951, the Medical Care of 1966, and the Canada Pension Plan of 1966. Further, in 1966, the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) was created and acted as a cost-sharing program between the federal and provincial levels of government for social assistance and a variety of related community programs such as rehabilitation, counselling, homemakers' services, community development and child care (Shier & Graham, 2014). With the introduction of nationalized social programming, the state gained its status as an active player in protecting people from social and economic insecurity. Thobani (2007) asserts that as the expansion of the national welfare system enabled Canada to constitute itself as "compassionate" and "caring," the system simultaneously exalted national subjects as possessive of the same qualities (p. 107). As national subjects gained access to the social programs of the welfare state, a sense of social solidarity was fostered among nationals who understood themselves as worthy and deserving of social rights (Thobani, 2007).

While the expansion of the national welfare system in the postwar period is often associated with the language of universality and entitlement, not everyone benefited from it; indeed, it was designed according to highly specific and normative notions of the citizen (Cowen, 2008). In order to access the benefits of the expanding national welfare system, "citizens had to act, think,

work, love, and look in very particular ways and places" (Cowen, 2008, p. 56). In her study of

military welfarism, Cowen (2008) asserts that, though welfare became a right in the postwar

period, "it was a right that was *earned*" (p. 52, emphasis original). She suggests that the key

elements of national welfare were adopted from the existing provisions for military personnel

and their dependents, who contributed to national warfare, thus deserving such rights. The

entitlement was firmly linked to "service" that was offered during wartime. The welfare, which

had historically been an entitlement for soldiers who sacrificed their labour for the nation, was

extended to the general population as part of a massive plan for reconstruction (Cowen, 2008).

Cowen (2008) asserts that the historical root of welfare in the military laid the foundation for the

ways in which the idea of citizen is linked to worker; the worker who contributes to the nation is

deserving of social rights. Thus, the national welfare system was not "designed to address

poverty and was certainly not a manifesto for building utopias for social justice. This was a

much more sober plan geared towards already-employed men, with benefits contingent on

contribution" (Cowen, 2008, p. 53).

Critical race and feminist scholars have elucidated the ways in which the expansion of the

welfare system in postwar Canada further established the racialized and gendered model of

national community (Porter, 2003; Sharma, 2002; Thobani, 2007). While the 1947 Canadian

Citizenship Act provided women with independent legal Canadian status from their male

"guardians,"[8] the gendered nature of the citizenship regime was firmly sustained through the

expansion of welfare provisions (Porter, 2003; Thobani, 2007). Porter argues that the postwar

welfare state was based on a particular family–market–state arrangement whereby women were

---

[8] Prior to 1947, a woman's legal status was attached to her male guardian, and his actions could lead to her deportation and that of her children, regardless of their actions (Parasram, 2010).

assumed to play a primary role at home or take up a particular form of paid labour. A case in point is the ways in which the Unemployment Insurance program often steered women towards jobs in a particular sector or denied women, especially married women, an independent source of income, reinforcing their dependence on the family and especially on the male as breadwinner (Porter, 2003, p. 37). Baines' (1996) examination of the Family Allowances Act also demonstrates how the welfare system operated via a gendered and heterosexist model of national community. Baines (1996) asserts that the Family Allowances Act only acknowledged Canadian women's work if it consisted of mothering but not other forms of work, such as elder care, cleaning, sewing, cooking, provisioning, and emotional support. The small sum of money provided through the Family Allowances Act was never sufficient to keep a single-parent family out of poverty but was sufficient to reward and assist families who had access to a male breadwinner's income. The national welfare system ignored the gendered, heterosexist, and classed complexities while promoting the idea of the modern and egalitarian Canadian nation-state (Thobani, 2007).

Thobani (2007) makes the point that the national welfare system was primarily set up to address the concerns of white families. Her point becomes clearer when examining how Indigenous populations and nonwhite immigrants were treated at the time. As the welfare state took shape in postwar Canada, nonwhite immigrants continued to be targeted for strict border control. Then Prime Minister Mackenzie King clarified his stance on the Canadian immigration system in 1947:

> "With regard to the selection of immigrants, much has been said about discrimination. I wish to make quite clear that Canada is perfectly within her rights in selecting the persons whom we regard as desirable future citizens. It is not a "fundamental human right" of any

127

alien to enter Canada. It is a privilege. It is a matter of domestic policy…. There will, I am sure, be general agreement with the view that the people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration in the character of our population. Large-scale immigration from the Orient would change the fundamental composition of the Canadian population." (as cited in Rawlyk, 1962, p. 287)

The overtly racialized immigration policy that distinguished between preferred and nonpreferred races continued until the 1960s (Thobani, 2007). During the postwar era, the majority of immigrants came from the United Kingdom, the United States, and continental Europe, and immigrants from Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa comprised only a small fraction of Canada's total immigration intake from 1946 to 1962 (Rawlyk, 1962). Nonwhite immigrants were admitted only if they were married to Canadian citizens or children under 18 years old[9] (Rawlyk, 1962). Accordingly, nonwhite immigrants were systemically excluded at the border even before they could enjoy the benefits of the national welfare system.

Neither did Indigenous peoples enjoy the benefits of an expanding national welfare system. An emerging interest in the plight of Indigenous peoples had led to an amendment to the Indian Act in 1951, which extended the application of provincial social welfare legislation to Indigenous peoples living on reserve. With this new amendment, the federal government officially delegated responsibility for Aboriginal health, welfare and education services to the provincial government (Bennett, Blackstock & De La Ronde, 2005). Yet, there was no additional funding provided by the federal government to the provinces to take on this new added responsibility, leaving Indigenous communities in continuing states of poverty (Bennett, Blackstock & De La Ronde, 2005).

---

[9] In 1956, the Canadian government entered into agreement with the government of India, Pakistan and Ceylon (i.e. Sri Lanka) to admit 300, 100, and 50 persons annually from these countries respectively (Rawlyk, 1962).

While the introduction of CAP in 1966 led to an expansion of provincial social services benefitting the majority of Canadians, it had a detrimental effect on Indigenous communities. As more funding became available for the child welfare system, a growing number of Indigenous children were apprehended by child welfare agencies for adoption and placement in foster families—almost all of which were non-Aboriginal families (Thobani, 2007, p. 109). By the end of the 1960s, approximately 30% to 40% of legal wards in the child welfare system were Aboriginal status children, even though they represented less than 4% of the national population (Fournier & Crey, as cited in Bennett, Blackstock & De La Ronde, 2005, p. 19). When the residential school system lost its grip on Indigenous communities, social welfare policies allowed government agencies to "continue to remove Aboriginal children from their homes and communities and damage Aboriginal culture and traditions all the while claiming to act in the best interest of the child" (Johnson, as cited in Alston-O'Connor, 2010, para. 5). Indigenous peoples continued to lose their children to the colonial system.

The linkage between welfare and warfare, the gendered and heterosexist construction of the welfare system, the continuing exclusion of nonwhite immigrants through a racist immigration policy, and the treatment of Indigenous peoples all elucidate how the expansion of the national welfare system in the postwar era did not guarantee social rights for all. While the welfare system functioned to create a sense of social solidarity and empowerment among national subjects (Thobani, 2007), already marginalized populations such as single mothers, nonwhite immigrants and Indigenous peoples were excluded from the benefits promised by the welfare system. In other words, the national welfare system further consolidated the inner borders that organized hierarchical membership in the nation and restricted access to its resources (Thobani, 2007).

The legitimization of social work. In postwar Canada, the social work profession elevated its professional status as it furthered the expansion of the national welfare system. As the federal government engaged in an extensive review of social and economic conditions in Canada, social workers were eager to participate in the construction of the welfare state (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). The Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW) collaborated extensively with the federal government on a variety of policy initiatives (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). The CASW developed policy positions on the social issues of the day and clearly reiterated that social workers had an integral role to play in social reconstruction. As a result, the demand for social work professionals grew, and more social workers gained employment in the public sector (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011). Social work also elevated its professional status as it played a key role in integrating newcomers from postwar Europe. As an academic discipline, its status was further advanced by the introduction of a graduate program in social work at the University of Toronto. Expansion of research teaching through the establishment of the graduate social work program was based on the idea that its practice should be grounded in scientific knowledge derived from the social and behavioural sciences (Gripton & Irving, 1996). Increasingly, social workers gained professional legitimacy as experts who understood the suffering of individuals and communities.

The legitimatization of the social work profession was premised on a close alignment with the Canadian nation-state. With the massive expansion of a non-profit sector and a growing presence of social workers in various areas of the public sector (e.g. child welfare, correctional services, welfare programs, health) (Jennissen & Lundy, 2011), social work became even more closely associated with the state in postwar Canada. The deepening relationship between the state and social work added layers of complexity in the way social work formed its professional

identity—as attached to and dependent on the state while attempting to be a critical voice in addressing the suffering of individuals and communities. Thus, the legitimization of social work in postwar Canada did not equate to social work becoming an opposing force to the unequal structure of the Canadian nation-state. As social work failed to address the structural oppressions embedded in citizenship and welfare policies, it further consolidated the inner borders that delineated membership and belonging according to social relations of race, gender, and class.

For example, the involvement of social workers in the expansion of the welfare state did not counter but rather reinforced the racialized and gendered construction of a national community. Jennissen and Lundy (2011) argue that the CASW tended to offer a limited critique that often ignored larger issues of sexism and other inequities. For example, Jennissen and Lundy (2011) found that the CASW did not make any comment on the 1960s Royal Commission on the Status of Women: "Given that social work is a profession with a preponderance of women, this was a very serious oversight and a lost opportunity" (p. 251). While the CASW was vocal about raising the benefit rates of social welfare programs and regularly brought up the issue of the stigmatization of social policy, the organization was silent about how the welfare system itself was founded on particular ideals of the Canadian family. In addition, despite the close relationship between welfare and citizenship policies, social work was silent about addressing the racialized nature of Canadian citizenship at the time that the Citizenship Act of 1947 was introduced. Instead, social work played a key role in propagating a nationalized welfare system that normalized the exclusive rights and entitlements of social programs for those who were considered Canadian citizens.

Furthermore, social workers continued to be actively engaged in producing the settler-citizen subject. Iacovetta's analysis of European immigrants in postwar Canada shows how social workers, among other professionals, became "gatekeepers" of the Canadian nation-state. Social workers were key players in transforming European newcomers into productive and democratic citizens. In the context of Cold War politics, social workers emphasized the superiority and abundance of Western capitalist countries. The challenges that European newcomers faced—wartime trauma, the migration process, unemployment and underemployment, language challenges, separation of family members, gender inequality, and so on—were believed to be solvable through access to the country's expanded social welfare service provisions. Social workers positioned themselves as experts whose role was to support the full recovery of European newcomers and to set them on the right path towards full integration and citizenship (Iacovetta, 2006). However, the inclusion of newcomers in the Canadian welfare state was not simply about providing basic needs or supporting their integration into Canadian society. Rather, it functioned to foster the sense of social conformity, loyalty, and obedience on the part of newcomers (Iacovetta, 2006). In their interactions with European newcomers, social workers were instrumental in reproducing the discourse of white civility that maintained the inner borders of Canadian citizenship.

Social work continued to participate on a broad scale in the cultural genocide of Indigenous communities. Between 1946 and 1948, the parliamentary committee examined the Indian Act to assess the effectiveness of residential schools. It was argued that segregated day and residential schools had failed to meet the goals of assimilation: most former students did not embrace Euro-Canadian identity (Alston-O'Connor, 2010). In response to this matter, the CASW

made a joint submission with the Canadian Welfare Council to the Senate-Common Committee on Indian Affairs:

> While we regard it as unfortunate that so much emphasis has been laid upon the residential school, and are convinced that educational standards in a number of these institutions leave something to be desired, we do not regard the actual existence of residential schools as undesirable. We feel that they have their place in a well-rounded system of *Indian education*, particularly insofar as they meet s*pecial needs including the educational requirements of children* [emphasis added] of nomadic families." (Lea, 1947, p. 6)

The oppressive nature of residential schools was effectively dismissed in the name of Indian education and special needs for nomadic children. Social work drew on the historical ideas of Indigenous communities as childlike and uncivilized to continue to engender support for the residential school system. When residential schools were discredited in the 1960s, social workers became active participants in assimilation and cultural genocide through the child welfare system (Alston-O'Conner, 2010). In this way, social work continued to be a key player in maintaining the inner borders that constructed Indigenous peoples as childlike, uncivil, and in continuous need of discipline and education.

Colonial continuities in contemporary Canadian citizenship

As the border began to open to nonwhite immigrants through the introduction of the point system in 1967, and especially after the introduction of the multicultural policy in 1971, the discourse of white civility that gave rise to and characterized Canadian citizenship needed to be replaced with the liberal democratic script of Canada as inclusive, tolerant, and humanitarian. This particular construction of Canada created the illusion that opening the border to formally

133

excluded groups of people fundamentally changed the underpinnings of Canadian citizenship. However, Thobani (2007) argues that the racial division that was historically created remains significant to the contemporary Canadian citizenship regime. Coleman (2011) similarly articulates how white civility continues to operate under the guise of stratified and bounded universalism, meaning that

> all citizens are to be treated equally, but racial profiling continues to patrol the borders of citizenship, and white privilege continues to generate what John Porter called a vertical mosaic, so that the whiter and more Anglicized you are, the higher you are ranked in social status. White civility assumes that the benefits of inclusion in the Canadian polity are something Canadian-Canadians grant to others when they apply for citizenship or landed immigrant status. (p.180)

Anyone who comes to attain the legal status of Canadian citizenship is expected to uphold the same script of Canadian citizenship as free, law-abiding, and prosperous as they gain access to material rewards, entitlements, and protections (e.g., access to healthcare, education, social services, voting rights, freedom of speech, etc.). The rights and responsibilities that come with the legal status of Canadian citizenship not only foster a sense of national identity and belonging but also discipline and regulate the making of proper Canadian settler-citizen subjects who further contribute to settler futurity (Tuck & Yang, 2012). This celebratory narrative of Canadian citizenship effectively renders invisible the settler histories and ongoing racialized structure on which Canadian citizenship is built.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I suggested that border making in Canada was intimately linked to the settler colonial project and that social work was implicated in border making through the

134

production of the settler-citizen subject in accordance with the discourse of white civility. I demonstrated that the emergence and development of social work was not independent from but has been intimately entangled with the histories of settler colonialism and immigration. In the process of establishing itself as the professional helper, social work actively participated in inner border making through creating classifications, categories and eligibility criteria in social work practice, delineating the suitability, desirability and deservingness of national membership and belonging in white settler Canada.

The earliest form of social work was developed in the form of poor relief practice in response to white British pauper emigrants who migrated to participate in further Indigenous land dispossession. Poor relief was not merely about providing material needs to the poor but an attempt to shape white pauper emigrants' work habits, foster discipline, and promote the morality necessary for such dispossession. As social work developed itself into a field for professional helpers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it played a key role in policing and regulating Canada's inner borders by participating in the institutional activities of moral reform and assimilation and deportation. In postwar Canada, social work legitimatized its professional status as it engaged in the expansion of the national welfare system. The establishment of the national welfare system, along with the introduction of the Canadian Citizenship Act of 1947 gave the nation-state the legitimacy to act as the protector and provider of citizenship rights. Yet, the developments of Canadian citizenship and the national welfare system were highly dependent on a particular idea of the Canadian citizen. Social workers played a key role in instilling the concept of white Canadian normalcy—disciplining the European newcomers into productive and docile citizens—and furthered the discourse of Anglo-Saxon superiority and the emerging rhetoric of a capitalist democracy in the Cold War years. At the

same time, social work became complicit in the cultural genocidal project of Indigenous peoples by supporting residential schools and later participating in the child welfare system.

As I demonstrated throughout this chapter, the discourse of white civility was key in establishing the territorial border and Canada's inner borders. As the territorial border emerged and solidified through the dispossession of Indigenous lands, the discourse of white civility functioned to disguise the violent nature of border making and justify the oppression of Indigenous peoples and deviant Others who traversed the colonial territories. The logic and practices that justified Indigenous land dispossession and the exclusion of deviant Others at the territorial border were reproduced internally to affirm white supremacy in settler colonial Canada. Social work, through the creation of categories, classifications and eligibilities in social work practices, was active in disciplining, governing, and disposing deviant Others according to the discourse of white civility, marking the inner borders of Canadian citizenship. While overtly racialized immigration and citizenship policies were no longer acceptable with the shift to a liberal multicultural discourse, its settler colonial and racial logic continues to shape the inner borders within the Canadian nation-state, demarcating the boundaries of national membership and belonging. In other words, both historical and contemporary border-making practices maintain the settler colonial project in the context of Canada, though in different ways. The next two chapters elucidate how inner borders are constituted and contested in contemporary social work with noncitizens.

CHAPTER 5

INNER BORDER MAKING THROUGH NEOLIBERALISM

Introduction

At the end of the last chapter, I began to discuss the colonial continuities (Heron, 2007) in contemporary Canadian citizenship. While the contemporary script of Canadian citizenship promotes the image of Canada as inclusive, tolerant, and humanitarian, the inner borders that demarcate national membership and belonging within the Canadian nation-state continue to exist. In this chapter, I attend to the current context of neoliberalism and examine how inner borders are constituted at multiple levels. In particular, I am interested in understanding how the current context of neoliberalism conditions what social workers can do (cannot do), know (cannot know) and say (cannot say) in regards to their work with noncitizens. My analysis in this chapter explicates how neoliberalism shapes the policies under which social workers work and how their navigation through the system and their practice choices implicate them in inner border making. I argue that neoliberalism is fundamental to the contemporary script of Canadian citizenship, though the historical discourse of civility continues to operate along with and is expressed through neoliberalist ideals.

To begin this analysis, I first discuss the contemporary role of the border. Drawing on critical border scholarship and settler colonial studies, I locate the changing nature of the border in the historical continuum of settler colonialism. I highlight the resurgence of settler national myths in contemporary immigration and citizenship policy discourse and the role it plays at a time when the proliferation of border-crossing activities is an undeniable feature of the contemporary world. As a variety of border-crossing activities bring about challenges and opportunities to nation-states, the border must take up a new role—not simply to restrict

137

movements but to facilitate them. I propose that the contemporary Canadian border functions to facilitate both global capitalism and settler colonialism by differentially including migrant bodies according to neoliberal rationality.

After highlighting the changing nature of the contemporary territorial border, I further discuss the features of neoliberalism and how it operates in inner border making in Canada. Drawing on the existing literature, policy documents, and interview narratives, I examine multiple levels of inner border making in the neoliberal era. I discuss how neoliberal restructuring of the welfare system since the 1990s, the intergovernmental arrangements of social rights, the immigration and citizenship policy changes under the previous Conservative government, and the gaps in social service deliveries have all contributed to varying conditions in which inner borders are produced in complex and contingent ways.

The last half of this chapter focuses on the micro-production of inner borders, attending to social workers' narratives about everyday experience with noncitizens. In particular, I examine how social workers negotiate and make sense of the challenges they face under the neoliberal restructuring of the immigration system. I demonstrate how the discourse of neoliberalism works on, through, and within social workers as they make decisions about inclusionary and exclusionary practices with noncitizens. While social workers positioned themselves against a Conservative government that implemented restrictive immigration and citizenship policies, they were implicated in inner border making.

Colonial continuities—How settler colonialism lives on through neoliberalism

In the first years following Confederation, Canada's leaders had a powerful vision: to connect Canada by railway and make the West the world's breadbasket and the foundation for the country's economic prosperity. Achieving this meant quickly

populating the Prairies, leading the Government of Canada to establish its first national

immigration policies. Over the last 150 years, immigrants have been a driving force in

Canada's nationhood and its economic prosperity — as farmers settling lands, as workers

in factories fuelling industrial growth, as entrepreneurs, and as innovators who help make

Canada competitive in the global, knowledge-based economy. (Citizenship and

Immigration Canada, 2010, p. 7)

At the conception of this research, I paid little attention to the relationships between the

contemporary Canadian citizenship regime and settler colonialism. I treated settler colonial

history more as background information than a site of analysis in itself in thinking about this

regime. Settler colonialism, while foundational in the historical making of the settler-citizen

subject, was not initially traceable in the contemporary landscape of Canadian citizenship. This

thinking was severely challenged when I read the passage above. It first appeared in 2010, in one

of the key policy documents produced by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Report on

Plans and Priorities, under the section "raison d'être." Prior to 2010, the "raison d'être" section of

the CIC Report on Plans and Priorities simply stated the responsibilities given to CIC, with no

particular reference to Canada's immigration history or economic prosperity. While the

economic orientation of Canadian immigration is nothing new, the sudden appearance of the

settler national history of immigration in a CIC document was compelling to me. As I continued

to examine a variety of policy documents, I came across many other such settler national stories.

As Homi Bhabha (1990) argues, the nation and narration are inseparable: national identity and

nations themselves are invented and articulated through stories, histories, and myths. Drawing on

Bhabha, the national narrative presented in the CIC document is not the neutral history of

139

Canadian immigration but nation building in action. The construction of the immigrant subject as anything but economic capital, and land as purely commodity and resource, as well as the complete erasure of Indigenous history and people, all point to how settler colonial logic remains integral to the contemporary Canadian immigration and citizenship regime. As a number of scholars have pointed out, such settler national myths have functioned to justify the legitimacy of the Canadian nation-state on stolen land (Alfred & Tomkins, 2010; Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015; Thobani, 2007). The image of a settler nation being built by hard-working immigrants effectively erases Indigenous peoples, land, and history as well as violent histories of slavery and racial oppression that characterize the Canadian immigration and citizenship regime. Simultaneously, the settler national myth sustains the image of Canada as a land of economic opportunity, where all immigrants supposedly have access to material benefits as long as they too participate in the settler colonial project.

I suggest that such settler imagery is even more necessary when the proliferation of border-crossing activities facilitates the erosion of nation-state sovereignty. As discussed in the introduction, a variety of border-crossing activities in economic, political, cultural, societal, and technological spheres have demystified the classic national–state–territorial trilogy as the natural social and political form of the contemporary world (Brambilla, Laine, Scott, & Bocchi, 2015). National policy making is increasingly shaped by global forces, while transnational migration has diversified the demography of nation-states; it is increasingly difficult to make the distinction between the global and the local. In Canada, another set of power relations is at play through ongoing Indigenous resistance to the Canadian nation-state, which has led to growing awareness and concern for Canada's colonial past and present, challenging the legitimacy of Canada's claim over Indigenous lands. I suggest that these local and global power relations have posed

critical questions about Canadian national identity and the state's sovereignty over and legitimacy in the territory known as Canada. As Dauvergne (2008) would argue, these power relations have led national governments to focus on those areas that remain within the direct control of national lawmakers, and migration and citizenship laws are one of "the last bastion[s] of sovereignty" (p. 169). It is in this context that "citizenship law and migration law work together in creating the border of the nation" (Dauvergne, 2008, p. 119).

Yet, the territorial border of the nation-state cannot be completely closed to potential migrants in a world dominated by global capitalism in its current neoliberal phase. Global capitalism thrives on the transnational circulation of capital, production and labour that goes beyond national borders. The differentially positioned migrant labourers are ever needed not only for Canada to stay competitive in a global capitalist market but also to continue its settler colonial project. As Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) have articulated, "settler colonialism is predicated on the movements of groups of peoples out of previous homelands and into new lands constructed as home" (p. 82) to erase Indigenous peoples' relationship to land. Thus, the territorial border must function not simply as a guard of nation-state sovereignty, but also as a facilitator of global capitalism and settler colonialism. In other words, the territorial border must facilitate selective mobility and immobility. The inclusionary and exclusionary role that territorial borders play must ensure that potential migrants crossing borders are those who contribute to the interdependent projects of global capitalism and settler colonialism. Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) have argued that the border "plays a decisive role in the production of labour power as a commodity"; the border constitutes a process of filtering and differentiation inscribed into the bodies of migrant workers, who are the bearers of labour power. They term this function of the border "differential inclusion of labour power." The migrant subjects are differentially

141

included in the sphere of citizenship through "the stratification and multiplication of systems of entry, status, residence, and legitimacy" (p. 164). De Genova (2013) similarly discusses the "obscene inclusion" of migrants that is "devoted to the subordination of their labor, which can be best accomplished only to the extent that their incorporation is permanently beleaguered with the kinds of exclusionary and commonly racist campaigns that ensure that this inclusion is itself, precisely, a form of subjugation" (p. 5). Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) and De Genova (2013) elucidate how the territorial border functions to produce migrants as labour power (i.e., the subjectivity of the migrant worker) and further subjects them to stratification, hierarchization, and exploitation in the country they migrate to. This regulatory function of the territorial border translates into migrant workers differently incorporated into the sphere of citizenship. While Mezzadra and Neilson's (2013) and De Genova's (2013) analysis surrounds the discussion of migrant workers, I want to extend their point and argue that it is not just migrant workers who are subjected to this bordering practice: all potential migrants are filtered and differentially treated according to their worth, which is calculated based on neoliberal rationality. In the next section, I further discuss the features of neoliberalism and how they operate in contemporary border making in Canada.

<div align="center">

Neoliberalism and border making

</div>

Neoliberalism is often identified as a key feature of global capitalism in which the flow of capital and goods is liquefied through the removal of barriers to free trade (e.g., tariffs, quotas, restrictions, regulations, etc.) (Ritzer, 2010). One of the key proponents of neoliberalism, Milton Friedman, has proposed that neoliberal economic models and policies lead to a flattening of the world, in which the removal of barriers and hurdles to free trade have created conditions where more and more people are able to play, compete, and win in a global capitalist market (Ritzer,

<div align="center">

142

</div>

2010). In other words, Friedman advances the idea that everyone benefits from neoliberal economic models and policies in a "borderless" world (Ritzer, 2010).

Critiques of neoliberalism have dismantled such fantasies of a borderless or flattened world by explicating the assumptions and values embedded in neoliberalism as well as the severe marginalization that emerges from it. Olssen and Peters (2005) argue that neoliberalism is a politically imposed discourse that constitutes the hegemonic fabric of Western nation-states. It rests on a Eurocentric idea of well-being and freedom; that is, that everyone in the world is in pursuit of economic wealth and democracy (Ritzer, 2010). Individuals are understood as self-interested, rational optimizers and the best judges of their own interests and needs (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Neoliberal policies are meant to achieve this version of entrepreneurial subjecthood, economic well-being, and political freedom by privileging the free market over the centralized market, individualism over collectivism, and global economic trade and deregulation of business over state intervention (Pollack, 2010; Ritzer, 2010). Neoliberalism promotes an idea and practice based on a corporate model of cost effectiveness and efficiency, individual responsibility, evidence-based programming, standardization of work practices, and reduction of public spending on social welfare programs and social service provisions (Baines, 2010; Macias, 2015a; Palumbo & Friedman, 2014; Pollack & Rossiter, 2010; Smith, 2011; Wehbi & Turcotte, 2007; Rossiter & Heron, 2011). What distinguishes neoliberalism from liberalism is that rather than rendering the state irrelevant, neoliberalism has modified the functioning of the state to facilitate the operation of the market (Ritzer, 2010). The state is to provide the conditions, laws, and institutions as well as the techniques—auditing, accounting, management—necessary for the operation of the market (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

Brown (2006) argues that neoliberalism is more than just a set of free market economic policies; it is more accurately framed as a form of political rationality that organizes the political sphere, governance practices, and citizenship. Giroux and Giroux (2006) similarly suggest that neoliberal ideology goes beyond the economic sphere:

> with its merciless emphasis on deregulation and privatization, [neo-liberalism] has found its material expression in an all-out attack on democratic values and social relations— particularly those spheres where such values are learned and take root. Public services such as health care, childcare, public assistance, education, and transportation are now subject to the rules of the market. Forsaking the public good for the private good and representing the needs of the corporate and private sector as the only source of sound investment. (p. 24)

What these critiques elucidate is the ways in which neoliberalism permeates every level of society, shaping the standardizing ideals and practices of the contemporary era. Drawing on these critiques, I suggest that neoliberalism is one of the key discourses that constitute the script of contemporary Canadian citizenship. In other words, neoliberalism sets up standardizing ideals of how human subjects ought to live and participate as "proper" citizens in contemporary Canadian society. This is not to say that the discourse of civility is no longer operative in the manufacturing of contemporary Canadian citizenship. As I demonstrate here and in a subsequent chapter, the discourse of civility continues to be a key feature of Canadian citizenship, though new ways of expressing civility in the neoliberal era continue to emerge. In addition to historical notions of white civility that privileged whiteness, masculinity, and Britishness (Coleman, 2006), contemporary notions of civility are expressed through neoliberalist ideals such as efficiency, productivity, self-reliance and individual responsibility. While expressions of civility have

changed in the contemporary context of neoliberalism, settler colonial logic continues to shape

the script of Canadian citizenship. In the following sections of this chapter, I elucidate how the

discourse of neoliberalism facilitates border making at multiple levels.

Inner border making through neoliberal restructuring of the welfare system

Since the 1990s, Western governments have embraced a neoliberal political rationality in

pursuit of economic development and introduced a wide range of economic, political, and social

reforms (Macias, 2015a). In Canada, scholars have observed that globalized neoliberalism started

to affect national policies in the 1980s, when the postwar equality agenda began to fall apart

along with the establishment of the Free Trade Agreement in 1988 and the North American Free

Trade Agreement in 1994 (Baines, 2010; Smith, 2011). The neoliberal effects on the welfare

system were reflected in the changes in the cost-sharing transfers, which were established by the

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangement. As the expenditures of the welfare system grew

substantially, the federal government began to reduce spending towards the funding through the

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangement (McBride & Shields, 1997). In 1977, the federal

government combined health care and post-secondary education funding into a block grant called

the Established Programs Financing (EPF). The EPF addressed the federal government's

growing financial problem by eliminating its open-ended commitment to match provincial

spending in health and post-secondary education (McBride & Shields, 1997). Under the original

agreement of EPF in 1977, the value of the tax points and the cash transfer was supposed to grow

according to the economies and the growth rate per capita of the Gross National Product (GNP).

However, in the 1980s, the federal government began to put the cap on its financial obligation to

provinces in response to concerns over rising program costs (Moscovitch & Thomas, 2015). By

1990, the EPF per capita transfer was to be frozen for 1990–1991 and 1991–1992 for all

145

provinces and territories (Moscovitch & Thomas, 2015). The decline in cost-shared transfers was similarly observed in the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP), which acted as a cost-sharing program between the federal and provincial levels of government for social assistance programs beginning in 1966. In 1990, the federal government imposed a limit of 5% growth in CAP payments to Alberta, Ontario, and British Columbia (Moscovitch & Thomas, 2015). In 1991, the federal budget extended the EPF freeze and CAP growth limit for three more years to 1994–1995 (Moscovtich & Thomas, 2015). The most significant shift in the welfare system took place in 1995 when the CAP and the EPF were combined into one block fund—the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST). This dramatically changed how the federal government shared tax revenues with the provinces; it shifted the responsibility for the administration of social health and social programs from the federal to the provincial level, and the funding necessary to support health and social programs was substantially reduced (Smith, 2011; Smith-Carrier & Bhuyan, 2010).

In the same year, the Progressive Conservative Party led by Mike Harris came into power in Ontario and introduced the Common Sense Revolution. In line with neoliberal ideology, the Common Sense Revolution advocated for welfare reform, introduction of tax cuts, and reduction in overall government spending, leading to dramatic cuts to public services and social programs (e.g., funding cuts to health, social assistance rates, and shelter allowances; reduction of grants to colleges and universities; a funding freeze extending from social housing to legal aid; tightened eligibility criteria, etc.) (Murnighan, 2001). The Harris government also introduced a variety of changes affecting migrant communities, in particular the disbandment of the Ontario Anti-Racism Secretariat, rescindment of the Employment Equity Act (1993), restructuring of the primary immigrant settlement program, and reduction of its funding by nearly 50% (Good,

2007). With these changes, the Harris government indirectly downloaded responsibilities for multiculturalism policy and immigrant settlement to local governments, leaving municipalities to choose whether they would fill the gap left by the province amid increasing fiscal pressure on already-strapped municipal revenues (Good, 2007). For the city of Toronto, the increased responsibility for immigrant settlement coincided with its amalgamation and posed a particular challenge as it attempted to deal with the majority of Canada's migrants (Good, 2007).

Neoliberal restructuring of the welfare system and intergovernmental arrangements of social rights established in the late 1990s shaped the complex ways in which public services and social programs have come to be delivered today. Smith-Carrier and Bhuyan (2010) argue that the devolution of social rights, once allocated federally to subnational governments, has produced inconsistent and often contradictory effects on the construction and exercise of social rights in Canada. They point out that despite the transfer of the responsibility to deliver public services and social programs to provincial and municipal governments, the federal government remained in charge of different domains that assemble social rights allocations (e.g., immigration, income assistant programs, etc.). Accordingly, the construction of legality in immigration law at the federal level had a significant effect on how the eligibility criteria of public services and social programs were differently interpreted at provincial and municipal levels (Smith-Carrier & Bhuyan, 2010). This meant that while provincial and municipal governments could theoretically seek to advance the social rights of all people living within their territorial boundaries, the exclusion based on immigration status was reproduced at the local level (Smith-Carrier & Bhuyan, 2010).

The way in which federal politics and subnational politics have intersected and arranged social rights was articulated by participants in this study. Bella, who works in the settlement

sector, discusses how the lack of coordination among the immigration, welfare, and shelter systems has led to a precarious situation for her client:

> One of my clients has a precarious status. She is a failed refugee claimant and has applied for H&C [humanitarian and compassionate grounds]… But a part of applying for H&C is that you can't go on welfare, right? You can't avail yourself of that, and she doesn't have a job, she's got two kids, she is in a shelter. Her immigration lawyer is like, "You can't go on welfare because that will mess up your immigration." And because she can't go on welfare, she's got two children, she is in a shelter. But the shelters have a protocol around how long she can stay there, so the client was like, "I can't go on welfare, and my shelter is like, 'You've been here too long.'" I think the shelter, the maximum stay is like three months, and they have their own regulation, like they have to get them housed, like city policy probably. So [she] is like, "A shelter worker is putting pressure on me to leave every day, and tells me to go on OW (Ontario Works)," so this client is like, "Do I go on the OW and mess up my immigration or do I risk being kicked out by the shelter?"

Bella's accounts elucidate how the neoliberal overhaul of the welfare system has created a complex intergovernmental arrangement of social rights, leaving noncitizen migrants to face inner borders in addition to the territorial border. As the discourse of neoliberalism set the standardizing ideals and practices around notions such as efficiency, self-reliance, and low taxes (as expressed in language such as the "Common Sense Revolution"), it shaped the overhaul of the welfare system and the complex intergovernmental arrangement of social rights, drawing inner borders for noncitizens. In the next section, I discuss how the immigration and citizenship policy changes that took place between 2008 and 2015 under the Harper government further created inner borders, pushing noncitizens into precarious circumstances. In particular, my

discussion will focus on four following areas of immigration and citizenship changes: 1) the

Stream for Lower-skilled Occupations within the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP);

2) the conditional permanent residency for sponsored spouses and partners within the Family

Class Program; 3) the changes to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) in 2010

and 2012; and 4) the introduction of Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act in 2013. What

becomes clear through the analysis of these four areas of policy changes is how migrants are

differentially included and excluded in the sphere of Canadian citizenship through the policy

changes that are operating within intersecting discourses of neoliberalism and white civility.

Inner border making through immigration and citizenship policy changes between 2008

and 2016

While economic interests have always informed the Canadian immigration system, the

policy changes that took place between 2008 and 2015 were explicitly designed to advance the

neoliberal agenda. As discussed in the introductory chapter, the Conservative government

followed the global tendency to resurrect temporary worker programs and revamp visa and entry

criteria as a way to manage migration in general and place restrictions on permanent

immigration. Soon after forming a minority government in 2006, the Conservative government

introduced an economic plan called "Advantage Canada: Building A Strong Economy for

Canadians." Advantage Canada was designed to respond to the needs of Canadians in a

competitive global marketplace and to "show the world who and what we are: a modern,

dynamic and tolerant country" (Department of Finance Canada, p. 6). The major shifts in the

immigration system began to take place in 2008, two years after the Conservatives came into

power. As a complement to Advantage Canada, CIC initiated "modernizing Canada's

immigration system," a major neoliberal overhaul of the immigration system, beginning with the

149

Budget Implementation Act of 2008 (Bill C-50), which committed $109 million over five years (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2008). A series of changes was implemented targeting all three streams of immigration (economic, family class, and humanitarian) and the rules for obtaining citizenship and temporary entry as a foreign worker, international student, or visitor. The neoliberal ambition of immigration reform was clearly communicated through policy narratives. For example, then CIC minister Jason Kenney commented:

> To ensure that immigration will fuel our future prosperity, we need to select immigrants who are ready, willing, and able to integrate into Canada's labour market and fill roles in our economy where we have existing skills shortages. We have to make sure the skilled immigrants we choose are the ones Canada needs, and are the most likely to succeed when they get here, rather than being underemployed, stuck in survival jobs (Government of Canada, 2012a, under Speaking Notes for Honourable Jason Kenney).

Accordingly, migrants deemed self-sufficient and highly skilled (i.e., federal skilled workers, provincial nominees, Canadian Experience Class, immigrant investors, and immigrant entrepreneurs) have been actively sought-after as a group, giving them easier access to permanent residency, while those deemed lower skilled have been accepted only with temporary immigration status. Flecker's (2015) study on the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP) documents how the policy changes were tailored to the needs of Canadian employers. While the Stream for Lower-skilled Occupations was introduced in 2002 as a pilot project, the number of people who entered Canada under this category grew from 2,277 in 2005 to more than 39,813 in 2013 under the Conservative government (ESDC, n.d.). Flecker (2015) suggests that the increase in the number of "low-skilled" migrants stems from policy changes that made it easier and faster for Canadian employers to hire temporary foreign workers. These changes include: (1) reducing

TFWP processing delays; (2) expanding the online TFWP application system; (3) reducing the minimum time required to advertise a job locally; (4) maintaining lists of occupations with alleged shortages; and (5) producing an employer-friendly guidebook on how to navigate the TFWP efficiently (Flecker, 2015, p. 130).

The opening of the Canadian border to participants of the Stream for Lower-skilled Occupations was premised on what Mezzadra and Neilson (2013) would call differential inclusion and what De Genova (2013) would call obscene inclusion. Migrant workers are included in the Canadian labour market, but still face inner borders. Migrant advocacy groups and scholars have documented how the Canadian labour market relies on low-wage migrant workers from the global South who are granted temporary immigration status; yet, they are excluded from accessing basic rights such as decent housing, health care, and workers' safety (Faraday, 2014; Mclaughlin & Hennebry, 2013; Nakache, 2013; Valiani, 2013). As noncitizens, they have fewer effective legal protections than Canadian workers (Faraday, 2014).

Other migrants who enter under the Family Class and Refugee Protection Program were similarly filtered and hierarchized through policy changes and face inner borders. As neoliberal logic permeated the overhaul of the immigration system, not only had migrants who entered under the Family Class and Refugee Protection Program been given less priority, but they had also often been targeted as security concerns and subjected to stricter conditions to acquire secure immigration status. The Conservative government justified many policy changes by constructing potential migrants as the uncivil Other, a disturbance to Canadian economic progress and the orderliness of Canadian society. For example, a two-year period of conditional permanent residency for sponsored spouses and partners was introduced in 2012. The key to this policy change was the Conservative government's construction of marriage fraud as a serious

threat to the integrity of the Canadian immigration system (Nobe-Ghelani, 2017). In announcing the conditional permanent residency, then CIC Minister Jason Kenney justified the policy change as follows: "The problem of marriage fraud is serious and will only get worse if we don't put measures in place that protect the integrity of our immigration system while deterring people from trying to use a marriage of convenience to cheat their way into Canada" (Government of Canada, March 9, 2012b). Under this change, the sponsored spouse or partner must cohabit in a legitimate relationship with their sponsor for two years from the day they become a permanent resident before they will be granted full permanent residency. This policy affects spouses and partners who have been married or living together for two years or less and who have no children in common at the time of application (Government of Canada, 2012b). Migrant advocacy groups as well as researchers studying violence against women have argued that such conditionality of permanent residency would further reproduce the gendered power inequality between the sponsor and the sponsored (Bhuyan, Osborne, Zahraei & Tarshis, 2014).

Refugee claimants were similarly constructed as potential cheaters who take advantage of the Canadian welfare system. To protect the integrity of the Canadian immigration system from "bogus refugees," the changes to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA) in 2010 and 2012 constructed a category of "deserving" and "undeserving" refugees through the creation of a list of Designated Countries of Origin and Designated Irregular Arrival criteria (Huot, Bobadilla, Bailliard, & Rudman, 2016; Reynolds & Hyndman, 2015; Silverman, 2014). This involved the creation of a list of countries of origin that the Minister of Immigration and Citizenship Canada deemed safe and thus unlikely to produce "true" refugees. Whether a person was considered an irregular or regular migrant was at the discretion of the minister. For example, people who arrive by boat are deemed irregular migrants. Those labelled as "bogus" or

"undeserving" refugees (i.e., those who are from a "safe" country who arrived in Canada "irregularly") were affected by differentiated detention processes, timelines for submitting claims and preparing for hearings, access to appeals and other post-hearing recourse, speed of deportation, health coverage, access to work permits, travel documents, and permanent residence (Alboim & Cohl, 2012; Bechard & Elgersma, 2012). Arbel (2016) asserts that, through the "Designated Foreign National" category, the Canadian border is no longer of protection for refugees; it has been reconstituted as a site of punishment.

Further, in 2014, the federal government introduced omnibus Budget Bill C-43, which amended the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act. The sections 172 and 173 of Bill C-43 allow provinces to impose residency requirements for access to social assistance, but only for refugee claimants and other people without permanent status in Canada. Previously, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act prohibited any minimum period of residency requirement for anyone (Canadian Council for Refugees, 2014). Given that it takes several months to obtain a work permit for refugee claimants, not having access to social assistance cuts off the only income source that refugee claimants would have, pushing them into more precarious situations.

As I discussed elsewhere, even the permanent residents who have historically held secure immigration status in Canada were considered a potential threat to Canadian civility and national security (Nobe-Ghelani, 2017). For example, Bill C-43: Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act (2013) targeted permanent residents who have been involved in the criminal justice system as a threat to the integrity of the Canadian immigration system and Canadian society at large. Under the Act, permanent residents were systematically designated as foreigners even if they have lived in Canada most of their lives and are subject to deportation from Canada. Under this change, individuals, including permanent residents and foreign nationals, lost the right to appeal

to the Immigration Appeal Division (IAD) of the Immigration and Refugee Board in the following circumstances: (1) they were sentenced to imprisonment in Canada for six months or more; (2) they were convicted of reportable offences outside of Canada or are believed to have committed foreign offences, even without conviction (Canadian Bar Association, 2012). A criminal sentence of imprisonment in Canada of six months or longer can be the result of charges such as shoplifting or drug-related activities. The term of imprisonment may also include a conditional sentence that is served in the community instead of in jail. Conditional sentence orders are normally set for much longer times than equivalent sentences served in jail (Canadian Bar Association, 2012). As for the criminal sentence given abroad, it could be anything from a fine, probation, or a jail sentence, as long as it would be punishable by potential imprisonment of 10 years or more in Canada (Canadian Bar Association, 2012). This would include many Criminal Code offences, including serious offences (murder or armed robbery) but also other minor offences such as the use of false documentation and assault causing bodily harm. Further, the Act denies the right of foreign nationals to access humanitarian and compassionate relief if they are deemed inadmissible based on security grounds, such as organized criminality. Organized criminality can include relatively low levels of participation in patterns of less serious criminal activity such as shoplifting (Canadian Bar Association, 2012). Thus, under the Act, a permanent resident can be deported if convicted of dangerous driving in Canada, if caught using fake identification to get into a bar in the United States, or if involved in neighbourhood gang-related activity for shoplifting or drug trafficking (Canadian Bar Association, 2012). In this way, permanent residents who have been involved with the criminal justice system were systemically subject to exclusion from the Canadian national border.

These policy changes between 2008 and 2015 highlight how the discourse of neoliberalism intersects with the historical discourse of white civility and draws inner borders within the Canadian nation-state. The neoliberal overhaul of the immigration system was designed to include those who were constructed as contributing to the Canadian labour market, though their access to rights and entitlements greatly differs depending on the profession. Migrant workers, who were considered low-skilled professionals, were rapidly taken into the Canadian labour market but with great precarity. Other policy changes also discursively constructed migrants as uncivilized Others—marriage fraudsters, bogus refugees, and foreign criminals—who were not only a burden to the Canadian economy but a threat to the integrity of the Canadian immigration system and Canadian civility and security at large. In this way, neoliberal logic worked in concert with historical notions of civility, thereby shaping border making through changes to immigration and citizenship law and policy.

Inner border making at the level of social service delivery

Inner border making is facilitated even at the level of social service delivery. As discussed earlier, complex intergovernmental arrangements have produced inconsistent and often contradictory effects on the construction and exercise of social rights in Canada (Smith-Carrier & Bhuyan, 2010). As the federal, provincial, and municipal governments impose different eligibility criteria on the programs they fund, social service agencies are often left to come up with their own organizational policies and practices around serving noncitizen migrants. In Toronto, some social service agencies offer limited services to noncitizen migrants according to the requirements of their funders and organizational policies, while other agencies adopted an open-door policy, meaning access to their services is given to "everyone" regardless of immigration status. However, inner borders are created even within the social services that are

155

supposedly open to everyone. For example, while Community Health Centres (CHCs) are open

to all residents regardless of their immigration status, insufficient funding and resources continue

to be a hurdle for the provision of quality care for noncitizens. Jonas works at a CHC that is a

member of a Local Health Integration Network (LHIN), which is a provincial mechanism for

planning, integrating, and funding services to uninsured people such as noncitizens. Accordingly,

anyone—regardless of their immigration status—can come in anytime to get healthcare as long

as they live in the catchment area. However, Jonas identified a gap between the organization's

open-door policy and the reality of serving noncitizens. In his context of working with

noncitizens with HIV/AIDS, Jonas found that the open-door policy is insufficient precisely

because it advocates for the equality of all residents.

> So supposedly, anybody regardless of immigration status can come in and get the
>
> services [at the Community Health Centre]. But usually for people with HIV and
>
> nonstatus, they are desperate. Their viral [loads] are quite high. They haven't seen
>
> doctors in years, so for them to wait and for them to get services, it still takes a few
>
> weeks. And you still have to come in for an interview and then wait for doctors
>
> available to see them, right? But the agency didn't want to have a specific project for
>
> nonstatus with HIV. Because there should not be any priority in anyone's needs, right?
>
> It should be equal needs, but for my end, from the people on the team I am working
>
> with, we felt that this group has more need because of a lot of factors as well, right? But
>
> from the management perspective, funder's perspective, they should be all equal.

Jonas's observation reveals how the efforts to include noncitizen migrants through initiatives

such as the open-door policy fail on the ground. The same can be said about the sanctuary city

movement, a municipal effort to minimize residents' inequality resulting from their lack of

secure immigration status. Although the City of Toronto became a sanctuary city in 2013, allowing all residents to access the city's services regardless of their immigration status, immigration status continues to be a hurdle in accessing critical services. For example, while the Toronto District School Board has adopted a "Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy" since 2007, a study by Francisco Villegas (2013) demonstrates that the policy has not fully been implemented and students continue to be shut out of the school process depending on their legal status. The participants in this study who work in the school system also stated that under the Conservative regime, checking students' immigration status became a common practice for assessing their eligibility for services funded by the federal government (e.g., settlement services at school). Likewise, the Toronto Police Service continues to be inaccessible and hostile to noncitizens. While the Toronto Police Services Board adopted new standards of conduct in 2007, stating that "victims and witnesses of a crime shall not be asked their immigration status unless there are bona fide reasons to do so," a study by Moffette in 2015 showed that Toronto police had contacted the border service agency more than 3200 times in an eight-month period (as cited in Goffin, 2017).

The study on nonstatus migrants in the city of Toronto by Social Planning Toronto (2013) also found that while community agencies across the city of Toronto have provided services to noncitizen migrants, they also face tremendous hurdles in service delivery:

Concerns over stretched organizational resources, funding constraints, increase caseloads, unfamiliarity with the needs of nonstatus residents, limited knowledge of legal rights and obligations, and lack of formal organizational policy and guidelines towards serving nonstatus residents, all contribute to creating an uneven patch work of service delivery

across the city, as well as a hesitancy in broadly opening up services to serve this

marginalized population. (Sidhu, p. 3)

A newer study by Hudson, Atak, Manocchi, and Hannan (2017) reveals that the situation for

nonstatus migrants has not improved much despite the implementation of sanctuary city policies.

The authors found inconsistencies among city program workers' knowledge and values

regarding nonstatus migrants, as well as distrust among nonstatus migrants towards government

authority, leaving nonstatus migrants at the margins. Bhuyan's (2012) analysis of service

delivery for violence against women organizations and Paloma Villegas's (2013) analysis of

health care workers also show how social service providers play the role of "gatekeepers" in

producing varying degrees of access to rights and entitlements to noncitizen migrants in the city

of Toronto. The study by Goldring et al. (2009) also noted similar service delivery challenges,

and suggested that frontline workers and administrators of public services exercised a great deal

of discretionary power in implementing and/or circumventing immigration laws, making the

navigation of these systems unpredictable and uneven (p. 253).

These previous studies and participant narratives suggest that inner borders are

consistently made and continually shifting in the area of social service delivery, making it hard

for noncitizens to access the crucial services that are supposedly open to them. In the next

section, I take a closer look at how the micro-production of inner border making is facilitated

through social workers' narratives.

**The micro-production of inner border making: Social workers' experience with non-
citizens**

Similar to previous studies that have examined public services and social programs for

noncitizens, my study has identified discursive practices through which social workers play a

role in producing varying degrees of access to rights and entitlements in their workplaces as they struggle to navigate a highly complex funding structure and institutional practices in the immigration, welfare, health, and education systems. At the same time, the social workers I spoke to identified the prevailing effects of neoliberal reforms: fear of further funding cuts, increased caseloads, contract-based (as opposed to permanent) employment, more surveillance from funders in the form of auditing and frequent visits, and increased administrative tasks (e.g., reporting, filing). As I tried to understand the effects of neoliberal reforms, I was reminded that neoliberalism was not purely a top-down force that is imposed on us (Macias, 2015a; Smith, 2011; Pollack & Rossiter, 2010). Macias (2015a) points to an important condition of neoliberalism: "its effects in producing subjects that, while suffering the detrimental effects of neoliberal de/regulation, nevertheless internalize neoliberal discourses and use them to understand themselves and others as rational, calculative, enterprising, and individually responsibilized subjects" (p. 254). Citing Rose (1999), Macias (2015a) argues that

> neoliberalism introduces a market rationality into discourses of subjectivity, making it possible for subjects to 'translate their activities into financial terms, to seek to maximize productivity… to cut out waste, to restructure activities that [are] not cost-effective, to choose between priorities in terms of their relative costs and benefits, to become more or less like a financial manager of their own professional activities. (p. 255)

Smith's (2011) examination of social workers' responses to neoliberal restructuring of the primary health care and child welfare sectors demonstrates how social workers position themselves within and beyond the changing context of neoliberalism. Drawing on feminist poststructural, critical race, and postcolonial theories, she traces how social workers arrange

themselves as self-managing individuals in different spheres of their lives such as work, health, and family according to and against neoliberal logic.

This understanding of neoliberalism helped me to trace the discursive process by which social workers internalize neoliberal logic in multiple and contingent ways. While they struggle with and vocally criticize neoliberal reforms, social workers must also make calculated decisions about who is deserving of their limited resources and how to cut waste from their work practice. In the following section, I elucidate how social workers draw on the discourse of neoliberalism to make decisions about their everyday professional activities with noncitizens.

Exclusionary mechanisms of inner border making: When the commitment to equality breaks down

Many participants in this study acknowledged that the principle of universal equality is a key value driving their professional activities. They imagined the equality principle as everyone having the same access to rights and entitlements regardless of immigration status. In their everyday practice, however, social workers found themselves trapped in a tension among opposing phenomena: their aspiration for universal equality, a sovereign force that limits who can and cannot be a member of the nation-state, and a neoliberal logic that determines who is deserving and undeserving. Many social workers shared their stories of struggle as they navigated this tension in their everyday practices.

Bella, who works at a settlement organization as a frontline worker, expressed how her commitment to equality collided with the organization's funding structure:

> There was pressure of like…having to report a certain number of people who do fit the funder's criteria [i.e., migrants with immigration status]. But of course, that impacts the services, right? Because when you have a lot of needy clients who are [refugee] claimants

160

who need help right now but you also have this pressure to get other clients who fit the

funder's criteria… it definitely impacts the services that way, because you are having to

split the resources, time, and energy and all of that in a way that maybe doesn't make the

most sense, right? If we are talking about equality, if we are talking about really whoever

needs the most help in this moment should be the priority. But in reality, it is much more

complicated.

Bella struggled to manage the neoliberal dictum of "needing to split the resources, time, and

energy" in her work while keeping her commitment to equality. For Bella, the priority should

have been set based on the equality principle that was premised on serving "whomever needs the

most help in this moment," not who counted according to the funder's criteria. Yet, she realized

that "it is much more complicated" to practice her commitment to the principle of equality on the

ground.

As a manager in the settlement sector, Nana further elucidated how her commitment to

the principle of equality ruptured as she made decisions about her outreach strategy:

Even though our organization accepted people who don't have status, we prefer clients

with status, like you know, the Convention refugees, because those are the people we can

count in the funding report, right? I mean the funders only look at the number of people

who have status, so showing that we are helping people with status was important to get

more funding for the future… So we asked our staff to outreach to these populations [i.e.

those who have secure immigration status]. The refugee claimants, nonstatus migrants,

they are the ones you don't need to outreach. They will come to you, because there are

not many services available to them elsewhere. But the staff gets overwhelmed with the

number of refugee claimants and nonstatus migrants. But those are the people who don't

go into the funding report, right? So it is extra work in a way [to work with people without full immigration status].

Nana's narrative demonstrates how "the funder" becomes a discourse that organizes how she thinks and acts as she attempts to navigate the neoliberal effects on her workplace. Her decision about outreach strategy was based on the need to show numbers to the funders to receive future funding. While she was concerned about the effects of neoliberalism on her workplace (i.e., further funding cuts) and aware that there were not many services available to noncitizens, she also internalized the neoliberal logic and existing immigration categories to make a calculated decision. As the funder becomes a key issue for Nana's decision, the act of counting becomes an important mechanism to measure human value. In this context, migrants who had securer immigration status (i.e., Convention refugees) were regarded as worthy of outreach efforts because they were evidence of the organization's productivity. In contrast, those who did not have secure immigration status (i.e., refugee claimants and nonstatus migrants) were seen as imposing "extra work" on her staff.

The funder as a discourse and the discursive construction of the noncitizen as the source of additional labour were also apparent in Melinda's narrative. Melinda worked in the federally funded employment program and explained that her workplace was progressive and inclusive. Accordingly, she worked with noncitizens on an occasional basis even though they didn't normally fit the eligibility criteria. However, Melinda expressed a sense of guilt as she navigated the eligibility criteria:

> Sometimes I deal with guilt because you know, I am very busy. I am working, and a person [without a work visa] comes by, they want to connect or need help. And I have to make a call about if I have time that day or "hey can you come back in an hour" or

whatever. So sometimes I do have to balance my own work responsibilities… Sometimes

my real work will take priority in that moment, and I feel guilty about that.

Her sense of guilt emerged as her commitment to equality fell apart. She struggled to manage the

tension between her work responsibilities and her personal commitment to work with everyone

regardless of immigration status. In that process, she discursively separated what she considered

a "real job" and/or "work responsibilities" from her interaction with non-visa holders,

prioritizing her time in light of the demands for productivity exerted by her organization and its

funders. The discursive effect of such a separation and her corresponding sense of guilt produced

noncitizens as subjects of humanitarian concern rather than obligation. Here I am reminded of

Dauvergne's (2005) discussion on humanitarianism. Dauvergne contends that unlike justice,

humanitarianism is not a standard of obligation but rather one of charity: "Humanitarianism

defines us as good when we are able to meet the standard, and justifiable when we are not" (p.

72). By discursively constructing service to noncitizens without full immigration status as "extra

work" as opposed to "real work" and "work responsibilities," the social workers' decisions about

unequal treatment of noncitizens become at least tolerable if not justifiable.

The commitment to equality can also break down in a workplace that is supposedly open

to all people regardless of immigration status. Tania worked for a school board that had adopted

the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy." Accordingly, Tania asserted that she was able to see

"everyone" within the school system. Yet, Tania's account revealed the ways in which the

discourse of neoliberalism functioned to govern her practice decisions:

Mexicans are going to get denied because they have the deck against them, right? You

almost like, you almost wouldn't go to the same length. Because sometimes,

consciously or unconsciously... because you know that with Roma populations, like

163

what's the point? Because they are going to get deported in a couple of months, you

know. I can fight and fight and fight to get this kid back to school and go to their house

every day, and then next month, he would be deported, you know… With other kids

who have citizenship status, I would find that time (to work together), whereas with

Roma students, it's like, I've done it and I have done it but it's like I almost, now I

wonder if I would do it again… just because, you know, my time is so in demand.

Here, Tania expressed her frustration with the system, addressing structural biases embedded in

the Canadian refugee determination system. Giving Mexicans and Roma populations as

examples of those who were less likely to gain refugee status, she asked "What's the point?" if

her clients were deported in a couple of months anyway. She asserted she had made time for her

clients who were less likely to stay in Canada in the past, but soon after she implicitly made

sense of potential future inaction owing to the unlikelihood that her clients would stay in Canada

and in light of the work demands she already faced. She continued:

… it's not a waste, human relations are never a waste but at the same time, when you

have limited time, you know, maybe you don't invest so much in people who are living in

this weird situation, status wise. Maybe you give up more easily, you get discouraged or

you get oppressed by the system a bit.

Tania's practice choices were imbued with neoliberal logic: the deservingness of her time

was calculated through the likelihood of long-term physical presence. In Tania's narrative,

"time" becomes a strong discourse that organizes the human value of her labour and work

responsibilities as she navigates the neoliberal effects on her work. While her struggles regarding

the lack of time and resources were prevailing byproducts of the neoliberal forces at play in the

education and social welfare systems, her language of choice, evident in the use of words such as

164

"waste" and "invest," points to the ways in which she internalized neoliberal logic to make sense of her possible inaction. Tania's possible inaction was further justified by discursively positioning herself as a victim of the system. In this discursive process, the system was conceptualized as a top-down force that was imposed on her.

Tania's account of systemic oppression resembled the stories of other social workers who also saw themselves as oppressed by the system along with their clients. Fellows and Razack (1998) and Chapman, Hoque, and Utting (2013) argue that positioning oneself as a victim could render invisible one's implication in the subordination of others through "the race to innocence" (Fellows & Razack, 1998) and "relative claim to innocence" (Chapman, Hoque & Utting, 2013). Drawing on their work, I suggest that once we position ourselves as victims of the system, we create the conditions of our own complicity in reproducing the invisibility of inner borders. This is not to say that social workers don't suffer or experience challenges due to systemic issues. Our own sense of victimhood is surely constructed through neoliberal effects on social policy, social service delivery, and immigration and citizenship policy. However, this is an incomplete story of the ways in which our sense of victimhood operates. As demonstrated in previous chapters and as other scholars have argued, the professional identity of the social worker is historically built on a sense of goodness and morality (Badwall, 2016; Jeffery, 2005; Johnstone, 2018; Lee & Ferrer, 2014). Thus, when we position ourselves as victims of state power, we are not simply saying that we suffer, but we are also implying that we are innocent, thus securing our sense of morality. Our sense of victimhood, innocence, and morality all come together not merely to rationalize the exclusionary practices against noncitizens, but also to invisibilize the ways in which we have become complicit in border making.

Inclusionary mechanisms of inner border making: The productive and enterprising citizen

So far, I have focused on how the discourse of neoliberalism has functioned to legitimize exclusionary practices in social workers' narratives. In this section, I turn my analysis to how the discourse of neoliberalism legitimizes inclusionary practices. An analysis of the inclusionary functions of neoliberalism is particularly important because it is a prime site where social workers become blind to their own complicity in the border making of the Canadian nation-state. As professionals who are committed to social justice and human rights, social workers believe that our values and practices work in opposition to the exclusionary practices imposed by the nation-state (e.g., a restrictive immigration policy, restrictive eligibility criteria, funding cuts, etc.). Yet, as critical social work scholarship has demonstrated, social work values and aspirations are enmeshed within a framework of citizenship, state sovereignty, and the nation-state, and accordingly, social work has historically played a role in legitimizing state sovereignty, which marginalizes particular populations (Blackstock, 2009; Cowie, 2010; Sinclair, 2004; Lee & Ferrer, 2014; Park & Bhuyan, 2012). My analysis below similarly demonstrates how the discourse of neoliberalism works on, through, and within social workers to reproduce inner borders through inclusionary practices.

Unsurprisingly, many social workers in my study were critical of changes in immigration and citizenship policy under the Conservative government, particularly how the policy narrative has constructed negative images of migrants as bogus refugees, fraudsters, and burdens to Canadian society. Aida, who works in the settlement sector, passionately rejected such a policy narrative by offering alternative images of migrants without full immigration status:

> They are amazing human resources. Economic wise and education wise if they are given
> the right to work, they already have a huge advantage. Most people who come to Canada

166

are actually great human resources. What do we need? The country needs human resources, and we are not valuing human resources (by not giving them the right to work in Canada). These are people who are accomplished in their countries; they are young adults and very healthy. Canada doesn't have to invest too much on them. They are ready, they are ready to work; they are ready to study. They are ready to contribute something to Canada.

While her account appeared to challenge the dominant idea of "noncitizens" as burdens on society, her effort to discursively transform noncitizens into contributing members (and a "human resource") of Canadian society operates according to the logic of neoliberalism. As such, the "worthiness" of noncitizens is calculated in terms of their ability to contribute to the Canadian economy, reducing them merely to their economic value. Simultaneously, Canada is legitimized as a protector and provider of rights as well as a beneficiary of its workforce. The discursive effect produces the subject position of the productive citizen "who is ready to work, study and contribute something to Canada," in opposition to the unproductive "noncitizen," who would not contribute to the Canadian economy.

The discourse of neoliberalism also influenced how the interviewees accounted for success stories. Melinda explained what she thought was a success story in her work with migrants without full immigration status:

One person I started to work with before he had a work permit. He was waiting for his work permit. We started to work on his résumé. And then he got his work permit. This person was so on top of everything; I was very, very impressed by just his ability to hold everything [together], his paper work, he wanted to apply to school, he wanted to work. So he has his work permit now, he is at [a community college] for welding, and also he's

been working at [coffee shop] as well for income, and now he is looking into moving into his own room in a place. So I think he comes to my mind as a success story, because he was… someone who kind of went along the timeline, right? Waiting for the status that he needed, and being able to go to school, being able to get a job, now being able to choose where he wants to live. So I feel very hopeful about ... what he will be. Soon he is able to get a job that pays a lot more because he'll be in welding. Ontario Works [social assistance] has been very supportive and helping him with school supplies and a helmet for welding.

Melinda's success story highlights the discursive processes by which her client was transformed from "noncitizen" into "ideal citizen." Her client was a self-sufficient worker who was able "to hold everything together," managing the immigration process, his education, employment, and housing all at once. He was also a law-abiding citizen who "went along the timeline" of waiting for his immigration status while pursuing other opportunities. He was deserving of government support (Ontario Works) as he became a productive citizen of Canada. Her sense of hope about her client's future depended on this image of the ideal citizen.

Melinda's account resembles many of the success stories that I heard during my interviews with social workers, most of whom measure success by the attainment of secure immigration status and economic and social integration into Canadian society (via schooling and employment). What these success stories reproduce is the ideal citizen subject who conforms to the dominant script of Canadian citizenship, which is shaped through neoliberalism and Canada's longstanding discourse of civility. Accordingly, the inner borders shape the binary construction of "deserving" and "undeserving," "productive" and "unproductive," and "law abiding" and "bogus," even though such distinctions constructed by the Canadian nation-state

168

are strongly opposed by social workers. Further, the discursive construction of the ideal citizen subject invisiblizes the material social factors that make many people "unsuccessful" (e.g. unemployment, underemployment, a lengthy immigration process, rising school fees and housing costs, and discrimination, just to name a few).

The discourse of neoliberalism can also be traced in the narratives that offer critical reflection. Bella has a critical view of the refugee determination system. She delegitimizes this system by explaining that the government should not have a say in who can come in and stay on land that is stolen. She further states that much of the world's refugee migration is caused by historical colonialism and contemporary intervention by Western nation-states. Therefore, she says, it does not make sense for a Western government like Canada's to refuse those whose causes of migration are rooted in the violence enacted by the West. Despite such critical reflection on the refugee determination system, she still thinks of success in terms of attainment of secure immigration status and individual achievement following such attainment. She articulates her view of success as follows:

> Even though I don't believe in the refugee determination system, every time someone gets the status, it is a success, right? Because it is a success for them. And, you know, it means that they are no longer having to live in fear, right? They no longer have to live in the uncertainty: "Am I going to be deported," "What is my life going to be like?" They at least know, "I am safe, I am physically safe." So that is always a success when you can say, like, you are going to be physically safe. I mean, for the most part, a lot of things can happen in Canada, but you know… I guess other successes are like, when we work with people, and eventually, they don't need you anymore, that is the success, right? So, working with people for a while, building up

whether their coping skills or whatever it is, and they are off and doing their own

things in the society, they don't need you.

Bella's critical view of the refugee determination system fades away as she prioritizes her

clients' perceptions of success, which are based on the attainment of secure immigration status.

At the same time, she discursively links the attainment of secure immigration status with the

safety and certainty of remaining in Canada, legitimizing the benevolent idea of Canada as a

country that provides safety and certainty in one's life. This idea of Canada as a safe place

effectively hides the racialized violence that continues to take place in contemporary Canada.[10]

Another version of a success story presented by Bella appears to challenge the dominant

script of success by focusing on self-determination and empowerment that goes beyond the

attainment of immigration status. Yet, a closer reading reveals that individual achievement

through self-determination and empowerment is discursively linked to the ideas of autonomy and

self-sufficiency, which operate according to the logic of neoliberalism. This can be observed in

the subsequent narratives that followed immediately after the quotation above.

I have clients, for example, when I was working in a child and youth counsellor

position… I was just helping them get into university, get into the program, who now

have a master's degree, who are like doing amazing stuff on their own, so that is always

a success right? When you see you were able to support someone and realizing their

goals and realizing their dream or whatever it is, so that is always amazing. Those are

big successes when people don't need you. When they are off on their own and they are

like, "I got a job, I am doing great, I am married, I have a kid," like, you know, they are

---

[10] A few examples of racialized violence in contemporary Canada include but are not limited to
the cases of missing and murdered Indigenous women, racial profiling against blacks, and hate
crimes against Muslims.

living their own lives. That is what the point is, so people can be like, can do their own

thing and have self-determination, feeling empowered and make the decision for

themselves to work towards their goals, and all of that.

Bella's emphasis on self-determination and empowerment paradoxically reproduces the

neoliberal values of autonomy and self-sufficiency. As Rose (1990) states, the "ideal" individual

in terms of neoliberal subjectivity consists of an enterprising self that is regulated through an

individualized understanding of autonomy, responsibilities, fulfillment, and choice: "the

individual is to become, as it were, an entrepreneur of itself, seeking to maximise its own

powers, its own happiness, its own quality of life, through enhancing its autonomy and then

instrumentalising its autonomous choices in the services of its lifestyle" (p. 11). Thus, though

Bella's narratives appear to challenge the dominant discourse of success by going beyond the

discussion of immigration status, she nevertheless reproduces the neoliberal discourse of success

by emphasizing an individualized understanding of autonomy and choice.

Further, while she emphasizes that success is determined by individual clients (e.g., her

clients "make the decision for themselves to work towards their goals"), her version of success

still follows a dominant social script by conceptualizing success in terms of higher education, a

job, marriage and children. In her discussion of the promise of happiness, Ahmed (2010) argues

that happiness is so entangled with dominant societal norms, behaviours, and life choices that, in

order to be happy, one must be directed towards specific "happiness objects" and follow certain

happiness scripts. Thus, Ahmed (2010) suggests, contrary to what is typically believed, the

conditions in which people perceive happiness is not a matter of individual choice; we are

expected to be happy and to be made happy by particular things. Drawing on Ahmed (2010), I

suggest that the "success objects" in Bella's narrative—higher education, a job, marriage, and

children—are entangled with dominant societal norms, behaviours, and life choices, despite her emphasis on self-determination and empowerment. Though these "success objects" do not include immigration status, the standardizing script of citizenship continues to invoke "success objects" to define who the ideal citizen subject is—a highly educated, employable individual who is a member of a family unit.

I further propose that these "success objects" are constructed not only via neoliberal discourse (as measurable achievements of an autonomous, self-sufficient, enterprising subject) but also through the discourse of settler nationhood. Immigrant success stories have historically functioned to erase Indigenous sovereignty while legitimizing Canada's settler colonial projects (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2014). Coleman's (2006) analysis of the figure of the Scottish orphan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries elucidates how the settlement story of Scottish Canadians shaped the conceptual foundation of the Canadian ideal of civility—which is premised on upward mobility and moral improvement—while displacing the Indigenous figure. The historical figure of the Scottish orphan continues to shape the contemporary script of the Canadian immigrant story: "prudent, good character produces (his) economic success" (p. 239), while simultaneously constructing Canada as a land of opportunity. The aspirational idea of Canada as a land of opportunity where, with the commitment of hard work, immigrants can "make it" for themselves and their families is deeply ingrained not only in our national identity but also in the immigrant identity. So when the national narrative positions immigrants as "a driving force in Canada's nationhood and its economic prosperity," as expressed in the documents of Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2010), it is hard to deny such a claim. Yet, the idea of success or "success objects" for noncitizens that Bella presents in her narrative—

while appearing to be apolitical and part of the natural course of human aspiration—is a contemporary expression of civility grounded in settler colonial histories and practices.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I examined multiple levels of inner border making in the neoliberal era. Drawing on critical border scholarship and settler colonial studies, I located contemporary bordering practices in the historical continuum of settler colonialism and proposed that the contemporary Canadian territorial border functions both to facilitate global capitalism and settler colonialism by differentially including migrant bodies according to neoliberal rationality. After highlighting the changing nature of contemporary bordering practices, I further discussed the features of neoliberalism and suggested that, in addition to the historical discourse of white civility, neoliberalism forms one of the key discourses that constitute the script of contemporary Canadian citizenship. I then examined how the discourse of neoliberalism operates to condition inner border making at multiple levels. Drawing on the existing literature, policy analysis, and interview narratives, I discussed how neoliberal restructuring of the welfare system since the 1990s—a complex intergovernmental arrangement of social rights and immigration and citizenship policy changes under the previous Conservative government—and gaps in service delivery have all facilitated inner border making in Canada. Finally, I examined the interview narratives of social workers in depth and traced the micro-production of inner border making. I demonstrated some of the ways that the discourse of neoliberalism worked on, through, and within social workers. Using neoliberal logic, social workers make sense of exclusionary and inclusionary practices towards noncitizens as they struggle to navigate a highly complex immigration system and funding structure as well as the effects of neoliberalism in their workplace. I showed that as social workers made sense of their exclusionary practices, they often

173

positioned themselves as fellow victims of a restrictive immigration and citizenship regime; however, when social workers discussed inclusionary practices towards noncitizens, they saw themselves as helpers and facilitators of noncitizens' integration into Canadian society as they positioned the noncitizens as productive and enterprising subjects who are capable of embodying neoliberalist ideals. Along with this subject making, social workers position the Canadian nation-state as both oppressive (as an implementer of restrictive immigration and citizenship policies) and benevolent (as a protector of safety and a land of opportunity). While these different positions appear contradictory, they work together to hide the illegitimacy of Canada as a settler nation-state. What is presumed to be oppressive is anti-immigrant and refugee policies, not the fundamental structure of settler nationhood, and the remedy to anti-immigrant and refugee policies is imagined as the legal and economic integration of noncitizens who would contribute to its settler nationhood. In this way, the settler nationhood of Canada remains unchallenged.

In summary, my analysis points to how contemporary border making operates through the discourse of neoliberalism and how it permeates everyday activities on the ground such as social work with noncitizens. The micro-production of inner borders among social workers demonstrates the pervasiveness of neoliberalism even when critiques are present. I argue that the pervasiveness of neoliberalism contributes to the sustainment of the settler colonial nationhood of Canada. Through the discourse of neoliberalism, capitalist and colonial interests intersect and flourish; neoliberal logic justifies how the border functions to include and exclude particular migrant bodies. Yet, we often do not see how our everyday social work activities reproduce the inner borders that sustain the macro-level operation of global capitalism and settler colonialism. I suggest that instead of seeing ourselves as victims of neoliberalism, we as social workers should

position ourselves as part of neoliberalism to make our complicity visible. This visibility is the first step to disrupting inner border making.

CHAPTER 6

AFFECTIVE CONDUCT OF INNER BORDERS: HOW DO EMPATHIC FEELINGS FUNCTION IN SOCIAL WORK WITH NONCITIZENS?

Introduction

At the end of the last chapter, I argued for the importance of making our complicity visible in inner border making. Yet, this task is easier said than done. I suggest that one of the reasons this is the case lies in our investment in being moral and innocent or more accurately in *being seen* as moral and innocent. I say "*being seen* as moral and innocent" here to suggest that our investment in our own morality and innocence is always social and relational. Our sense of morality and innocence are socially constructed; accordingly, being moral and innocent must be socially acknowledged. It is through being seen as moral and innocent that we affirm our professional identity as social workers.

But what happens when the innocence of helping is lost? What does it mean to see our role as helping professionals being inevitably entangled with the oppressive structure we aim to challenge? Rossiter (2001) engages with this line of questioning and proposes that instead of seeking a site of innocence, critical social work education should aim to foster "'negative capability' — being capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason" (Keats, cited in Rossiter, 2001, para. 20). In her later work, Rossiter (2011) draws on the scholarship of Levinas and advocates for unsettling social work as an ethical direction where ethics precedes knowledge. By "unsettling social work," Rossiter (2011) means that "social work practice gives up the fantasy of complete comprehension" (p. 994) and is prepared to come to know the person in the ways in which she chooses to be seen.

Rossiter suggests that this move requires social workers to shift our professional tendency to bring difference into sameness. This approach to ethics is similarly argued in other social justice endeavours. For example, Tuck and Yang (2012) propose an ethic of incommensurability in engaging with decolonization, arguing that real solidarity and collaboration arise from acknowledging our differences rather than smearing them together to construct makeshift coalitions. Similarly, in the context of critical reflexivity in the research process, Pillow (2003) proposes that "a reflexivity that pushes towards an unfamiliar, towards the uncomfortable, cannot be a simple story of subjects, subjectivity, and transcendence or self-indulgent telling"; she further suggests that such reflexive practices are not aimed at "clarity, honesty, or humility, but as practices of confounding disruptions — at times even a failure of our language and practices" (p. 192). When we approach reflexive practice in this manner, the work is no longer a site of self-knowledge but rather a site where the claim of self-knowledge is put into question.

While I agree with Rossiter (2001, 2011), Tuck and Yang (2012), and Pillow (2003) and see the possibility of ethics at the site of unsettlement and discomfort, I am also wary, because there is a real pull to see ourselves as a unitary subject. For social workers, this unitary subject position has been secured through notions of morality and innocence. Challenging and unsettling these notions means putting our unitary subjecthood at risk, and accordingly, we tend not to embrace feelings of unsettledness and discomfort or we do not know how to be in the state of unsettledness and discomfort (Wong, 2004). What happens then is that we tend to turn away from the state of unsettledness and discomfort or turn it into a state of settledness and comfort. As Tuck and Yang (2012) state in the context of settler colonialism, "[D]irectly and indirectly benefiting from the erasure and assimilation of Indigenous peoples is a difficult reality for

settlers to accept. The weight of this reality is uncomfortable; the misery of guilt makes one hurry toward any reprieve" (p. 9).

I have observed this tendency in the way we engage with critical reflexivity. For example, Heron (2005) elucidates the ways in which critical awareness of one's privileged social locations does not necessarily unsettle its operation. Instead, Heron (2005) suggests, this awareness has the potential to leave those who name it in a place of double comfort: "the comfort of demonstrating that one is critically aware, and the comfort of not needing to act to undo privilege" (p. 344). Similarly, Badwall (2016) argues that "critical reflexivity has become another hegemonic script in social work, and its connections to whiteness are made through reflections on the self that restore the subject back to a place of innocence and moral superiority" (p. 9). Both Heron (2005) and Badwall (2016) assert that while reflexive practice has become standard for critical social work practice and education and is being assumed as a way to enter the state of unsettledness and discomfort, it does not always function that way. Positioning ourselves as critical is becoming another version of performing and securing goodness and morality; accordingly, even reflexivity and the awareness it engenders are at risk of reproducing social hierarchy and marginalization.

This leads me to question the conditions in which we are pulled to being settled and comforted into the sense of morality and innocence (be it through the "good" intention of helping others, participating in social change, or being critical). How do we become attached to the ideas of morality and innocence? I suggest that the root of our attachment to the ideas of morality and innocence is historical. In her study of white Canadian women who participated in international development, Heron (2007) suggests that the moral self that is embodied by the contemporary international development worker can be traced back to whiteness and bourgeois subjectivity that

emerged in the era of empire. Drawing on Heron (2007), I contend that contemporary social

workers' investment in morality and innocence is rooted in whiteness and bourgeois subjectivity,

which gave rise to colonial notions of white civility that have shaped the moral–ethical code of

Canadian-ness (Coleman, 2006). As discussed in chapter 4, the discourse of civility privileged

whiteness, masculinity, and Britishness not only as a standard of progress but also as a moral–

ethical code. The development of social work as a field for the professional helper was premised

on embodying the idealized profile of English Canadians through the discourse of white civility

as well as on producing settler-citizen subjects who similarly aspired to ideals shaped by white

civility. Accordingly, being seen as moral and innocent was fundamental to the legitimization of

social workers as professional helpers.

I want to acknowledge the centrality of white subjects in Heron's (2007) theorization of

contemporary international development workers as well as my historical analysis of the

Canadian social work profession in chapter 4; the historical attachment to morality and

innocence premised on whiteness and white civility may not have been available to racialized

social workers, who have been historically excluded from a mostly white profession (Badwall,

2016). This is not to say that racialized social workers are not invested in morality and innocence

that are essential to the social work profession. Rather, as I elaborate later in this chapter, their

attachments to morality and innocence operate differently.

To further investigate the different ways in which social workers become attached to the

ideas of morality and innocence, I suggest we attend to the affective dimension of our investment

in these ideas. The purpose of this chapter is to elucidate how our affective investment in

morality and innocence renders our complicity in inner border making invisible. I trace our

affective investment by focusing on empathic feeling, which was one of the primary affective

experiences expressed in social workers' narratives. My analysis below reveals that empathic feelings secure a sense of morality and innocence among social workers, though the processes of this affective conduct differ depending on the social locations and personal biography of social workers. I propose that understanding how empathic feelings are differently generated leads to a deeper understanding of how affective conduct in social work with noncitizens invisibilizes, and sometimes sustains, the Canadian national border.

My analysis of the affective experiences of social workers is structured in four parts. Following this introductory section, I explicate what prompted me to examine the affective experience of social workers. This section presents the reflexive moment when I began to question how my own affective experience was being generated through broader social relations of power. I discuss my affective reaction to anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric advanced by the Conservative government, and begin to examine what this affective reaction says about the way in which I and the other social workers in my study position ourselves in the climate of anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric.

The third section outlines my theoretical approach to the examination of empathic feelings. I first discuss the existing literature on empathy in social work, and then offer critiques drawing on critical affect theories (Ahmed, 2004; Pedwell, 2014; Zembylas, 2015).

The fourth section presents data from the interviews, attending to various historical lines of empathic feeling of differently positioned social workers. My concern is not about locating an "origin" of social workers' empathic feelings but rather, following Ahmed (2004), to trace the concrete ways in which this feeling circulates and "sticks" as we navigate through exclusionary practices towards noncitizens. Social workers come to feel for and with noncitizens in many different ways, but many associate their empathic feelings with their own transnational

experiences. I examine how empathy is deployed in the process of relationship building with noncitizens and as an advocacy strategy in everyday social work. I interrogate how pain and suffering become central discursive practices in social work with noncitizens and how these discursive practices function to position social workers in the site of morality and innocence and reproduce Canada as a humanitarian nation-state. I argue that empathic feelings among social workers are not simply about the feelings for and with noncitizens; they function to confirm the social workers' identities as professional helpers and a particular script of Canadian citizenship. Thus, while social workers imagine empathy to be integral in overcoming border practices that are imposed by the Canadian nation-state, empathy also functions to invisibilize and sustain the Canadian national border.

Centering affect in the analysis of border making

I conducted this particular interview during the 2015 federal election campaign. One day, as I was waiting for the participant at a coffee shop, I overheard a conversation about Zunera Ishaq. Ishaq was a Pakistani national and permanent resident of Canada who became the central figure of a debate in what came to be known as the niqab issue. Ishaq was challenging a new rule of the 2011 Citizenship Act that required immigrants partaking in the Oath of Citizenship to remove their face covering. While Ishaq was willing to uncover herself in private in front of a female official for identification purposes, she objected to taking off the niqab during the public citizenship ceremony. She filed for judicial review, arguing that the ban breached her Charter rights of religious freedom. The Federal Court of Canada found that the ban on face covering violates administrative law and is illegal. The Conservative government tried to overturn the ruling, arguing that the ban on face covering enhances the integrity of obtaining citizenship (Macleod, 2015). Despite the Conservative government's effort to enforce the ban on face

181

covering during the citizenship ceremony, Ishaq eventually won her case and gained her Canadian citizenship status while wearing the niqab, right before the 2015 federal election. Soon after, the newly elected Liberal government withdrew a request to the Supreme Court to hear an appeal on the issue, ending a four-year legal battle to enforce the ban on face coverings at the citizenship ceremony.

As this legal battle took place during the 2015 election campaign, Ishaq and the issue of face coverings during the citizenship ceremony received intense political and public attention. A number of major Canadian media outlets, including the *Toronto Star*, the *National Post*, and Global News, reported that different public polls showed that the majority of Canadians supported the Conservative government's policy to ban face coverings during the citizenship ceremony.[11] As the face-covering ban became one of the key election issues, political leaders, as well as the general public, were affectively invested, so much so that it was not unusual to hear the conversations about Ishaq or niqab wearing at places such as this coffee shop.

As I overheard the conversation about Ishaq, which contained what I considered racist and sexist comments, I remembered feeling sad and angry about how pervasive and acceptable anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric had become under the Conservative government. From the interviews, it became clear that many social workers, to different degrees, shared my feelings. Many were angry, frustrated, and disappointed with the negative representation of migrant communities that was prevalent in Canada's immigration and citizenship policies under the Conservative government. At first, I did not think much about these emotional responses. I thought the responses—disappointment, anger, frustration, etc.—were "normal," because we as

---

[11] Global News (Logan, 2015) reported that 88% of Canadians strongly or somewhat supported the ban, while the *National Post* (Doyle, 2015) reported 82% support for the ban and the *Toronto Star* (Vincent, 2015) reported 67%.

social workers are committed to values such as equality, diversity, human rights, and social justice. How can we not be upset about anti-immigrant and anti-refugee sentiments that had become so prevalent under the Conservative government?

Yet, as Ahmed (2004) suggests, all emotions, whether they are considered "good" or "bad," "normal," or "absurd," are social practice. Emotions are generated and become productive through the repetitive mediation between what we see, what we say, what we believe, and what we do. Through this repetition, we mark a wide range of boundaries—between what (who) is right and what (who) is wrong, who is deserving and who is not, what is acceptable as professional practice and what is not, and who belongs and who does not. Derek Hook (2007) builds on Foucault's theory of governmentality and suggests that affect becomes a disciplinary power mechanism both at the macro-political level and at the micro-political level. He examines the relationship between micro-political dimensions of interpersonal racism and broader macro-level components of racist state power, arguing that they work in conjunction through the conduct of affect. He asserts that the relationships between micro-politics and macro-politics are not straightforward but operate in often discontinuous and indirect ways. Yet, Hook argues, the micro-politics of racism "typically work to support and extend the overarching agendas of macro-power" (2007, p. 224). In other words, while our emotional responses to anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric may appear oppositional to macro-politics, our affective conduct is still implicated in the histories and social relations of power. Thus, the affective conduct of our emotions must be interrogated: How do we as social workers come to feel what we feel, and what does our feeling do to ourselves and others? How do our feelings move us closer to or further away from noncitizens as well as the Canadian nation-state?

This line of questioning enabled me to interrogate the "naturalness" of the emotional responses expressed by social workers and to examine how these emotions were shaped through our histories and broader social relations. In this chapter, I attend to those "natural" feelings expressed by social workers, primarily focusing on "empathy." To be sure, empathy is a slippery term, as are other terms that try to capture what is typically considered pre-discursive, that is, "bodily, affective, pre-symbolic" (Hook, 2006, p. 207). Considering the slippery nature of empathy, in addition to the narratives that explicitly use the word "empathy," I also attend to affective moments when social workers express feelings *for* and *with* noncitizens. Drawing on critical theories of affect and emotions, I conceptualize the empathic expressions of social workers as a prevailing site where we can witness social and political relations involving the imbrication of cognitive, perceptual, and affective processes (Ahmed, 2004; Pedwell, 2014). The next section further explicates the theoretical approach I take up in the examination of empathic feelings. Before I outline my theoretical approach, however, I examine how empathy is typically taken up in social work discourse so that I can address the importance of conceptualizing empathy differently.

Empathy in social work

Empathy can be described as "putting yourself in someone's shoes" (Pedwell, 2014). This conventional understanding of empathy can be traced back to its semantic origins in the German word *Einfuhlung*, meaning *feeling into* the other (Stueber, as cited in Eriksson & Englander, 2017). Einfuhlung as imitation and an inner resonance was translated to the English-speaking world in the early twentieth century; it has been closely associated with the therapeutic relationship and become a standard term in helping relationships (Eriksson & Englander, 2017). Carl Rogers, one of the founders of humanistic psychology, asserted that empathy is a vital

therapeutic tool for "entering the private world of the other and becoming thoroughly at home in it" (cited in Pedwell, 2014, p. 6–7). Empathy is seen as an ability "to gain a grasp of the content of other people's minds and to predict and explain what they will think, feel and do" (Coplan & Goldie, cited in Pedwell, 2014, p. 123). American social work pioneer and early organizer of the Charity Organization Society Mary Richmond described the use of "'imaginative sympathy' to see the world of the other in a similar way to how the other sees himself or herself, at the same time maintaining one's 'own professional work in mind'" (as cited in Eriksson & Englander, 2017). While Richmond uses the term "sympathy," Eriksson and Englander (2017) assert that the meaning is more aligned with what would now be considered empathy, that is, imaginative perspective-taking.

Since the time of Mary Richmond, the centrality of empathy has continued in contemporary social work. The role of empathy is regarded as central to social work practice, particularly in the context of relationship building. The Canadian Association for Social Workers states in its "Standards of Practice" (1995) that "empathizing with clients' feeling and concerns" would help "establish egalitarian relationships with clients" (Standards III 2). Ingram (2012) argues that emotional attunement and empathy are the foundations of establishing an open and trusting relationship. The advancement of information technology, the transnational migration of people, and global social justice movements have also facilitated affective relationship building globally, which shows the possibility of collectively addressing inequity and oppression. Affective knowledge is regarded as vital in ethical relationship building (Gerdes & Segal, 2009).

The theorization of empathy in contemporary social work is aligned with the current obsession with "neuro" or brain science in social work and social science at large (Rose & Abi-Rached, 2013). For example, in addressing the lack of social work models of empathy, Gerdes

185

and Segal (2009) advocate for a unified conceptualization of empathy through social cognitive neuroscience. Gerdes (2011) explains that social cognitive neuroscience offers a new understanding of empathy that focuses on "how mirror neurons and neural networks mediate the process of empathy in the brain" (p. 235). According to social cognitive neuroscience, the human brain is wired to mimic other people, and this mimicry involves automatic and thus involuntary affective experiences in the observer (Gerdes & Segal, 2009). Iacoboni (as cited in Gerdes & Segal, 2009) explains the neurological process of empathy as follows:

Mirror neuron areas help us understand the emotions of other people by some form of inner imitation. According to this mirror neuron hypothesis of empathy, our mirror neurons fire when we see others expressing their emotions, as if we were making those facial expressions ourselves. By means of this firing, the neurons also send signals to emotional brain centers in the limbic system to make us feel what other people feel. (p. 117)

Through this "embodied simulation" (V. Gallese, Keysers, & Rizzolatti, as cited in Gerdes, 2011), we come to empathize with others (Gerdes, 2011). Accordingly, Gerdes (2011) defines empathy as "the physiological experience of feeling what another person is feeling and the cognitive processing of the experience; the ability to perceive and feel the world from the subjective experience of another person" (p. 233). Self is understood as an autonomous agent whose affective and cognitive responses emerge within. Drawing on this understanding of empathy, Gerdes and Segal (2009) developed a social work model of empathy that has three components: (1) the affective response to another's emotions and actions; (2) the cognitive processing of one's affective response and the other person's perspective; and (3) conscious decision-making to take empathic action. They contend that while affective responses are

automatic and thus involuntary, cognitive processing and conscious decision-making are voluntary, so it is possible to train and facilitate this empathic ability among social work students by helping them develop the skills of perspective-taking, self-awareness, and emotional regulation.

Drawing on a phenomenological approach, Eriksson and Englander (2017) critique Gerdes and Segal's model of empathy as the subjective experience of another person and instead advocate for other-oriented perspective-taking. Citing Zahavi, Eriksson and Englander (2017) explain that

> empathy is a basic, irreducible form of intentionality that is directed toward the experiences of others… In empathy, the experience you empathically understand remains that of the other. The focus is on the other, and not on yourself, not on how it would be like for you to be in the shoes of the other. (p. 610)

To support this point, Eriksson and Englander (2017) conducted interviews with social workers in the field of forced migration. In their study, they identified three key structures of the phenomenon of empathy: (1) empathic presence (listening and being present), (2) professional stance, and (3) recognition of the other. Drawing on this empirical study, they suggest that empathy was experienced as a primordial account of interpersonal understanding, not as an embodied simulation as suggested by Gerdes (2011). Accordingly, they suggest that social workers should focus on the clients' meaning expression—"what is expressed and what is unfolding right in front of us" (p. 619) to foster and facilitate empathy.

Despite their different approaches to empathy, neuroscience and phenomenology coalesce on the notion that empathy, if done correctly, leads to better understanding of the client

in social work practice. The fundamental assumption here is that the affective process of empathy and the knowledge following from it remain in the domain of individuals.

I wish to critique this assumption of empathy as belonging to individual domain via critical theories of affect and emotions. In introducing the concept of affective economies, Ahmed (2004) explains that emotions, while often regarded as a private matter belonging to individuals, are indeed a social practice. By emphasizing the sociality of emotion, however, Ahmed does not mean that emotions simply move in from outside (e.g., ideology of the state). Instead she proposes that emotions only exist within the mediation between the psychic and the social, and between the individual and the collective. The repetition of words and signs are important to this mediation, as it is through these repetitions that emotional responses are elicited. Through this repetitive mediation, emotions create "others" by "working through signs and on bodies to materialise the surfaces and boundaries that are lived as worlds" (p. 191).

Ahmed (2004) further articulates that "[emotions are] not only about movement, they are also about attachments… what moves us, what makes us feel, is also that which holds us in place, or gives us a dwelling place… [that] connects bodies to other bodies" (p. 11). Thus, emotions circulate socially and work to align individuals with communities by creating social relationships that designate the rhetorical terrain of the nation and by defining whom we relate to as proximate and who is distant (Ahmed, 2004). Ahmed's theorization of emotions poses an important disruption to how we think about empathy in social work. In the literature examined above and in the conventional social work approach, empathy is unquestionably placed as an essential quality for good social work. Accordingly, as I demonstrated above, the discussion on empathy within social work often surrounds the question of how to cultivate empathy, not how to question it. Yet, I suggest that empathy does not exist outside power relations.

188

Several feminist scholars have noted that empathy is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, radically "unsettling" affective experiences of empathy may lead to the realization of one's complicity and thus social responsibility and meaningful engagement (Bartky, 1996; LaCapra, 2001; Davis, 2004). On the other hand, the claims to "know" or represent the experiences of "others" through empathic identification may involve forms of appropriation on the part of already "privileged" subjects (Spelman, 1997). Hemmings (2011) also argues that empathy is not boundless but tends to follow along already defined lines of cultural investment. Drawing on critical theories of transnationality and international geopolitics, Pedwell (2014) examines how empathy is generated within, circulated through, and productive of transnational relations of power. Through an understanding of "transnationality" as constituted by interrelated and shifting processes of colonialism, slavery, diaspora, migration, development, globalization, neoliberalism, and global media, among other phenomena, she examines how empathy emerges and flows through global circuits of power and elucidates the complex ways in which it transforms and translates as it travels between diverse contexts. For example, she examines how empathy is translated as a tool for increasing multinational corporations' competitiveness and profit accumulations in popular business literature. Multinational corporations such as IMB and Nike promote empathic engagement with their customers to generate greater knowledge about consumers' specific interests and needs, which then lead to profit accumulation. Similarly, she examines the operation of empathy in international development programs such as immersion that enable development workers to live with poor families in developing countries. She traces how the participants of immersion programs assume physical proximity (living together) as facilitating empathic knowledge. Accordingly, the immersion program participants come to claim their status as expert authorities on poor populations, which reproduces preexisting

189

asymmetrical power relations. Through these analyses, she contends that while the transnational

formation of empathy can produce transformative connections, it is also at risk of generating

damaging exclusions: "empathy, care and compassion are generated in the interests of

maintaining dominant social and economic forms, such as the nation and the multinational

corporation" (Pedwell, 2014, p. 183). Pedwell's (2014) analysis is insightful in locating empathy

as a lens on how transnational relations of power manifest in everyday social work practice with

noncitizens through the conduct of affect. As I asserted in the previous chapter, neoliberalism, a

key feature of transnationalism, intersects with the historical notion of white civility, shaping the

conditions in which inner borders are drawn in everyday social work with noncitizens. Similarly,

I suggest that our affective experiences—the way we feel for and with noncitizens–are generated

along with transnational relations of power, and invisibilize and sustain Canadian national

border.

The following two sections examine the affective experiences of social workers attending

to different lines of transnational and migratory experiences. Addressing how particular

emerging discourses interact differently from one individual to another owing to their social

locations and histories, the first set of analysis focuses on the affective experiences of white

Canadian-born social workers who entered the social work profession via their work experience

in the global South, while the second set of analysis focuses on affective experiences of social

workers who have (or whose family have) migrated to Canada. By juxtaposing two types of

transnational and migration experiences, my purpose is not to put them in a dichotomous

position in a deterministic way. Rather I hope to elucidate some ways in which empathic feelings

are generated and function among social workers who come with varying histories of

transnational and migratory experiences.

The discussion below focuses on one of key differences in the affective conduct of empathic feelings between white Canadian-born social workers and social workers with migration histories—that is, the function of what Coleman (2006) calls "wry civility." Coleman (2006) explains that wry civility involves being critically self-conscious about the contradiction and ambivalence of civility while at the same time continuing to aspire to and be caught up in the ideals set by the discourse of civility. This is because, Coleman (2006) argues, "self-awareness is the eye of the needle through which the camel of privilege can very seldom pass" (p. 43). Just as race is a floating signifier, which remains fundamental even though it has long been discredited as a reliable system of classifying essential human types (Hall, cited in Coleman, 2006), English-Canadian whiteness is a floating signifier that persistently structures Canada's racial hierarchy. Coleman asserts that it is through the discursive productivity and reiteration of English-Canadian whiteness that wry civility is produced. In other words, wry civility is produced and sustained through a simultaneous pull between critical awareness of the contradiction and ambivalence of English-Canadian whiteness and its pervasive temptation. Building on Coleman's (2006) wry civility, I suggest that the empathic feelings of white Canadian-born social workers are an affective manifestation of wry civility, which facilitates this simultaneous pull: while white Canadian social workers are critically aware of whiteness, white privilege, and unequal social relations, they nonetheless aspire to the ideals of Canadian civility that sustain these unequal social relations. It is in the production of wry civility through empathic feelings that white Canadian-born social workers confirm their identity as professional helper and exalted subject (Thobani, 2007) in the white settler Canadian nation-state.

For social workers with migration history, particularly those who self-identify as racialized, empathic feelings are not so much about wry civility, as the profile of English-

Canadian whiteness has not historically included them. This is to say that English-Canadian whiteness is not readily available to their identity, though they may aspire to and become caught up in the ideals set by it. Instead, the empathic feelings of social workers with migration histories function to move them closer to noncitizen citizens through the discourse of "I am immigrant/refugee too," setting them apart from white Canadian-born social workers. As social workers with migration history use common migration histories to establish their legitimacy in their work with noncitizens, they construct space for belonging in a white dominant profession and the Canadian nation-state. The following two sections detail this difference in the affective conduct of empathy between white Canadian-born social workers and social workers with migration history.

Knowing noncitizens through work in the global South

An examination of affective moments elucidates how social workers make a linkage between empathy and knowledge. Many believe that knowing the life circumstances of noncitizen clients helps to cultivate empathy in themselves and those around them. Interestingly, social workers attributed their knowledge of noncitizens to their work experience abroad, particularly in the global South. This was particularly prevalent among self-identified white social workers. All self-identified white social workers, in one way or another, commented on how their work experience in the global South led to a deeper understanding of the global geopolitical conditions that surround the lives of noncitizen clients in Toronto.

For example, Thomas, who used to work in a Central American country and in the United States, explained how his time abroad enabled him to be more understanding and empathic towards the clients he works with now in Toronto:

You know, my time abroad taught me many things. That there really exists the global

inequality that we talked about in the textbook, and people do suffer because of it. Having

this kind of understanding makes you feel more empathic and compassionate towards

suffering you see in the lives of my clients here… I have encountered a lot of different

values while living in the U.S. too, which is very anti-immigrant. There was real lack of

understanding of why people leave their country of origin, why people take the risk

without being sure they can stay…. so I think seeing those values [anti-immigrant] really

made me aware of what mine were—how humanity doesn't stop at the border and how

the border is made and how much it has changed. Am I supposed to stop caring about

someone once they, you know, cross the border? Is that the defining line, are we only

caring about people in this city or this province or this country?

As Thomas's account shows, knowledge gained through his time abroad was crucial in

fostering empathy towards his noncitizen clients. Thomas imagined that empathy and

compassion premised on knowledge of global geopolitics transcended the borders of

communities and nations. For Tania, who also spent a few years in Central America prior to

entering social work, experience in the global South led to not only an understanding of global

geopolitics but also an awareness of her white privilege. Originally wanting to pursue a career in

international development, Tania decided to pursue social work upon returning to Canada. When

I asked her to elaborate on her decision to make this career shift, she stated:

Well, like my privilege, right? There were so much I didn't understand that was cultural,

like I could read all the books about (a Central American country) and conflicts there but

you know, you realize when you get there, you know nothing. There are so much

involved in developing capacity, and who am I, a white privileged lady to come down

193

and teach them how to do things, right? So you know, yes, I understand that there are

some areas I had more education, but I had so much to learn too so I just felt conflicted

about, you know, trying to be the person who knows. I felt like, a lot of development can

be, like colonial relations.

Tania felt conflicted about how her status as a white woman automatically located her in the

position of knower and privileged in the context of international development. Awareness of her

white privilege was prevalent throughout the interview and was a theme she kept returning to.

Other white social workers, though not as extensively as Tania, similarly recounted how they

became aware of privilege and inequality through their time in the global South. Initially

motivated by a sense of adventure, Kathy spent a year teaching English in a Central American

country after finishing her undergraduate degree. Yet, her time in Central America offered more

than the adventure she was expecting:

I was kind of bombarded by civil war that is happening there. Lots of atrocities were

happening in the country while I was there. And I was teaching English as a second

language and just the way I was treated versus how local folks were treated and

Indigenous peoples[12] were treated, it was really shocking to me and again, the whole

inequality… It was quite an experience…

Thomas's, Tania's, and Kathy's accounts elucidate how wry civility (Coleman, 2006)

was operative in the construction of their experiences in the global South. Their accounts are

reflective of their performance of self-awareness gained through their experience in the global

South. Yet, this self-awareness does not prevent them from continuing to aspire to the ideal of

---

[12] Kathy is using the term "Indigenous peoples" in the context of a Central American country
where she was teaching English.

civility. All of them, to varying degrees, became self-consciously aware of their whiteness, white

privilege, global inequality, and even the violence embedded in the civilizing project of

international development (in Tania's case). Yet, they continued to aspire to the ideal of civility,

so much so that their critical awareness of privilege and global inequity ignited their desire to

pursue the social work profession upon their return to Canada.

For Tania, her critical awareness of her privilege was heightened when she expressed her

feelings about the immigration and citizenship policy reform that took place under the

Conservative government:

> I feel like I blame on Harper, hate the federal government we have, I hate their attitude
>
> towards immigrants… I get angry at the federal government. I feel like it has been very ill
>
> of refugee claimants, and I am very sensitive to that. Anytime a friend or someone I know
>
> has anything negative to say about refugees, it takes a lot for me to stay in a moment to
>
> cope with it…

When I asked her to clarify where her sensitivity came from, Tania stated:

> I mean, myself I grew up in a very privileged position, and 10 years I worked with people
>
> who had such challenges that they never asked for, you know a lot of people don't
>
> understand. There is a divide between those who grew up in privilege and never
>
> necessarily had a connection with somebody who was a refugee, who was kidnapped or
>
> affected by war. They don't understand. You know, I feel like a need to educate my
>
> social network, or some of my colleagues, people in the education system about what
>
> their experiences might have been like, so that it will help them gain empathy or
>
> compassion, right? Maybe it will change the way they vote or it will change the way they
>
> see the immigration policy, anti-terrorist law or you know, some of these things that are

kind of flying under the radar for most people. They don't see it even as an issue because

they are not their people or they don't have a connection with the issue, you know?

Tania understands her sensitivity as coming from her experience working with underprivileged

populations. As she learned about the challenges her clients faced, she came to see a divide

between who grew up with privilege like her and who did not. Accordingly, she feels obliged to

educate her social network so that they too can learn about the challenges facing underprivileged

people. She believes that this knowledge will help privileged people connect with the issues that

underprivileged people face, and gain empathy and compassion towards them, which may then

lead to changes in their political views.

While both Thomas and Tania stated that gaining a better understanding of noncitizens'

life circumstances potentially leads to empathy and holds transformative potential, critical

scholars question how specifically we can understand the workings of empathy and its political

and ethical implications. For example, Sandra Bartky (as cited in Pedwell, 2016) asks:

> What does it mean, exactly, to become more "sensitive" to the Other — in addition, that
>
> is, to my learning more about her circumstances? Does it require that I feel what she
>
> feels? Is this possible? Is it desirable? Does a heightened sensitivity require an
>
> imaginative entry into the affective life of the Other? ... Is such an entry possible? ... Does
>
> greater sensitivity require perhaps a merging of Self and Other? (p. 34)

Bartky's questions are important in thinking through how empathic knowledge could involve

problematic forms of appropriation on the part of already privileged subjects (Pedwell, 2016;

Spelman, 1997). Contrary to what Thomas and Tania reflect in their statements, empathic

knowledge does not simply lead to the positive changes they envision; instead, empathic feelings

involve the risk of obscuring the complicity of the already privileged individual in wider

relations of power in which marginalization, oppression, and suffering occur (Pedwell, 2016). This risk is particularly high when empathic knowledge is gained through a highly privileged activity such as work experience in the global South. While Tania is acutely aware of her privileged position, she blames the Conservative government (i.e., "I feel like I blame Harper") for anti-immigrant and anti-refugee sentiments, and consequently, she discursively moves herself out of the power relations that actually situate her in a privileged position.

Tania's sense of innocence and moral superiority is further affirmed when she positions herself as a "knower" who needs to educate other privileged people and is aware of the challenges and sufferings of underprivileged people. As Lamble (2008) puts it, "Those who know and educate are positioned as morally superior to those who are ignorant: we congratulate ourselves for our political awareness without moving outside the comfort zone of moral authority and self-knowing" (p. 35). Once we position ourselves as a moral subject, it becomes extremely hard to see our own complicity in the unequal power relations that sustain our privileged position. Further, by positioning herself as a knowing subject, Tania secures her professional status as a (critical) social worker. As Healy (2000) suggests, professions are legitimized through the possession and exercise of special knowledge, and this knowledge is associated with power and privilege.

The ways in which social workers position themselves through affective conduct point to Ahmed's argument about how identity is established through rendering strangers internal rather than external to identity: "the journey towards the stranger becomes a form of self-discovery, in which the stranger functions yet again to establish and define the 'I'" (Ahmed 2000, p. 6). In the case of the self-identified white social workers in this study, the "I" imagined in their narratives relies on and is confirmed by the figure of the (racialized) stranger (i.e. "local" in the context of

their work in the global South, noncitizens in the context of their work in Canada). In the process of establishing the "I", the figure of the (racialized) stranger is frozen into the subordinate position of someone who is in need of help here in Canada and in the global South. What is confirmed in this subject making is the historical notion of whiteness as caring, innocent, moral and knowing (Heron, 2007). Accordingly, empathic knowledge does not always facilitate the transgressive relationship building in social work with noncitizens; instead, empathy sometimes functions to confirm white social workers as knowledgeable, moral, and innocent subjects. I propose that this subject positioning exemplifies the danger embedded in wry civility: as (white) social workers become self-consciously aware of their privilege, they unconsciously use this awareness to re-secure their privileged status.

Knowing and feeling through proximity—"I am an immigrant/refugee" too

While white social workers associate their empathic feelings with knowledge they primarily gained from their experience in the global South, other social workers, some of whom identified as racialized, discussed their own or their family's migration histories when expressing their empathic feelings towards noncitizens. For example, Erica, whose parents moved to Canada from Southeast Asia in the 1970s, discusses how much her immigrant parents influenced her choice to pursue her career as a social worker. She recounted her childhood memories of when her parents would sponsor and take care of other newcomers despite their own challenges with resettlement. This childhood memory led to her desire to "help in any way and whatever capacity I can." Erica explains that she uses her parents' story to build rapport with her clients in her work in child welfare:

I tend to bring up my own family's immigration story. I think by doing so, I kind of open myself and give them a little bit of information about myself, but also I try to explain, I know that coming to a new country for my parents was difficult, so I can imagine that it is for you as well. I think that it really open doors and just opens them [noncitizens] to working with me.

Another social worker, Naomi, who works in grassroots organizations, also discussed how her own immigration and resettlement experience directly affected her desire to work with noncitizens. She came to Canada on a work visa along with her spouse, but later applied to gain permanent residence status. She discussed the immigration policy change that affected their permanent residency application and how hard it was for her and her spouse to live with precarious immigration status, and how it affected their health. After she acquired permanent residency, she enrolled in a social service program first and a social work degree later, to work with this population specifically.

Jonas, who works at a CHC, recounted his family migration history and discussed how this experience has enabled him to have empathy towards noncitizens:

My family comes originally from [a Southeast Asian country]. We were refugees. It is not easy. But at least we were sponsored… You see now Syrian people, the same. No different then. So, I can empathize a little bit. I can see that it is not easy; I can see that desperation, the need and vulnerability as well. So for me, it is easy to engage and easy to work with the clients like that. I don't see it as difficult at all. I can see that what they go through will happen to me easily. To my family, easily. That is what happened to us. So I don't see difference between what I am and them. I don't see it as legal thing or I don't see it as... yeah, I don't see it different.

199

Jocelyn, another social worker who works at a school board, similarly recounted her own history:

My family faced discrimination since I was young, simply because we were [a particular ethnic background]. My parents couldn't even go to school, and I grew up thinking that it was not fair… When things got really bad, we moved to [a neighbouring country]. When I came to Canada too, it was difficult. I didn't have money, no house… So I think that these experiences have a lot to do with how I work with my clients now… like I think I understand them better, because I went through the same.

While Erica, Naomi, Jonas, and Jocelyn described their migration histories differently, their feelings of empathy towards noncitizens were drawn from their own histories of oppression and hardship during the migration process. In other words, they consider their empathy not as simply a feeling (i.e., as if you were in another's situation) but a shared migration experience (i.e., I am an immigrant/refugee too). Empathy based on shared experience is, as Ahmed (2004) would argue, "sticky" and becomes central to the ways in which racialized social workers set themselves apart from white Canadian-born social workers and make sense of their social work practice and relationships with noncitizens. Jocelyn's account describes the stickiness of empathy based on shared experience:

If you don't suffer, you don't quite understand... Oppression, oppression is something that gets stuck in your brain. When you experience it, you always feel you have to do something about it. It's like a… urge to help. Maybe, as I told you because I had always seen my parents suffer… When I started to work with immigrants in Canada for example, I always compare their lives with ours. Imagine if you can't go to school just because of

200

who you are. So I said, now I have power. I can help, you know. Long, long time ago my parents didn't get this kind of help just because of who they were…

Here Jocelyn addresses the impossibility of separating her history of oppression (i.e., oppression is something "stuck in your brain") from her work with noncitizens. As she recounts her childhood and her parents' suffering, her empathy based on shared experience prompts her "to do something about it" whenever she sees oppression. She describes this as an impulse (i.e. "urge to help"), something that doesn't involve much thinking. At the same time, her accounts make it clear that her empathic feeling is grounded in her history of oppression. In other words, the stickiness of empathy is produced historically. When Jocelyn and other racialized social workers deploy the feeling of empathy based on their own version of migration, the histories become sticky, prompting them to discursively and affectively position themselves in proximity to their noncitizen clients.

I want to suggest that both possibilities and risks exist in this stickiness. On one level, this stickiness is a reminder of injustice embedded in the global migration regime and Canadian immigration system. The social workers I spoke with, particularly those who came as refugees to Canada, were well aware of how global geopolitics played a role in their or their family's migration. The social workers' narratives above also point to how the Canadian immigration system and resettlement process is far from the idyllic experience captured by the celebratory script of multicultural Canada. As common struggles of migration experiences become apparent, it is possible to disrupt the celebratory script of multicultural Canada and consider how global geopolitics and the Canadian immigration regime intersect to produce marginalization and oppression.

But there are also risks in this stickiness. As social workers discursively position themselves in proximity based on their migration history, migration experiences become the "truth" or reference point of empathy. Empathy rests on a particular story of the migration experience—in many cases a story of pain and suffering—that social workers identify with. In this process, the story of pain and suffering comes to hold an essentializing quality. In her study of racialized social workers in Canada, Badwall (2013) identified the ways in which racialized social workers constructed their professional identity by framing their experience of suffering and oppression as foundational to being a good social worker. Badwall (2013) addresses the tension racialized social workers must negotiate because their identities are built upon their cultural, social, and political histories as well as discourses shaping professionalism. Badwall (2013) argues that as racialized social workers used the essentializing script of suffering and oppression to construct a space of belonging within a mostly white profession, this script also works to secure a subject position that is moral and innocent. Drawing on Badwall (2013), I contend that while social workers gain critical awareness of the geopolitical conditions that shape the marginalization of noncitizens through their own migration experiences, this critical awareness secures their subject position as moral and innocent. In other words, empathic feelings premised on their shared migration history move them to the site of goodness and innocence while also constructing a space of belonging in white dominant social work and the Canadian nation-state.

Further, while social work often represents migration as a site of struggle, migration in itself is not a purely forced or voluntary phenomenon. As Ahmed (2000) puts it, "[m]igration involves complex and contradictory relationships to social privilege and marginality (they are not necessarily about one or the other) and they involve complex acts of narration through which

202

families imagine a mythic past" (p. 91). In other words, migration is not simply about shared suffering that social workers' empathy tends to draw on. Ahmed (2000) reminds us that the telling of (migration) stories "is bound up with — touched by — the forming of new communities. In this sense, memory can be understood as a collective act which produces its object (the 'we'), rather than reflects on it"" (Ahmed, 2000, p. 91). Drawing on Ahmed, I suggest that when we as social workers discursively position ourselves in proximity based on our migration histories, we are attempting to transcend a set of inner borders that separate us as professional helpers from vulnerable noncitizen clients.

Yet, as social workers become a unified "we" with noncitizens based on "shared" histories of migration, what becomes overlooked are the ways in which other social relations of power operate to sustain our privileged position as professional helper. Chapman (2011) argues that while referencing our own experience with social work clients may be inevitable and certainly a useful way of incorporating new information and viewpoints, it carries the considerable risk of imposing our meaning, context, values, or norms onto others if we do not take interlocking power relations into consideration. For example, as professional helper, a social worker is afforded the power to "help". Jocelyn's account signals this acknowledgement when she states, "Now I have a power. I can help". However, her accounts of being a helper do not address how "helping" in the social work profession in itself operates within the context of the oppressive power relations that I have been tracing in earlier chapters. Instead, empathic feelings through shared migration histories lead social workers to construct a meaning of helping that is more authentic and pure and relatively free from oppressive power relations.

Here I want to draw on Jafri's (2012b) discussion of the distinction between privilege and complicity in regards to settlerhood. Attending to the conversations around communities of

colour and their relationship to settler colonialism, she proposes a shift from discussing privilege to complicity in order to "think about settlerhood not as an object that we possess, but as a field of operation into which we become socially positioned and implicated" (2012b, n.p.). In considering this shift, Jafri (2012b) poses a critical question: "Is it possible to be complicit within a system of hierarchical power without at the same time accruing its benefits?" (2012b, n.p.). Jafri suggests that considering systemic inequities, underemployment, and the racialization of poverty, most people of colour do not enjoy settler privilege; however, people of colour, as settlers on this land, are still complicit in an ongoing colonizing process. Drawing on Jafri's discussion, I argue that though social workers with migration histories, particularly those who are racialized, may not have enjoyed the privilege that is accorded to white Canadian-born social workers, we are still complicit in a system of hierarchical power that positions us as professional helpers. Just as people of colour cannot escape historical and ongoing settler colonialism as we live on stolen land, social workers with migration histories, racialized or otherwise, cannot escape the history and contemporary practice of social work that is built on white supremacy and Indigenous dispossession as we become and act as professional helpers. However, when social workers generate empathic feelings towards noncitizens through shared migration histories, there is little affective space to consider our complicity as professional helpers and settlers on this stolen land.   Accordingly, these empathic feelings become a blinder to our implication in inner border making.

Empathy in advocacy and the production of humanitarian Canada: When empathic feeling sustains national borders

The sense of morality and innocence is further re-secured through the use of empathic feeling in advocacy. In social work with noncitizens, advocacy efforts are often targeted to

204

ensure that the clients can access services or to help them gain secure immigration status, thus disrupting the inner borders that position noncitizens in precarity. Empathy remains a key affective component as social workers navigate a system that is designed to exclude noncitizens. Yet, in the context of advocacy efforts, empathy takes up a new purpose for social workers. Empathy is no longer about relationship building through knowing the clients' circumstances (for white social workers) or through shared migration histories (i.e., "I am an immigrant/refugee too"), but rather about skill and strategy. Bella explains her advocacy strategy:

If you have to convince, let's say, a doctor to take on a patient, for example, or convince the shelter to not kick out this woman, you are not going to tell that this woman is resilient. You are not going to talk about women's strength or her empowerment, which clearly she has because she is doing x- y- z for so long, and she's for so long surviving, but you have to really just point to how vulnerable this person is, and how vulnerable her mental health is, how vulnerable her situation is so that they *feel the pain*. So it kind of puts you in the situation where you are advocating for them but you are also forced to focus on their weakness. Right? You are not focused on resilience. Because that is not going to get them the help they need, right? And that is not what you are supposed to be doing as social worker in a way, right? But it is just a reality.

Bella is conflicted about using an advocacy strategy that focuses on the vulnerability and pain of her noncitizen clients, as she views it as against the social work principle of strength-based practice and empowerment. But she also sees it as necessary so that the feeling of pain is communicated and understood.

Jenny's reflection on her advocacy strategy also points to how empathy in advocacy is premised on the feeling of pain. Jenny worked in palliative care and described her advocacy

205

strategy as "begging" in her efforts to get her noncitizen clients access to home nursing care. When I asked to further explain what she meant, she responded:

> I think you are trying to get to someone's heart, right? To make them see individuals as opposed to regulations. I say begging because to beg, you sort of have to have your own techniques to get what you want. And some ways you are trying to establish close rapport with the person that you are talking to, making them feel at ease with you and that they also feel the pain the person (client) is feeling, they become more human, right?

Jenny's use of begging is interesting because she uses it as a skill that "gets to someone's heart," implying agency on the part of the person doing the begging. Yet, at the same time, "begging" requires the person who is begging to be in "pain," and it is through the communication of pain that the person becomes human. In this way, pain becomes essential to the elicitation of humanness.

The elicitation of humanness through evoking pain is also discussed in Kiran's accounts of her advocacy work. Kiran works in a community legal clinic where she advocates on behalf of noncitizens. As part of her job, she writes advocacy letters to immigration officers to support her clients' immigration applications. She describes her strategy of advocacy letter writing:

> Kiran: I always think, I have to share this person's story, and how do I do it in such a way that this person reading it [an immigration officer] is going to feel it, the way I am feeling, and the person who is reiterating, the person who is speaking [the client] is heard, so I always think about that.
>
> C.N-G: What is that feeling?

Kiran: Oh my god, I don't know. It just feels so, sometimes it is so tough, cause, like I need a break. Like you know, you are always hearing these tough stories day in and day out. You just wanna leave… But I don't know how to put it, if there is a word for that feeling. It is like, a whole sort of feeling, you know, listening to the story evokes feeling, and putting on the paper, you have to evoke those feelings, and you know. I think just, trying to get empathy, just like, essence of understanding and to recognize that we are all humans, and this is, human story and it is real story.

Kiran's account makes it clear that her advocacy efforts are affective work that she sometimes finds overwhelming. Kiran has a hard time articulating her feeling that emerges from listening to "tough stories day in and day out" in this account. However, she knows that the representation and circulation of this feeling is essential in her advocacy efforts. Kiran understands that her advocacy work requires her to translate this vague and overwhelming feeling into a story that is legible and affective to the reader (i.e., "speak in such a way that the immigration officer reading it is going to feel it"). This particular story is supposed to evoke the feeling of empathy, which would reestablish the humanness of all the parties involved (i.e., we are all human).

Kiran, like Bella and Jenny, assumes that stories of pain and suffering will evoke empathy in others, which then would transcend the inner borders as we all become simply human. Yet, as Arendt (1973) reminds us, there exists a real danger in turning people into "nothing but human" in the absence of the sphere of humanity: "the world found nothing sacred in the abstract nakedness of being human" and "a man who is nothing but human has lost the very qualities which make it possible for other people to treat him as a fellow-man" (p. 299–

300). In her critique of human rights discourse, Arendt (1973) argues that the danger of human rights is precisely its pledge to turn a person into a human being in general—"without profession, without a citizenship, without an opinion, without a deed by which to identify and specify himself" (p. 302). Such a pledge of human rights enabled the imagination and emergence of men so deprived of what made them human that they were "nothing more than savages" (p. 300). Consequently, they lost "a right to have rights" (p. 296).

Expanding on Arendt (1973), I will add that once a person becomes a human in general, and loses "a right to have rights,", they become consumable. We come to create a story about them the way we see fit, and our feeling is circulated along a particular storyline. In other words, there exists a particular script in which some human stories are deemed deserving of empathy while others are not. Kiran's account indeed points to this when she states, "how do I speak in such a way that the immigration officer reading it is going to feel it?" In the context of advocacy on behalf of noncitizens, the script must emphasize the pain, suffering, and vulnerability of their clients, so that noncitizens will be protected by the Canadian nation-state. Not only does this empathic identification further contribute to essentializing their pain, suffering, and vulnerability but it also reproduces an inner border that separates the deserving noncitizen from the undeserving noncitizen. The deserving subject is one whose stories follow the dominant script of pain and suffering. Yet, their deservingness comes with the price of being essentialized and displaced from their own stories. In the context of slavery, McGowen (1994) articulates the risk involved in the essentialization of pain and suffering:

> Slaves were identified on the basis of their impotence and their suffering, not their labour or their speech. Indeed their weakness came to efface all the other attributes they might have possessed. The humanitarians focused upon the pain, suffering, degradation, and

208

cruelty the slaves endured. In order to raise the slaves up they must first be pictured in the

most miserable terms. In their absolute suffering they found a purity that was beyond

reproach. (p. 106)

McGowen (1994) addresses the risk of erasing the very humanity that social workers are trying

to elicit in their advocacy through the affective conduct of empathy. Thus, as Hartman (1997)

argues, "empathy is double-edged, for in making the other's suffering one's own, this suffering

is occluded by the other's obliteration" (p. 19). Razack (2007) makes a similar point in her

discussion of the Rwandan genocide and the Canadian humanitarian response, arguing that

empathy becomes a form of theft when we engage in a process of consumption of the stories and

experiences of others. Through this "stealing of pain," Razack (2007) asserts, we come to see

ourselves as "citizens of a compassionate middle power who is largely uninvolved in the

brutalities of the world," and "we have relied on these images and stories to confirm our own

humanitarian character" (p. 376). Drawing on McGowen (1994) and Razack (2007), I suggest

that when we consume others' suffering and pain, even with good intention (i.e., as a form of

advocacy), we not only position ourselves at the site of morality and innocence but also the

Canadian nation-state itself by constructing it as a rescuer of the suffering noncitizen subject.

Kiran's account of her "success story" elucidates how the consumption of pain and

suffering through empathic feeling can position the Canadian nation-state at the site of morality

and innocence. Kiran recounts a case of forced marriage in which a young woman was forced to

move back to her country of origin to marry. Originally entering into Canada as an international

student, this particular woman did not want to get married and approached the organization

Kiran worked at so that she could stay in Canada. Kiran, along with her colleagues, worked to

put together supporting documents so that this woman could gain secure immigration status in

Canada. Kiran states that she became emotionally invested in the case and recounts the moment when this woman gained her immigration status:

> I remember as soon as we got the decision… the members took maybe 15 minutes break and they came back and said they made the decision. We were like, oh my god, this never happened where, usually they take 30 days to 60 days to render the decision. In this situation, it was done so quickly, like 15 minutes. So oh my god, she is not gonna get it. Because we didn't have original documents. We scoured basically the earth to get the documents, right? But she is accepted, and all of us started crying. It was so, just so emotional, because this person was like, she really, really needed to be here. And she was so grateful, like she got her life back. It was just so beautiful to see… It was one of those good feelings, you know?

In this emotional account, we can see how Kiran's feelings shift as she waits for the decision about her client's status. The successful application leads all of them to start to cry. In this moment, the tears become the symbol of "we are human," and the border that separates the clients from Canada seem to be transcended. Yet, the tears in this account are politically induced and play a particular role in confirming the goodness of Canada. When Kiran describes her client as a grateful subject who "really needed to be here," she inevitably invents Canada as a place that offers safety and protection, confirming Canada's identity as a humanitarian nation-state. Accordingly, the highly political nature of advocacy work paradoxically turns into more of a moral argument. Put another way, the argument against the cynical, amoral, self-interested nature of the Canadian immigration and refugee system is turned into a compassionate, principled, and impartial discourse of Canadian humanitarianism (Nyers, 2006). Thus, while Kiran and other social workers are critical of the Canadian immigration and refugee system, their affective

investment in advocacy efforts inevitably rely on and reproduce this discourse of Canadian humanitarianism. The discourse pushes the Canadian border to open but it does so only for a particular migrant body (e.g. a suffering victim) and only when it is convenient (e.g. in the form of self-promotion). When this logic is internalized within the nation-state, it solidifies the inner border between deserving and undeserving migrants.

Further, I contend that it is through the contemporary discourse of Canadian humanitarianism that the historical notion of white civility is sustained. The discourse of Canadian humanitarianism positions Canada as a saviour that brings civility to people's lives vis-à-vis refugee-producing countries that are uncivilized, making it impossible to address Canada's role in inducing migration from the global South (e.g. through military interventions in the Middle East and Africa, mining company operations in Latin America and Africa, etc.). As Canada's status as a humanitarian nation-state is reconfirmed, not only does it make historical and contemporary racism, imperialism, and settler colonialism invisible but it also legitimizes the national territorial border that asserts the sovereignty of the Canadian nation-state over stolen lands.

Good, happy feelings: What empathy secures and conceals

Despite the critiques above, the discursive construction of Canada as a civil, humanitarian safe haven is firmly embedded in the liberal script of Canadian citizenship. It is a sticky discourse that many of us as social workers become implicated in even when we try to resist it. And this is the danger and temptation of Canadian civility. While many social workers are aware of the injustice embedded in the Canadian immigration and citizenship system, we have

nevertheless aspired to the ideal of Canada as a civil, humanitarian nation. And I add that it has particular stickiness for social workers who have migration (hi)stories.

Jordan, who was born in Canada but grew up in his parents' birthplace in East Asia, explained that he grew up holding the idea of Canada "being this amazing place." Being educated in a Canadian international school, he felt more connected to Canada than his parents' homeland and always wanted to live here and move here. Jordan recounts his childhood memories as a manifestation of "strong internal racism"—how he didn't want to watch a local movie, how he upheld the idea of "everything is better in the West," and how he was inspired by the progressiveness and respect for human rights in Canada. While Jordan's migration history is unique, other social workers with migration histories similarly talked about how we, myself included, held a particular image of Canada—beautiful, peaceful, democratic, and prosperous—prior to arriving here. These mystical images of Canada are reflective of what Jafri (2012a) would call "transnational whiteness." Drawing on the work of Arat-Koc, Jafri (2012a) suggests that the national identity of Western states, Canada included, is re-whitened in accordance with an imagined set of common civilizational markers, such as democracy, modernity and liberalism, particularly after 9-11. These markers have become synonymous with Western/Canadian values, which are generated transnationally and ingrained in us even before we set foot on this land.

What is more, these images are reproduced as social workers with migration histories seek integration in Canada. While many social workers with a migration background might critique the Canadian immigration system, they rarely critique the life they or their family have once in Canada. The narratives of social workers with migration histories are filled with their own or their families' stories of hard work and subsequent achievements. For example, Tina, who came from an African country as an international student, recounts the extensive education

212

she acquired and her hard work to successfully integrate in Canada. She states that she "did not want to waste time" despite her health condition and pregnancy because she knew "what it takes to get a professional job in Canada." Erica, whose parents came from a South East Asian country, similarly talks about her parents' hard work upon arriving to Canada, needing to manage multiple jobs. Erica explains that though they struggled with their resettlement, her parents are "doing really well": "You know, my parents and everyone they sponsored to come to Canada, everyone is doing really well. It was tough for them for sure, but they are settled… They are good now."

Tina's and Erica's stories are not simply about their or their family's hard work but also about how they construct a migrant settler identity: it represents how social workers with migrant histories are recognized and how they belong in the Canadian nation-state. In one way, social workers with migration histories see themselves as success stories, as they or their parents have struggled but worked hard to integrate themselves in Canada. Accordingly, we assume what "the good life" looks like for our clients. Thus, when our advocacy efforts help clients achieve that goal of the good life via the attainment of citizenship rights (either as legal status or social, political and economic rights), social workers' unpleasant feelings of anger and frustration towards systemic oppression transform into good feelings. As I demonstrated above, it is through this circulation of good feelings that the script of liberal humanitarian Canada becomes affirmed, erasing its racial and settler colonial violence. As Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) argue, "it is entirely possible — and in fact quite common — for communities of marginalized peoples to buy in to the structures of invasion, to identify strongly with Settler Canadian myths and narratives, and to participate in systemic dispossession of Indigenous peoples, all the while struggling against their own marginalization or oppression" (p. 72). Ahmed contends that one of

the reasons that social transformation is so difficult to achieve, that relations of power are "so intractable and enduring, even in the face of collective forms of resistance," is because of the strength of our affective attachments to social norms. Thus, Ahmed (2004) continues, the conversion of "bad" feelings to "good" feelings does not mark justice. Rather, "challenging social norms involves having a different affective relation to those norms" (p. 196).

For both white Canadian-born social workers and social workers with migration histories, it is "normal" to feel happy when our clients gain their secure immigration status or access to the services they need. It is "normal" to feel happy if we, as professional helpers, become part of these success stories. Yet, Ahmed (2010) challenges us to re-evaluate and interrogate our happiness and follow where that happiness goes. She argues that happiness is entangled with particular norms, and to be happy rests on making the "right" choice, in being directed towards specific "happiness objects" and in following certain happiness "scripts." I understand Ahmed is saying that we should examine how our happiness moves us and the nation to the position of morality and innocence, how our happiness draws borders of good–deserving and bad–undeserving (e.g., we feel happy when a deserving refugee obtains status), and how our happiness confirms the national citizenship regime (e.g., Canadian citizenship as the pathway to happiness). Most of all, we have to examine what happiness hides—unhappy histories, unhappy subjects, and unhappy effects. In the context of happy Canadian citizenship stories, what is erased are historical and ongoing settler colonial projects and imperialism as well as structural and everyday racism. There exists a real need to expose these unhappy effects and listen to unhappy subjects because it is in this unhappiness that we may come to see an alternative social promise (Ahmed, 2008), a way to transgress the existing borders of Canadian citizenship.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I examined the affective experiences of social workers. Drawing on scholarship that reconceptualizes emotion as social practice, I paid particular attention to empathic feeling, one of the primary feelings that was expressed by social workers as they narrated their everyday work experiences with noncitizens. The social workers imagined empathy as crucial in their relationship building and advocacy work, which could potentially transcend a national border that marginalizes noncitizens. Yet, my analysis reveals how, in some cases, empathic feelings become a blinder to our implication in border making.

Attending to different transnational and migration experiences of social workers, I examined how empathic feelings emerged, circulated, and "stuck" through broader histories and social relations of power. I identified that white social workers often associated their empathic feelings towards noncitizens with knowledge gained abroad, particularly through their work in the global South. I proposed that empathic feelings expressed by white social workers are an affective manifestation of wry civility (Coleman, 2006). The accounts of white social workers suggest that they gained a critical awareness of global geopolitics as well as awareness of their own privilege through their time in the global South. Yet, this critical awareness did not necessarily disrupt the operation of privilege; it re-secured the privileged positions of white social workers as superior knower subjects who are more aware of global geopolitical conditions, thereby securing their sense of morality and innocence.

A different pattern of affective conduct of empathy was traced in social workers with migration histories. Unlike white social workers whose empathic feelings are premised on wry civility, these social workers, some of whom identified as racialized, often associated their empathic feelings with their own or their family's migration history to Canada. In other words,

their empathic feelings were premised on the discourse of "I am an immigrant/refugee too."

Accordingly, empathy was employed to position themselves in proximity to the noncitizens they work with. I have suggested that the empathic feelings of social workers with migration history function to establish their legitimacy as professional helpers who understand noncitizen clients better through their own struggles of migration and resettlement. Yet, as social workers carry their histories of oppression and marginalization into their work with noncitizens, they do not see themselves as complicit in the oppressive helping relations embedded in the social work profession.

As social workers (both white Canadian-born and with migration histories) evoked empathic feelings in others while undertaking their advocacy efforts, they not only further secured their sense of morality and innocence but that of the Canadian nation-state. I contended that the tendency to focus on the pain, suffering, and vulnerability of noncitizens involves the risk of erasing the very humanity that social workers are attempting to protect in their advocacy efforts. The story of pain and suffering is then consumed to affirm Canada as a civil, humanitarian nation-state. Further, I argue that in the context of advocacy for noncitizens, citizenship becomes a "happy object," and the attainment of secure immigration status is constructed as an ultimate goal and pathway to happiness. I contend that this happy feeling attached to Canadian citizenship reproduces the liberal, humanitarian, multicultural script of Canada while erasing historical and contemporary injustice and violence. Accordingly, Canada's status as a civil sovereign nation-state is reaffirmed, further solidifying the national border that is historically produced.

Altogether, my analysis demonstrates the complex and paradoxical ways in which empathy operates in everyday social work with noncitizens. While social workers evoked

empathic feelings with the intention of transcending the national border that separates noncitizens from citizens through the discourse of "we are all human," in some cases, it functions to re-affirm the sense of morality and innocence of social workers as well as that of the Canadian nation-state. Thus, I argue that empathy—an affective attempt to minimize difference, conflict, and uncertainty—does not always lead to ethical relationship building or political transformation; instead, it functions as a blinder to social work's complicity in inner border making.

While my analysis in this chapter has been critical of the operation of empathy in social work with noncitizens, I do not claim that empathy always functions to secure a sense of morality and innocence. Nor do I suggest that empathy has no transformative potential. Gregorio and Merolli (2016) point out that affect in itself has been deployed both to control and resist. This is because affect has an ephemeral, evolving, unpredictable character, rendering it inherently flexible and open to deployment against the state, capitalist economic structures, and its related racist, gendered, and colonial logic (Gregorio & Merolli, 2016, p. 938). Pedwell (2016) similarly points to the ambivalent, complex, and contingent nature of empathy and proposes approaching empathy in ways that "open up rather than resolve, that mutate rather than assimilate, and that invent rather than transcribe" (p. 55). This way, empathy is no longer about knowledge of and proximity to others but about embracing difference, conflict, and the impossibility of certainty. Such an approach to empathy may enable us to take "empathic failures" (Pedwell, 2016, p. 55) as opportunities to explore meaningful ethical relationships and political engagement.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Summaries

This thesis interrogated the notion of citizenship as a social good through critical analysis of Canadian social work with noncitizens. Multidisciplinary scholarship—critical border scholarship, Indigenous studies, critical race studies, settler colonial studies, affect theories, and Foucault's notion of power—provided a theoretical lens to consider both the historical and contemporary contexts in which social work with noncitizens has become invested in Canadian citizenship and turned itself into a site of inner border making where the boundaries of national membership and belonging are drawn through everyday practices of inclusion and exclusion.

Weaving together interview data, policy analysis, and historical analysis, I conducted three strands of analysis of border making that attended to the following: (1) entangled histories of settler colonial projects, immigration, and social work; (2) the contemporary context of neoliberalism and its relation to social work with noncitizens; and (3) affective relations involved in social work with noncitizens. Drawing on the guidelines of Foucauldian discourse analysis in chapter 3, I aimed to make invisible borders visible. To do so, I attended to the historicity of discourse, the ruling discourse operative in border making, inclusionary and exclusionary discursive practices, the constitution of various subject positions through border making processes, and the material conditions shaped through discursive practices. I demonstrated how differentially expressed notions of civility are the key discourse in Canadian border making that sustains settler colonial projects. I showed some of the ways in which social work takes up and reproduces the discourse of civility, while positioning itself, and sometimes even the Canadian

nation-state, as a site of morality and innocence. I asserted that the ways in which social workers take up the discourse of civility and construct themselves in their accounts of everyday social work with noncitizens are contingent and complex, making it challenging to address social work's complicity in inner border making.

In chapter 4, I historicized social work's investment in Canadian citizenship through the examination of border histories. I attended to both territorial and inner border making processes by examining the entangled histories of settler colonialism, immigration, and social work. I highlighted the co-constitutive processes of territorial and inner border making, arguing that the discourse of white civility (Coleman, 2006) was fundamental to border making in white settler Canada. The discourse of white civility justified the violent and uncivilized dispossession of Indigenous lands, constructing Indigenous peoples as uncivilized Others whose lands needed to be saved and who needed to be developed by civilized European settlers. The discourse of white civility was also operative in the disciplining of pauper migrants as well as in the exclusion of nonwhite immigrants both at and within territorial border. Early social work was instrumental in reproducing the discourse of civility; it not only embodied the discourse of white civility but also instilled it in the people social workers worked with to turn them into settler-citizen subjects who would participate in settler colonial projects. I argued that while the overtly racist expression of white civility faded after the border was opened to nonwhite immigrants in the 1960s, and particularly after the introduction of multicultural policy in the 1970s, the settler colonial and racist logic that underlies white civility continued to shape the conditions of contemporary Canadian citizenship. Chapter 4 provided the historical context in which I pursued the contemporary analysis of social work as a site of inner border making.

Social work became a site of inner border making in much more nuanced and complex ways in the contemporary era. Today, social workers are committed to what would be considered progressive values—equality, human rights, social justice, and anti-oppression practice—and accordingly, we are critical of the anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric that was advanced under the Conservative government. Yet, our critiques of immigration and citizenship policy changes do not always lead to the undoing of inner border making; instead, these critiques become a blinder to the ways in which social workers become complicit in reproducing the discourse of civility.

Chapter 5 elucidated how neoliberalism has facilitated multiple levels of inner border making in social work with noncitizens. I attended to the changing nature of the border and asserted that the contemporary Canadian border functions to facilitate both global capitalism and settler colonialism by differentially including migrant bodies according to neoliberal rationality. I suggested that neoliberalism shapes the contemporary script of Canadian citizenship, though the historical discourse of civility continues to operate along with and is expressed through neoliberalist ideals. I discussed how inner borders are arranged via complex intergovernmental policies and how these policies have affected social work with noncitizens. I further examined how the discourse of neoliberalism is produced at the micro-level by shaping social workers' exclusionary and inclusionary practices. The micro-production of inner borders among social workers demonstrates the pervasiveness of neoliberalism even when critiques are present. I assert that the pervasiveness of neoliberalism sustains the settler colonial nationhood of Canada.

Chapter 6 elucidated how social work's historical and affective investments in morality and innocence have prevented us from seeing our implication in inner border making of the Canadian nation-state. Drawing on affective theories that reconceptualized feelings as social

practice, I focused on empathic feelings—feeling for and with noncitizens—and examined the ways in which empathy facilitated proximity with and knowledge production about noncitizens. I examined the different lines of empathic feelings, attending to the different subject positions taken up by social workers. I identified how self-identified white social workers often associated their empathic feelings with their experiences in the global South, while other social workers associated their empathic feelings with their own migration histories. I showed how differently positioned social workers confirm their professional identity as moral and innocent through empathic feelings. I examined how the empathic feelings were enacted in their advocacy efforts for noncitizens, highlighting how our affective investment in Canadian citizenship could reproduce Canada's identity as a humanitarian nation-state. Thus, I contended that while social workers evoked empathic feelings in themselves and others, with the intention to transcend the inner borders that exclude noncitizens from the sphere of Canadian citizenship, such empathy does not always lead to ethical relationship building or political transformation; instead, it sometimes functions as a blinder to social work's complicity in inner border making.

Altogether, this thesis elucidated how the idea of Canadian citizenship as a social good has been tenaciously carried out by the social work profession in the past and present. Social work's historical investment in white civility has legitimized our position as the professional helper, and in turn, we have failed to see how the idea of Canadian citizenship as a social good is itself built on - and reproduces - colonial and racial violence. Thus, even as social workers strongly critique the restrictive government policies and discourses against noncitizens, we do not fundamentally challenge the racial and colonial scripts of Canadian citizenship. Instead, social workers reinforce the ideals set by white civility in our work with noncitizens.

Though my analysis focused on the social workers' experiences during the time period under Harper's Conservative government, I would suggest that the historical notion of white civility continues to permeate, if not more explicitly, in the discursive practices of social work with noncitizens in the current context of Trudeau's Liberal government. As Trudeau's Liberal government introduced seemingly more liberal immigration policies, such as a resettlement program for Syrian refugees, the idea of humanitarian Canada re-emerges in discursive practices of Canadian citizenship. Accordingly, the discourse of humanitarianism may become more predominant in the way social workers navigate and negotiate our work with noncitizens. Yet, as I argued, the discourse of humanitarianism still reproduces the colonial and racial scripts of Canadian citizenship; it conceals its violence. In other words, whether social workers position ourselves against or in favour of policy discourses reaffirmed by different political parties, the idea of Canadian citizenship as a social good remains pervasive in our work with noncitizens. I argue that it is through our investment in Canadian citizenship that we participate in the border making of national membership and belonging, failing to see our complicity in it.

Contributions

So what can we gain from my analysis of inner border making in social work with noncitizens? I suggest that the key insight emerging from border analysis is the need to think beyond the perceived binaries that have framed the norms and assumptions we bring into social work with noncitizens. I propose that this insight has theoretical, methodological, and disciplinary implications. First, my analysis, like that of other scholars before me, challenges the imagined binaries of global–local and transnational–national by addressing the importance of considering how global geopolitics and local struggles are mutually constituted (Bosniak, 2006; Kumsa, 2005; Walia, 2013). I identified the growing need to attend to the global proliferation of

222

border-crossing activities and how this global phenomenon affects the ways in which we imagine

membership, belonging, rights and identity on the ground. In this way, my study provided a

deeper understanding of the changing nature of the border and citizenship and its implications for

social work. I propose that we think of social work as "glocal space" (Kumsa, 2005) where the

privilege and marginality produced in the local space are intimately interwoven with global

geopolitics. This spatial reconceptualization, I suggest, helps us challenge what Wimmer and

Glick Schiller (2003) call "methodological nationalism" in social work research and social

policy—a conceptual tendency whereby the nation-state remains the authoritative and

legitimized reference point.

Second, this study identified the importance of theorizing contemporary issues through a

historical lens. I elucidated the operation of colonial continuities in the contemporary Canadian

citizenship regime and social work practices. In other words, this study disrupted the binary of

past and present and elucidated how the past continues to live on in the present. I would add that

this temporal reconceptualization is particularly important for the social work discipline, where

history is often taken as background information as opposed to the central site of analysis

(Johnstone, 2016).

Finally, this study addressed how inclusion and exclusion do not exist in opposition to

each other but always co-exist. While we often think of inclusion and exclusion in opposite

terms of good–bad or desirable–undesirable, they are always co-constitutive. I contend that this

understanding directs us to examine inclusion and exclusion together in social work theories and

practices. Because of our focus on marginality and vulnerability, social work tends to focus on

exclusionary practices, but little attention is paid to how inclusionary practices also operate

through the same logic that produces and sustains exclusions. I assert that when we examine

inclusion and exclusion within the same analytical framework, we can gain a deeper understanding of the power relations embedded in social work practice.

While this study's primary disciplinary contributions lie in social work, it also brings a new dimension to the existing literature on critical border studies and citizenship. My theorization of inner borders addresses the importance of a micro-analysis of border making, extending the macro-level border analysis that is prevalent in critical border scholarship. This study disrupts the tendency to examine the territorial border control regime (e.g. admission policy) and citizenship regime (e.g. integration policy) separately, opening up a space to consider the co-constitutive processes of borders and citizenship. My focus on settler colonialism also highlighted the need to consider Indigenous histories and experiences in border analysis and citizenship studies. The social workers' narratives I presented in this study address the pervasiveness of Canadian citizenship as a social good, and point to the need for more theorization of rights, membership, belonging and identity beyond national borders and citizenship.

Limitations of this study

While I have highlighted what I believe to be the contributions of this study, I must also address some of the study's limitations. There are two major ones. The first is my incomplete engagement with settler colonialism. As I mentioned in chapter 5, while I considered the settler colonial and racist histories of Canadian citizenship at the inception of this study, I did not pay sufficient attention to how these histories continue to live on in the contemporary Canadian citizenship regime. It was only through the analysis of government documents that I came to see how alive the settler colonial logic is in contemporary Canadian citizenship. After I realized this, it was impossible to ignore it, and weaving an examination of settler colonialism into a broader

analysis of border making became important. I extensively addressed the histories of settler colonialism in border making in chapter 4; however, this analysis would have been made better by incorporating more Indigenous scholarship. I was also less successful in my analysis of how settler colonialism lives on in contemporary social work with noncitizens. For example, I was not aware of the significance of settler colonialism in contemporary Canadian citizenship at the time of the interviews, and I did not ask the participants any questions pertaining to settler colonialism. This omission has resulted in a lack of conversations and narratives about settler colonialism. Ultimately, my theorization of how settler colonialism manifests in everyday social work with noncitizens is limited.

I would like to think, however, that this limitation is also the beginning of something. As I think back on how I did not initially pay sufficient attention to settler colonialism at the inception of this study, I am reminded how much I, too, carry the norms and assumptions about Canadian citizenship in a way that erases Indigeneity, even as I position myself as a critical scholar. I am also reminded that I, too, am a product of a particular historical discourse in that my interest in pursuing an analysis of settler colonialism came as awareness of Canada's colonial past was growing.

Currently, there is a growing awareness of how the histories of settler colonialism manifest in the contemporary struggles of Indigenous communities. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls claim to address historical injustices; however, as Indigenous scholars have argued, these issues must be considered along with the question of land and how we can rethink our relationships with Indigenous communities as settlers (Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Simpson, 2014; Simpson, 2013; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Thus, for social work, it is not enough to

acknowledge the historical wrongdoings that our profession was complicit in. It is not enough to address the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in the child welfare or criminal justice system. Nor should it be about empowering Indigenous communities to aspire to what "all Canadians" do. Instead, I believe it should be first about listening not only to their histories and struggles but also to their land-based ontologies, epistemologies, and ethics. Yet, this listening act also must take into consideration how our already established norms and assumptions frame what we can listen to and how we do so. Wong (2004) argues that listening to marginalized voices is not merely a passive act; it requires radical transformation on the part of the listeners. Thus, it is not enough to include the "marginalized voices," but rather we must become aware of the filters we use when listening to voices that contradict what we believe in.

For social workers who work with migrant communities, there is another layer to consider in engaging with the conversation about settler colonialism—that is, how our efforts for migrant justice converge with Indigenous sovereignty. While a growing body of scholarship attends to the tension between Indigenous sovereignty and migrant justice, there exists a tendency to treat migrant justice and Indigenous sovereignty separately in social work (Chatterjee, 2018). Yet, as I argued in this thesis, Indigenous dispossession and immigration are constitutive of settler colonialism. More research is needed to address this link and examine how the tensions and contradictions of migrant justice and Indigenous self-determination play out on the ground of social work practices.

The second limitation of this study is that I did not address the issue of resistance. I spent considerable time thinking about whether I should have had a separate chapter on resistance. I am concerned that I have produced a totalizing account of the ways in which social workers conduct themselves in their everyday social work practice, and this has minimized social

226

workers' agency and the choices they make as they face an overdetermined power imbalance. I am haunted by the feeling that I misrepresented participants and closed down the possibility of resistance. Yet, in the end, I made the decision not to pursue an inquiry into resistance. There are a few reasons for my decision.

First, this study took up Foucault's notion of power. Thus, I understood power not as a top-down or bottom-up process, but as a practice that circulates throughout society; accordingly, it would have been at odds theoretically to suddenly discuss individual acts of resistance as if they were not part of the power relations that I have interrogated. This does not mean that individual social workers do not resist the overdetermined power imbalance structured through the nation-state framework. In fact, there are many accounts that suggest that social workers are doing this in everyday social work. Linda, who worked in social services, shared an account of how she refused to report her clients to the immigration authority after their immigration papers expired, even though there was an "unwritten rule" in her workplace that she had to do so. Jocelyn talked about how she chose not to listen to her boss when she was told not to extend herself beyond the work duties that were assigned to her. Tania shared her account of how she ended up sponsoring her former client as a live-in caregiver so that her client could have immigration status. Erica discussed how she has given "unprofessional advice" to her refugee claimant clients to use the funds that were meant to purchase children's clothes for their refugee application instead. All these accounts indeed suggest that social workers are resisting the idea of professionalism as well as the rules and regulations imposed on them via the nation-state framework. So why not theorize these acts of resistance?

This leads to my second reason. I decided not to discuss such acts of resistance because I did not want to fall back into the dichotomy of good and bad forces. Social workers are prone to

the heroic narrative as part of our professional identity, and the discussion of resistance often leads to the reproduction of what we already know ourselves to be—moral, innocent subjects. Throughout the thesis, I have committed to critically reflecting on how we have come to hold this subject position, and I was concerned that by talking about resistance I would once again reproduce what I have been arguing against. The pull to reproduce the narrative of social workers as moral and innocent subjects is strong.

I felt this pull even as I took up the subject position of researcher. I wonder if my desire to write about resistance is a move to secure my relative innocence as a researcher, as someone who would like to think of herself as a good researcher who is caring and considerate of her research participants. On the other hand, I think of my desire as representative of my investment in finding a place free from complicity, even as I theoretically understand that there is no such site of innocence. Or perhaps, I am mourning the loss of innocence. I think all these things have some "truth" in them, and I am concerned that talking about resistance in a way that produces "heroic social work subjects" would undermine the critical analysis I have presented in this thesis. So, with the risk of being considered an unkind and out-of-touch researcher, I decided to own my criticality, however uncomfortable, unsettling, and vulnerable it may be.

As I write about the limitation of not discussing resistance, I am also reminded of my own norms and assumptions about resistance. I am deeply attached to the idea of resistance as innately positive. And this habitual thinking kept coming back as I debated whether to write a chapter on resistance. Perhaps—and it is likely to be true—the limitation of this study is not that I did not talk about resistance, but rather that my conceptualization of resistance was limited by my habitual thinking.

Once again, I would like to think of this limitation as a beginning point and an opportunity to disrupt my habitual thinking. Indeed, there were moments during this research that provided an opportunity to think about resistance differently. One such moment came during the interview process with participants. When I was listening to the accounts that I considered to be stories of resistance, I was struck by how these stories were accompanied by what I perceived to be a sense of ambivalence instead of a sense of pride or satisfaction. As I pondered the sense of ambivalence expressed by social workers, I was reminded that these acts of resistance are always in relation to norms and assumptions that we hold close to our heart. In speaking of counter-conduct within Christianity during the Middle Ages, Foucault argues that dissenting movements do not exist outside Christianity but are "continually reutilized, re-implanted, and taken up again in one or another direction, and these elements, such as mysticism, eschatology, [or] the search for community, for example, have been continually taken up by the Church itself" (as cited in Walters, 2015, p. 6). Thus, acts of resistance do not exist outside power relations. They are very much a part of it. So when social workers act subversively, it does not mean that they let go of these norms and assumptions automatically or immediately. These norms and assumptions do still pop up as they construct their experience.

The sense of ambivalence expressed by social workers disrupts the perceived binaries of resistance–dominance and innocent–complicity. Lee (2016) makes an important point that while critiques of complicity abound, few discuss how we might precisely take, use, or extend this complicity to further the struggles and expand the horizons of social change (p. 249). This is because, Lee argues, our efforts in the social justice project have centered on aspirations for purity and decontamination; yet, social transformation is predicated on unlearning internalized oppression, raising political consciousness, and forging oppositional resistance and strategies (p.

248). While these endeavours are indispensable for social justice projects, Lee suggests that they also direct us to cling closest to what we believe in most—"purity" (p. 248). Yet, Lee (2016) asserts, "purity" and "contamination" are not oppositional but co-constitutive. To extend our critique of complicity to expand the horizons of social change, Lee (2016) draws on the words of martial artist Bruce Lee, who used the metaphor of "being like water." By "being like water," Lee means that instead of worrying about "maintaining a strictly purified (democratic) style or approach" (p. 253), we can absorb the opponent's contaminating weaponry to overturn, transform, and regenerate the situation: "there is not just one way to use contamination, but many ways; since contamination never stays in one form, utilizing it also takes on many forms" (p. 253). Lee's metaphor of "being like water" points to the kind of fluid social justice strategies that are ingenious—"with purposeful elasticity, necessary modesty, and contextual sensitivity" (p. 256).

I would like to add that "being like water" in our struggles for social justice requires constant reflexive practices so that we do not get swayed by the currents of "contamination" or pulled into the desire for "purity." Recalling Heron (2005) and Badwall's (2016) warning that reflexive practice is at risk of becoming another version of performing and securing goodness and morality, I suggest that we use our reflexive practice as an anchor in our effort to "be like water." This anchor is necessary because, as I demonstrated in chapter 6, the seduction to think of ourselves as innocent and moral (i.e., pure) is strong, while being complicit in the production of privilege and marginality is inevitable (i.e., contamination) because it is conditioned in and reproduced by us. Understanding that we are already and always swimming in the ocean that brings unexpected waves of purity and contamination, it is important not to lose sight of our intended goal of social justice, however unachievable it may be. Critical reflexive practices do

not shield us from complicity. However, they do provide us with an anchor to come back to when we are pulled into the seduction of binaries of innocence and complicity, resistance and domination, good and bad, and justice and injustice.

Final remarks and notes to participants

The last few words of this thesis go to the participants. I keep wondering about how the participants would read this thesis and whether they would find any of the things I wrote to be beneficial to them or their work. As I took up this analysis of the micro-processes of border making by drawing on Foucault's notion of power, I situated all of us as subjected to and implicated in power relations. This made my study inevitably "critical," and at times I am overwhelmed with the feeling that I froze their subjectivity and did not do justice to their humanity. I suspect that many of them would think of my thesis as both totalizing and incomplete, and perhaps even mean-spirited. At worst, they may feel that they have been used and that their words have been twisted for the sake of my "critical analysis." I am no longer a practicing social worker. I no longer have to deal with the challenges, limitations, and contradictions embedded in work with noncitizens on an everyday basis. So even though I was one of "them" at one time and am included in this analysis, who am I to write about their (our) struggles and subject their words to a critical analysis of power and theoretical discussion?

Despite this recurring sense of doubt and hesitation, I do believe that engaging in critical reflexive practice is a powerful way to expose not necessarily what we as individuals think but how we all become attached to the norms and assumptions of our society. Throughout this thesis, I have been committed to elucidating how power works on, through, and within us despite our commitment to values such as equality, anti-oppression, human rights, and social justice. In one way, this thesis manifests my own investment in and desire for "wry civility"

231

(Coleman, 2006) in that while I have provided various critiques of Canadian civility, I continue to aspire to the ideal of civility. Accordingly, I have tried to put my researcher self under the same critical scrutiny as part of my reflexive practice. I have kept in mind Kumsa's (2015) metaphor of "pointing the finger" as a reflexive strategy: when my finger points outward to the participants, the remaining three fingers are also pointing back at me. As Kumsa (2015) suggests, while the realization of our complicity comes with shame and pain, thinking through the metaphor of pointing fingers makes it bearable and even transformative, as this perspective helps us to see shame not as something fixed in an individual's body but as a malleable relational process between self and other.

My wish for this thesis is that when the participants and others read it, they gain insights into not only how our social work practice with noncitizens has operated within complex social relations of power, but also the contingent and nonlinear ways in which knowledge is produced. By elucidating the complexity and contradictions of social work practice and knowledge production, I hope that I have disrupted some of the perceived binaries we hold close to our heart in our work. When we come to see our practice and knowledge production in shades of grey, we can approach our social justice efforts and struggles in more nuanced and interconnected ways and embrace our and others' uncertainty, discomfort, and unsettledness with less judgement and more openness (Wong, 2004). This may open up a transgressive space where we no longer have to rely on the existing borders that separate Self and Other and imagine different ways to engage in meaningful dialogues and ethical relationships.

References

Abu-Laban, Y. (1998). Keeping 'em out: Gender, race, and class biases in Canadian immigration policy. In J. Anderson, A. Eisenberg, S. Grace, & V. Strong-Boag (Eds.), *Painting the maple: Essays on race, gender and the construction of Canada* (pp. 69-82). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Adelman, J., & Aron, S. (1999). From borderlands to borders: Empires, nation-states, and the peoples in between in North American history. *American Historical Review, 104*(3), 814-841.

Agamben, G. (1995). We refugees. *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal in Modern Literatures, 49*(2), 114-119.

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life.* (D. Heller-Roazen, Trans.). Stanford: CA: Stanford University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London, England: Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text, 22*(2), 117-139.

Ahmed, S. (2008). Multiculturalism and the promise of happiness. *New Formations, 63*, 121-137.

Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Alboim, N., & Cohl, K. (2012). *Shaping the future: Canada's rapidly changing immigration policies*. Retrieved from http://maytree.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/shaping-the-future.pdf

Alfred, G. T. (2009). Colonialism and state dependency. *Journal of Aboriginal Health, 5*(2), 42-60.

Alfred, G. T., & Tomkins, E. M. (2010). *The politics of recognition: A colonial groundhog day*. Retrieved from

https://taiaiake.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/politicsrecognition_alfredpaperfinal.pdf

Alston-O'Connor, E. (2010). The sixties scoop: Implications for social workers and social work education. *Critical Social Work, 11*(1). Retrieved from

http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/the-sixties-scoop-implications-for-social-workers-and-social-work-education

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.

Anderson, B. (2014). Exclusion, failure, and the politics of citizenship. *RCIS Working Paper, 1*, 1-11.

Anderson, B., Sharma, N., & Wright, C. (2009). Editorial: Why no borders? *Refuge, 26*(2), 5-18.

Anzaldua, G. (1987). *Borderlands/ La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Arbel, E. (2016). Bordering the constitution, constituting the border. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 53*(3), 824-852.

Arendt, H. (1973). *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York, NY: Harcourt.

Asaka, I. (2012). 'Our brethren in the West Indies': Self emancipated people in Canada and the Antebellum politics of diaspora and empire. *Journal of African American History, 97*(3), 219-239.

Avery, D. (1975). Continental European immigrant workers in Canada 1896-1919: From 'stalwart peasants' to radical proletariat. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12*(1), 53-64.

Badwall, H. (2013). *Can I be a good social worker? Racialized workers narrate their experiences with racism in every day practice* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Badwall, H. (2016). Critical reflexitivy and moreal regulation. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 27*(1), 1-20.

Baehre, R. (1981a). Pauper emigration to Upper Canada in the 1830s. *Social History, 14*(28), 339-368.

Baehre, R. (1981b). Paupers and poor relief in Upper Canada. *Historical Papers, 161*, 57-80.

Baines, D. (1996). Rebel without a claim: Women's changing bases to claim on the state. *Canadian Social Work Review, 13*(2), 187-204.

Baines, D. (2010). 'If we don't get back to where we were before': Working in the restructured non-profit social services. *British Journal of Social Work, 40*, 928-945.

Baines, D., & Sharma, N. (2002). Migrant workers as non-citizens: The case against citizenship as a social policy concept. *Studies in Political Economy, 69*, 75-107.

Balibar, E. (2002). *Politics and the other scene.* (C. Jones, J. Swenson, & C. Turner, Trans.). London, England: Verso.

Balibar, E. (2009). *We, the people of Europe?: Reflections on transnational citizenship.* (J. Swenson, Trans.). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bannerji, H. (2000). *The dark side of the nation: Essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender.* Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Bansel, P., Davies, B., Gannon, S., Linnell, S. (2008). Technologies of audit at work on the writing subject: A discursive analysis. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(6), 673-683.

Bartky, S. L. (1996). Sympathy and solidarity: One a tightrope with Scheler. In D. T. Meyers

    (Ed.), *Feminists Rethink the Self* (pp. 177-198). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Battell Lowman, E., & Barker, A. J. (2015). *Settler: Identity and colonialism in 21st century*

    Canada. Winnipeg, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

Bauder, H. (2011). Toward a critical geographer of the border: Engaging the dialectic of practice

    and meaning. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 101*(5), 1126-1139.

Bauder, H. (2013). Why we should use the term illegalized immigrant. RCIS Research Brief.

    Retrieved from http://www2.sta.uwi.edu/~pkissoon/download/bauder.pdf

Bechard, J., & Elgersma, S. (2012). *Bill C-31: An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee*

    Protection Act, the Balanced Refugee Reform Act, the Marine Transportation Security

    Act and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act. Retrieved from:

    http://www.lop.parl.gc.ca/content/lop/LegislativeSummaries/41/1/c31-e.pdf

Benhabib, S. (2004). *The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens.* Cambridge, England:

    Cambridge University Press.

Benhabib, S. (2005). Borders, boundaries, and citizenship. *Political Science and Politics, 38*(4),

    673-677.

Bennett, M., Blackstock, C., & De La Ronde, R. (2005). A literature review and annotated

    bibliography on aspects of Aboriginal child welfare in Canada. *First Nations Child &*

    Family Caring Society of Canada. Retrieved from

    http://cwrp.ca/sites/default/files/publications/en/AboriginalCWLitReview_2ndEd.pdf

Berinstein, C., McDonald, J., Nyers, P., Wright, C., & Sahar Zerehi, S. (2006). *Access not fear:*

    Non-status immigrants and city services preliminary report. Retrieved from Toronto:

http://www.socsci.mcmaster.ca/polisci/emplibrary/Access%20Not%20Fear%20Report%20(Feb%202006).pdf

Berinstein, C., Nyers, P., & Wright, C. (2008). '*Access not fear': Non-status immigrants and city services*. Retrieved from: https://we.riseup.net/assets/17034/Access%20Not%20Fear%20Report%20(Feb%202006).pdf

Bhabha, H. (1990). Introduction: Narrating the nation. In H. K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration* (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bhuyan, R. (2012). Negotiating citizenship on the frontlines: How the devolution of Canadian immigration policy shapes service delivery to women fleeing abuse. *Law & Policy, 34*(2), 211-236. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9930.2011.00361.x

Bhuyan, R., Osborne, B., Zahraei, S., & Tarshis, S. (2014). *Unprotected, unrecognised: Canadian immigration policy and violence against women 2008–2013*. Retrieved from: http://www.migrantmothersproject.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/MMP-Policy-Report-Final-Nov-14-2014.pdf

Bill C-31: An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the Balanced Refugee Reform Act, the Marine Transportation Security Act and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Act (2012). Retrieved from the Parliament of Canada website: https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-1/bill/C-31/royal-assent

Bill C-43: Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act, An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2013). Retrieved from Justice Laws website: https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/annualstatutes/2013_16/page-1.html

Bill C-50, Budget Implementation Act (2008). Retrieved from the Open Parilemnet website:

    https://openparliament.ca/bills/39-2/C-50/?singlepage=1

Blackstock, C. (2009). The occasional evil of angels: Learning from the experiences of

    Aboriginal peoples with social work. *First People's Child & Family Review, 4*(1), 28-37.

Bohaker, H., & Iacovetta, F. (2009). Making Aboriginal people 'immigrants too': A comparison

    of citizenship programs for newcomers and Indigenous peoples in postwar Canada,

    1940s–1960s. *The Canadian Historical Review, 90*(3), 427-461.

Bosniak, L. (2006). *The citizen and the alien: Dilemmas of contemporary membership*.

    Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyko, J. (2013). *Blood and daring: How Canada fought the American civil war and forged a*

    faction. Toronto, Canada: Alfred A. Knope Canada.

Bradburn, D. (2010). The problem of citizenship in the American revolution. *History Compass,*

    8/9, 1093-1113.

Brambilla, C., Laine, J., Scott, J. W., & Bocchi, G. (2015). Introduction: Thinking, mapping,

    acting and living borders under contemporary globalisation. In C. Brambilla, J. Laine, J.

    W. Scott, & G. Bocchi (Eds.), *Borderscaping: Imaginations and practices of border*

    making (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown, W. (2006). American nightmare: Neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-

    democratization. *Political Theory, 34*(6), 690-714.

Brown, W. (2010). *Walled states, waning sovereignty.* New York, NY: Zone Books.

Brown-Kubisch, L. (2004). *The Queen's Bush Settlement: Black pioneers 1839-1865* (pp. 25-

    53). Toronto, Canada: Natural Heritage.

Brubaker, W. R. (1989). The French revolution and the invention of citizenship. *French Politics and Society, 7*(3), 30-49.

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Canadian Bar Association. (2012). *Bill C-43, Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act*. Retrieved from https://www.cba.org/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=a12bce4d-aaf4-4bfa-b6ac-5b2514ac973f

Canada Border Service Agencies. (2008). *Removals processed by region by year.* Retrieved from https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/87ccfc74-1065-4399-aeb7-34a07de25c0b

Canada Border Service Agency. (2014). *Removals processed by region by year*. Retrieved from https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/87ccfc74-1065-4399-aeb7-34a07de25c0b

Canadian Association for Refugee Lawyers. (n. d.). *The Faster Removal of Foreign Criminal Act (Bill C-43).* Retrieved from http://www.carl-acaadr.ca/our-work/issues/BillC43

Canadian Association of Social Workers. (1995). *Standards of practice in social work.* Retrieved from https://www.casw-acts.ca/en/canadian-association-social-workers-standards-practice-social-work-1995

Canadian Council for Refugees. (2008). *Bill C-50 - Proposed amendments to IRPA: 10 reasons to be concerned.* Retrieved from http://ccrweb.ca/en/bill-c-50-proposed-amendments-irpa-10-reasons-be-concerned

Canadian Council for Refugees. (2014). C-43 and social assistance: Kicking people when they are down. In *Submission to the Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.* Retrieved from http://ccrweb.ca/sites/ccrweb.ca/files/c43-senate-submission.pdf

Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (2009). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chambon, A. (1999). Foucault's approach: Making the familiar visible. In A. S. Chambon, A. Irving, & L. Epstein (Eds.), *Reading Foucault for social work* (pp. 51-81). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Chambon, A. (2012). Disciplinary borders and borrowings: Social work knowledge and its social reach, a historical perspective. *Social Work and Society, 10*(2), 1-12.

Chambon, A. S., Irving, A., & Epstein, L. (1999). Glossary. In A. S. Chambon, A. Irving, & L. Epstein. *Reading Foucault for social work* (pp. 269-280). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Chapman, C. (2011). Resonance, intersectionality, and reflexivity in critical pedagogy (and research methodology). *Social Work Education: The International Journal, 30*(7), 723-744.

Chapman, C., Hoque, N., & Utting, L. (2013). Fostering a personal - is - political ethics: Reflexive conversations in social work education. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Policy and Practice, 2*, 24-50.

Chatterjee, S. (2018). Teaching immigration for reconciliation: A pedagogical commitment with a difference. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Policy and Practice, 6*(1), 1-15.

Cisneros, J. D. (2013). *The border crossed us: Rhetorics of borders, citizenship, and Latina/o identity*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2008). *Annual report to parliament on immigration*.

Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Retrieved from

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/immigration2008_e.pdf.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2010). *Report on plans and priorities 2010-2011*. Ottawa:

Government of Canada. Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rpp/2010-

2011/inst/imc/imc-eng.pdf

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2012). *Discover Canada: The rights and responsibilities*

of citizenship. Retrieved from

https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/pdf/pub/discover.pdf

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2015). *Canada facts and figures: Immigrant overview*

temporary residents. Retrieved from Ottawa: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/2014-

Facts-Figures-Temporary.pdf

Civility. (2018). In *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved from www.oed.com/view/Entry/33581

Coleman, D. (2006). *White civility: The literary project of English Canada*. Toronto, Canada:

University of Toronto Press.

Coleman, D. (2011). Imposing subCitizenship: Canadian white civility and the two row

wampum of the Six Nations. In A. N.M. Fleischmann, N. Van Styvendale, & C.

McCarroll (Eds.), *Narratives of citizenship: Indigenous and diasporic people unsettle the*

nation-state (pp. 177-212). Edmonton, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.

Coloma, R., S. (2011). Who's afraid of Foucault?: History, theory, and becoming subjects.

History of Education Quarterly, 51(2), 184-210.

Cowen, D. (2008). The (military) labour of social citizenship. In D. Cowen (Ed.), *Military workfare: The soldier and social citizenship in Canada* (pp. 25-59). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Cowie, A. (2010). Anti-oppressive social work practice in child welfare: Journeys of reconciliation. *Critical Social Work, 11*(1), 46-51.

Dauvergne, C. (2005). *Humanitarianism, identity, and nation.* Vancouver, Canada: The University of British Columbia Press.

Dauvergne, C. (2008). *Making people illegal: What globalization means for migration and law*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, M. H. (2004). Empathy: Negotiating the border between self and other. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *Studies in emotion and social interaction: The social life of emotions* (pp. 19-42). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

De Genova, N. P. (2013). Spectacles of migrant 'illegality': The scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36*(7), 1-19.

De Genova, N. P. (2002). Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*, 419-447.

DeChaine, R. (2012). Introduction: For rhetorical border studies. In R. DeChaine (Ed.), *Book rhetorics: Citizenship and identity on the US-Mexico frontier* (pp. 1-18). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Department of Finance Canada. (2006). *Advantage Canada: Building strong economy for Canadians*. Retrieved from http://www.fin.gc.ca/ec2006/pdf/plane.pdf.

Diaz-Bone, R., Buhrmann, A. D., Rodriguez, E. G., Schneider, W., Kendall, G., & Tirado, F. (2007). The field of Foucaultian discourse analysis: Structures, developments and

perspectives. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2). Retrieved from

http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/234/517

Diefenbach, T. (2009). Are case studies more than sophisticated storytelling?: Methodological

problems of qualitative empirical research mainly based on semi-structured interviews.

Quality & Quantity, 43, 875-894.

Doyle, P. (2015, September 24). Majority of Canadians agree with Conservatives over niqab ban,

poll finds *National Post.* Retrieved from https://nationalpost.com/news/politics/majority-

of-canadians-support-conservatives-niqab-ban-poll-finds

Employment and Social Development Canada. (n.d.). *Stream for lower skilled occupations.*

Retrieved from

http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/lower_skilled/index.shtml

Eriksson, K., & Englander, M. (2017). Empathy in social work. *Journal of Social Work

Education, 53*(4), 607-621.

Esser, R. (2006). Citizenship and immigration in 16th- and early 17th-century England. In S. G.

Ellis, G. Hálfdanarson, & A. K. Isaacs (Eds.), *Citizenship in historical perspective* (pp.

237-252). Pisa, Italy: Pisa University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). A social theory of discourse. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Discourse and social

change*. Cambridge, England: Polity.

Faraday, F. (2014). *Profiting from the precarious: How recruitment practices exploit migrant

workers*. Retrieved from https://metcalffoundation.com/wp-

content/uploads/2014/04/Profiting-from-the-Precarious.pdf

Fellows, M. L., & Razack, S. (1998). The race to innocence: Confronting hierarchical relations

among women. *The Journal of Gender, Race & Justice, 1*, 335-352.

Finkel, A. (2006). *Social policy and practice in Canada: A history*. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid

    Laurier University Press.

Flecker, K. (2015). *Welcome! (But don't get comfortable): The permanence of Canada's*

    temporary migration program. Retrieved from

    https://www.policyalternatives.ca/Harper_Record_2008-2015/07-HarperRecord-

    Flecker.pdf

Fortier, C. (2015). No one is illegal, Canada is illegal! Negotiating the relationships between

    settler colonialism and border imperialism through political slogans. *Decolonization:*

    Indigeneity, Education & Society. Retrieved from

    https://decolonization.wordpress.com/2015/09/21/no-one-is-illegal-canada-is-illegal-

    negotiating-the-relationships-between-settler-colonialism-and-border-imperialism-

    through-political-slogans/

Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. New

    York, NY: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaelogy of knowledge*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Truth annd power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/ knowledge: Selected*

    interviews and other writings, 1972–1977 (pp. 109-133). New York, NY: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1984). What is an author? In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 101-

    122). New York, NY: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (2003). The subject and power. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential*

    Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984 (pp. 126-144). New

    York, NY: The New Press.

Furniss, E. (1999). *The burden of history: Colonialism and the frontier myth in a rural Canadian community*. Vancouver, Canada: The University of British Columbia Press.

Garcia, R. J. (1995). Critical race theory and Proposition 187: The racial politics of immigration law. *Scholarly Works, 662*, 118-154.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gerdes, K. E. (2011). Empathy, sympathy, and pity: 21st century definitions and implications for practice and research. *Journal of Social Service Research, 37*, 230-241.

Gerdes, K. E., & Segal, E. (2009). A social work model of empathy. *Advances in Social Work, 10*(2), 114-127.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Post-colonial ruptures and democratic possibilities: Multiculturalism as anti-racist pedagogy. *Cultural Critique, 21*, 5-39.

Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2006). Challenging neoliberalism's new world order: The promise of critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, 6*(1), 21-32.

Global Detention Project. (2018). *Canada immigration detention*. Retrieved from https://www.globaldetentionproject.org/countries/americas/canada

Goffin, P. (2017, February 17). Toronto not truly a "sanctuary city", report says. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved from https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2017/02/17/toronto-not-truly-a-sanctuary-city-report-says.html

Goldring, L., Berinstein, C., & Bernhard, J. (2007). *Institutionalizing precarious migration status in Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.ceris.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/WKPP%20List/WKPP2007/CWP61.

pdfhttp://www.ceris.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/WKPP%20List/WKPP2007/CWP 61.pdf

Goldring, L., Berinstein, C., & Bernhard, J. (2009). Institutionalizing precarious immigration status in Canada. *Citizenship Studies, 13*(3), 239-265.

Goldring, L., & Landolt, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Producing and negotiating non-citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: The University of Toronto Press.

Good, K. (2007). *Urban regime-building as a strategy of intergovernmental reform: The case of Toronto's role in immigration settlement*. Paper presented at the CPSA Annual Conference, Saskatoon, Canada. Retrieved from https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2007/Good.pdf

Government of Canada. (2012a). *Archived - Conditional permanent residence proposed to deter marriage of convenience [Press release]*. Retrieved from http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=4&crtr.dpt1D=6664&nid=661969&crtr.tp1D=&crtr.kw=conditional+spouse&crtr.yrStrtVl=2006&crtr.dyStrtVl=1&crtr.mnthStrtVl=6&crtr.page=2&crtr.yrndVl=2016&crtr.dyndVl=23

Government of Canada. (2012b). *Speaking notes for The Honourable Jason Kenney, P.C., M.P. Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism*. Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2012/2012-06-20.asp.

Government of Canada. (2018). *Estimates of non-permanent residents, quarterly*. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1710002301.

Gregorio, M. D., & Merolli, J. L. (2016). Introduction: Affective citizenship and the politics of identity, control, resistance. *Citizenship Studies, 20*(8), 933-942.

Gripton, J., & Irving, A. (1996). Social work and social welfare research in Canada in the post-war years, 1945–1960. *Canadian Social Work Review, 13*(2), 205-220.

Guest, D. (2003). *The emergence of social security in Canada*. Vancouver, Canada: The University of British Columbia Press.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72-81). London, England: Sage Publications.

Hartman, S. V. (1997). Innocent amusements: The stage of sufferance. In S. V. Hartman (Ed.), *Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America* (pp. 17-48). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Healy, K. (2000). *Social work practices: Contemporary perspectives on change*. London, England: Sage Publications.

Hemmings, C. (2011). *Why stories matter: The political grammar of feminist theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hennebry, J. (2008). Bienvenidos a Canada? Globalization and the migration industry surrounding temporary agricultural migration in Canada. *Canadian Studies in Population, 35*(2), 339-356.

Heron, B. (2005). Self-reflection in critical social work practice: Subjectivity and the possibilities of resistance. *Reflective Practice-International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives, 6*(3), 341-351.

Heron, B. (2007). *Desire for development: Whiteness, gender and the helping imperative*. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Holston, J., & Appadurai, A. (1996). Cities and citizenship. *Public Culture, 8*, 187-204.

Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis. *Theory and Psychology, 11*(4), 521-547.

Hook, D. (2006). 'Pre-discursive' racism. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 16*(3), 207-232.

Hook, D. (2007). *Foucault, psychology and the analytics of power*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hudson, G. A., Atak, I., Manocchi, M., Hannan, C. (2017). *(No) Access T.O.: A pilot study on sanctuary city policy in Toronto, Canada.* Retrieved from https://www.ryerson.ca/content/dam/rcis/documents/RCIS%20Working%20Paper%202020 17_1GHudsonFinal%20.pdf

Huot, S., Bobadilla, A., Bailliard, A., & Rudman, D. L. (2016). Constructing undesirables: A critical discourse analysis of 'othering' within the Protecting Canada's Immigration System Act. *International Migration, 54*(2), 131-143.

Iacovetta, F. (2006). *Gatekeepers: Reshaping immigrant lives in Cold War Canada*. Toronto, Canada: Between the Lines.

Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. An Act respecting immigration to Canada and the granting of refugee protection to persons who are displaced, persecuted or in danger (2001, c. C-27). Retrieved from the Justice Laws website: https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/i-2.5/

Ingram, R. (2012). Locating emotional intelligence at the heart of social work practice. *British Journal of Social Work, 43*(5), 987-1004.

International Labour Organization. (2015). *ILO global estimates on migrant workers: Results and methodology.* Geneva, Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_436343.pdf

Jafri, B. (2012a). National identity, transnational whiteness and the Canadian Citizenship Guide. *Critical Race and Whiteness Studies, 8*, 1-15.

Jafri, B. (2012b). Privilege vs. complicity: People of colour and settler colonialism. *Indigenizing the academy and Indigenous education.* Retrieved from https://www.ideas-idees.ca/blog/privilege-vs-complicity-people-colour-and-settler-colonialism

Jafri, B. (2017). Ongoing colonial violence in the settler states. *Lateral: Journal of the Cultural Studies Association, 6*(1). doi:https://doi.org/10.25158/L6.1.7

Jager, S., & Maier, F. (2010). Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 34-61). London, England: Sage.

Jeffery, D. (2005). What good is anti-racist social work if you can't master it?: Exploring a paradox in social work education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(4), 409-425.

Jennissen, T., & Lundy, C. (2011). *One hundred years of social work: A history of the profession in English Canada, 1900–2000.* Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Johnson, C., Jones, R., Paasi, A., Amoore, L., Mountz, A., Salter, M., & Rumford, C. (2011). Interventions on rethinking 'the border' in border studies. *Political Geography, 30*, 61-69.

Johnstone, M. (2016). The pervasive presence of the discourse of white civility in early Canadian social work in immigration services (1900–1920). *British Journal of Social Work, 46*(6), 1724-1740.

Johnstone, M. (2018). Settler feminism, race making, and early social work in Canada. *Affilia, 33*(3), 331-345.

Joseph, A. J. (2015). Beyond intersectionalities of identity or interlocking analyses of differences: Confluence and the problematic of "anti"-oppression. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Policy and Practice, 4*(1), 15-39.

Kauanui, J. K. (2016). "A structure, not an event": Settler colonialism and enduring indigeneity *Lateral: Journal of the Cultural Studies Association, 5*(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.25158/L5.1.7

Kedar, A. (2003). On the legal geography of ethnocratic settler states: Notes toward a research agenda. *Current Legal Issues, 5*, 401-441.

Kelley, N., & Trebilcock, M. J. (2010). *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press

Khosravi, S. (2007). The 'illegal' traveller: An auto-ethnography of borders. *Social Anthropology, 15*, 321-334.

King, T. (1993). *One good story, that one.* Toronto, Canada: Harper Perennial Canada.

Kongeter, S. (2012). Transnational roots of the settlement movement - The example of St. Christopher House in Toronto, Canada. *Transnational Social Review: A Social Work Journal, 2*(2), 43-47.

Kumsa, M. K. (2005). Shifting spaces of justice and the poetics of be-longing. *Currents: New Scholarship in the Human Services, 4*(2). Retrieved from https://www.ucalgary.ca/currents/files/currents/v4n2_kumsa.pdf

Kumsa, M. K. (2015). Subversive education: Turning coercive encounters into transformative possibilities. In N. Yu & D. Mandell (Eds.), *Subversive social action: Extralegal action for social justice* (pp. 145-164). Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press

Kunzel, R. G. (1993). *Fallen women, problem girls: Unmarried mothers and the professionalization of social work, 1890-1945*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. London, England: SAGE Publications.

LaCapra, D. (2001). *Writing history, writing trauma*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lamble, S. (2008). Retelling racialized violence, remaking white innocence: The politics of interlocking oppressions in transgender day of rememberance. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 5*(1), 24-42.

Lavallee, L. F., & Poole, J. M. (2010). Beyond recovery: Colonization, health and healing for Indigenous people in Canada. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 8*, 271-281.

Lawrence, B. (2003). Gender, race, and the regulation of native identity in Canada and the United States: An overview. *Hypatia: A journal of feminist philosophy, 18*(2), 3-31.

Lawrence, B. (2002). *"Real" Indians and others: Mixed-blood urban Native peoples and Indigeneous nationhood*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing antiracism. *Social Justice, 32*(4), 120-143.

Lea, N. (1947). Joint submission of Canadian Association of Social Workers and Canadian Welfare Council to the Senate-Commons Committtee on Indian Affairs. *The Social Worker, 15*(4), 1-11.

Lee, C. (2016). *Ingenious citizenship: Recrafting democracy for social change*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lee, E. O. J., & Ferrer, I. (2014). Examining social work as a Canadian settler colonial project: Colonial continuities of circles of reform, civilization, and in/visibility. *Journal of Critical Anti-Oppressive Social Inquiry, 1*, 1-20.

Logan, N. (March 20, 2015). Most Canadians say faces shouldn't be covered at citizenship ceremonies: poll. *Global news*. Retrieved from https://globalnews.ca/news/1894770/most-canadians-say-faces-shouldnt-be-covered-at-citizenship-ceremonies-poll/

Macias, T. (2012). 'In the World': Toward a Foucauldian ethics of reading in social work. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Policy and Practice, 1*, 1-19.

Macias, T. (2015a). Between a rock and a hard place: Negotiating the neoliberal regulation of social work practice and education. *Alternative Routes, 26*, 251-276.

Macias, T. (2015b). "On the footsteps of Foucault": Doing Foucaultian discourse analysis in social justice research. In S. Strega & L. Brown (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Revisiting critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches* (2nd ed., pp. 221-242). Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholar Press.

Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Macklin, A. (2017). From settler society to warrior nation and back again. In J. Mann (Ed.), *Citizenship in transnational perspective: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand* (pp. 285-314). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Macleod, I. (September 30, 2015). Removing niqab 'enhances integrity' of citizenship,

government tells top court. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from

http://ottawacitizen.com/news/politics/removing-niqab-enhances-integrity-of-citizenship-

government-tells-top-court

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*. Cambridge, England: The Cambridge

University Press.

Martin, P. (1995). Proposition 187 in California. *The International Migration Review, 29*(1),

255-263.

Maurutto, P. (2003). *Governing charities: Church and state in Toronto's Catholic Archdiocese,

1850-1950*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McBride, S., & Shields, J. (1997). *Dismantling a nation: The transition to corporate rule in

Canada*. Winnipeg, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.

McDonald, J. (2009). Migrant illegality, nation-building, and the politics of regularization in

Canada. *Refuge, 26*(2), 65-77.

McGowen, R. (1994). Power and humanity, or Foucault among the historians. In C. Jones & R.

Porter (Eds.), *Reassessing Foucault: Power, medicine and the body* (pp. 91-112). New

York, NY: Routledge.

Mclaughlin, J., & Hennebry, J. (2013). Pathways to precarity: Structural vulnerabilities and lived

consequences for migrant farmworkers in Canada. In L. Goldring & P. Landolt (Eds.),

Producing and negotiating non-citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada (pp. 175-

194). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as method, or, the multiplication of labor*. Durham,

NC: Duke University Press.

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Morgan, C. (2016). Turning strangers into sisters? Gender and the work of missionary

colonization in Upper Canada. In M. Epp, F. Iacovetta, & F. Swyripa (Eds.), *Sisters or*

strangers?: Immigrant women, minority women and the racialized 'Other' (pp. 89-107).

Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Morris-Suzuki, T. (2010). *Borderline Japan: Foreigners and frontier controls in the postwar*

era. Cambridge, Canada: Cambridge University Press.

Moscovitch, A., & Thomas, G. (2015). *A new social care act for Canada*. Retrieved from

https://www.casw-acts.ca/sites/default/files/a_new_social_care_act_for_canada.pdf

Murnighan, B. (2001). *Selling Ontario's health care: The real story on government spending and*

public relations. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Retrieved from

https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Ontario_Office_

Pubs/on_healthcare.pdf

Nail, T. (2015). *The figure of the migrant*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nakache, D. (2013). The Canadian Temporary Foreign Worker Program: Regulations, practices

and protection gaps. In L. Goldring & P. Landolt (Eds.), *Producing and negotiating non-*

citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada (pp. 71-96). Toronto, Canada: University

of Toronto Press.

Newman, D. (2006). The lines that continue to seprate us: borders in our 'borderless' world.

Progress in Human Geography, 30(2), 143-161.

No One is Illegal - Vancouver Unceded Coast Salish Territories. (n.d.). *Neverhome.ca:*

Legislating discrimination in Canadian immigration. Retrieved from

http://www.neverhome.ca/detention/

Nobe-Ghelani, C. (2017). Inner border making in Canada: Tracing gendered and raced processes of immigration policy changes between 2006 and 2015. *Canadian Review of Social Policy, 77*(Fall), 44-66.

Noble, J. (1979). 'Class-ifying' the poor: Toronto charities, 1850–1880. *Studies in Political Economy, 2*(1), 109-128.

Nyers, P. (2006). *Rethinking refugees: Beyond states of emergency*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nyers, P. (2008). Community without status: Non-status migrants and cities of refuge. In D. Brydon & W. D. Coleman (Eds.), *Renegotiating community: Interdisciplinary perspectives, global contexts* (pp. 123-140). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.

Nyers, P. (2010). No one is illegal between city and nation. *Studies in Social Justice, 4*(2), 127-143.

O'Connell, A. (2013). The deserving and non-deserving races: Colonial intersections of social welfare history in Ontario. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice, 2*, 1-23.

Okhonmina, S. (2010). States wiithout borders: Westphalia territoriality under threat. *Journal of Social Sciences, 24*(3), 177-182.

Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(3), 313-345.

Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants. (2011). Background information on CIC cuts. Retrieved from http://www.ocasi.org/downloads/OCASI_CIC_Cuts_Backgrounder.pdf

Palmer, H. (1990). Reluctant hosts: Anglo-Canadian views of multiculturalism in the twentieth century. In R. D. Francis & D. B. Smith (Eds.), *Readings in Canadian history post-confederation* (pp. 192-209). Toronto, Canada: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Palumbo, E., & Friedman, M. (2014). Occupying social work: Unpacking connections and contradictions in the social work/activist divide. *The Journal of Critical Anti-Oppressive Social Inquiry, 1*, 82-100.

Parasram, A. (2010). *Us and them: The plumbing and poetry of citizenship policy and the Canadians abroad*. Retrieved from https://www.asiapacific.ca/sites/default/files/filefield/UsandThem.pdf

Park, Y., & Bhuyan, R. (2012). Whom should we serve? A discourse analysis of social workers' commentary on undocumented immigrants. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 23*(1), 18-40.

Parker, N., Vaughan-Williams, N., Bialasiewicz, L., Bulmer, S., Carver, B., Durie, R., . . . Williams, J. (2009). Lines in the sand?: Towards an agenda for critical border studies. *Geopolitics, 14*, 582-587.

Pedwell, C. (2014). *Affective relations: The transnational politics of empathy*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pedwell, C. (2016). De-colonising empathy: Thinking affect transnationally. *Samyukta: A Journal of Women's Studies, 16*(1), 27-49.

Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175-196.

Pitsula, J. (1979). The emergence of social work in Toronto. *Journal of Canadian Studies, 14*(1), 35-42.

Pocock, J. G. A. (1992). The ideal of citizenship since classical times. *Queen's Quarterly, 99*, 33-55.

Pollack, S. (2010). Labelling clients 'risky': Social work and the neo-liberal welfare state. *British Journal of Social Work, 40*, 1263-1278.

Pollack, S., & Rossiter, A. (2010). Neoliberalism and the entrepreneural subject: Implications for feminism and social work. *Canadian Social Work Review, 27*(2), 155-169.

Porter, A. (2003). *Gendered states: Women, unemployment insurance, and the political economy of the welfare state in Canada, 1945–1997*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Rawlyk, G. A. (1962). Canada's Immigration Policy, 1945–1962. *The Dalhousie Review, 42*, 287-300.

Razack, S. (1998). Race, space, and prostitution: The making of the bourgeois subject. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law, 10*, 338-376.

Razack, S. (2000). "Simple logic": Race, the identity documents rule and the story of nation besieged and betrayed. *Journal of Law and Social Policy, 15*, 181-209.

Razack, S. (2002). Introduction: When place becomes race. In S. Razack (Ed.), *Race, space, and the law: Unmapping a white settler society* (pp. 1-20). Toronto, Canada: Between the Lines.

Razack, S. H. (2007). Stealing the pain of others: Reflections on Canadian humanitarian responses. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 29*(4), 375-394.

Reynolds, J., & Hyndman, J. (2015). A turn in Canadian refugee policy and practice. *Journal of Diplomacy & International Relations, 41*, 41-55.

Ritzer, G. (2010). *Globalization: A basic text.* West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rooke, P., & Schnell, R. (1982). Childhood and charity in nineteenth-century British North America *Social History, 15*(29), 157-179.

Rose, N. (1990). Governing the enterprising self. Paper presented at the The Values of the Enterprise Culture, University of Lancaster, England. Retrieved from http://neoliberalfeminism.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Rose-1990-Governing-the-Enterprising-Self-ENT-R.pdf

Rose, N., & Abi-Rached, J. M. (2013). *Neuro: The new brain sciences and the management of mind*. New Jersey, NY: Princeton University Press.

Rossiter, A. (2001). Innocent lost and suspicious found: Do we educate for or against social work? *Critical Social Work, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/innocence-lost-and-suspicion-found-do-we-educate-for-or-against-social-work

Rossiter, A. (2005). Discourse analysis in critical social work: From apology to question. *Critical Social Work, 6*(1). Retrieved from http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/discourse-analysis-in-critical-social-work-from-apology-to-question

Rossiter, A. (2011). Unsettled social work: The challenge of Levinas's ethics. *British Journal of Social Work, 41*(5), 980-995.

Rossiter, A., & Heron, B. (2011). Neoliberalism, competencies, and the devaluing of social work practice. *Canadian Social Work Review, 28*(2), 305-309.

Rumford, C. (2014). *Cosmopolitan borders*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Said, E. (1975). The text, the world, the critic. *Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association, 8*(2), 1-23.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Sassen, S. (2005). When national territory is home to the global: Old borders to novel borderings. *New Political Economy, 10*(4), 523-541.

Scott, J. W. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry, 17*(4), 773-797.

Sharma, N. (2002). Immigrant and migrant workers in Canada: Labour movements, racism and the expansion of globalization. *Canadian Woman Studies, 21*(3), 18-25.

Sharma, N. (2006). *Home economics: Nationalism and the making of 'migrant workers' in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Shier, M. L., & Graham, J. R. (2014). Social policy in Canada. In *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Sidhu, N. (2013). *Accessing community programs and services for non-status immigrants in Toronto: Organizational challenges and responses*. Retrieved from http://www.socialplanningtoronto.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Accessing-Community-Programs-and-Services-for-Non-status-Immigrants-in-Toronto-Organizational-Challenges-and-Responses.pdf

Silverman, S. J. (2014). In the wake of irregular arrivals: Changes to the Canadian immigration detention system. *Refuge, 30*(2), 27-34.

Simmons, A. (2010). *Immigration and Canada: Global and transnational perspectives.* Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Simon, J. K. (1971). A conversation with Michel Foucault. *Partisan Review, 38*(2), 192-201.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson, L. B. (2008). Looking after Gdoo-naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg diplomatic and treaty relationships. *Wicazo Sa Review, 23*(2), 29-42.

Simpson, L. B. (2013). Elsipogtog everywhere. Retrieved from http://leannesimpson.ca/elsipogtog-everywhere/

Sinclair, R. (2004). Aboriginal social work education in Canada: Decolonizing pedagogy for the seventh generation. *First People's Child & Family Review, 1*(1), 49-61.

Smith, K. (2011). *Activist social workers in neoliberal times: Who are we becoming now?* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Smith-Carrier, T., & Bhuyan, R. (2010). *Assessing the impact of neoliberalism on citizenship: The stratification of social rights by immigration status in Toronto, Ontario*. Paper presented at the Producing and negotiating precarious migratory status in Canada, York University, Toronto, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.yorku.ca/raps1/events/pdf/Smith_Carrier_Bhuyan.pdf

Solidarity City Network. (2013). *Towards a sanctuary city: Assessment and recommendations on municipal service provision to undocumented residents in Toronto*. Retrieved from http://solidaritycity.net/learn/report-towards-a-sanctuary-city/

Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Spelman, E. V. (1997). *Fruits of sorrow: Framing our attention to suffering*. Boston, ME: Beacon Press.

Stark, H. K. (2016). Criminal empire: The making of the savage in a lawless land. *Theory & Event, 19*(4), 1-20.

Stasiulis, D., & Bakan, A. (2005). *Negotiating citizenship: Migrant women in Canada and the global system.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Statistics Canada (2015). *Table 2: Immigrants to Canada by category, 1981 to 2011.* Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 91-209-X. Ottawa. Version updated November, 30, 2015. Ottawa. Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/91-209-x/2013001/article/11787/tbl/tbl2-eng.htm

Tamboukou, M. (2013). A Foucauldian approach to narratives. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Doing narrative research* (pp. 88-107). London, England: Sage.

Taylor, A. (2002). The divided ground: Upper Canada, New York, and the Iroquois Six Nations, 1783–1815. *Journal of the Early Republic, 22*(1), 55-75.

Thobani, S. (2000). Closing ranks: Racism and sexism in Canada's immigration policy. *Race & Class, 42*(1), 35-55.

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconcilling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.* Retrieved from http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Exec_Summary_2015_05_31_web_o.pdf

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1-40.

Tungohan, E. (2016). *Change to the Temporary Foreign Worker Program and Caregiver Program.* Retrieved from

http://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/421/HUMA/Brief/BR8360570/br-external/DrEthelTungohan-e.pdf

United Nations. (2017). *International migration report*. Retrieved from

http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2017_Highlights.pdf

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2017). *Global trends 2016: Forced displacement in 2017*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2017/

Valiani, S. (2013). Immigration policy: The rise of temporary migration and employer-driven immigration. In L. Goldring & P. Landolt (Eds.), *Producing and negotiating non-citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada* (pp. 55-70). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Valverde, M. (2008). *The age of light, soap, and water: Moral reform in English Canada 1880s–1920s*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Villegas, F. (2013). Getting to "Don't Ask Don't Tell" at the Toronto District School Board: Mapping the competing discourses of rights and membership. In L. Goldring & P. Landolt (Eds.), *Producing and negotiating non-citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada* (pp. 258-273). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Villegas, P. (2013). Negotiating the boundaries of membership: Health care providers, access to social goods, and immigration status. In L. Goldring & P. Landolt (Eds.), *Producing and negotiating non-citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada* (pp. 221-237). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Vincent, D. (March 17, 2015). Canadians oppose niqab during citizenship ceremony, poll

    suggests. *Toronto Star.* Retrieved from

    https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2015/03/17/canadians-oppose-niqab-during-

    citizenship-ceremony-poll-suggests.html

Walia, H. (2010). Transient servitude: Migrant labour in Canada and the apartheid of citizenship.

    Race & Class, 52(1), 71-84.

Walia, H. (2013). *Undoing border imperialism.* Oakland, CA: AK press/Institute for Anarchist

    Studies.

Walters, W. (2002). Deportation, expulsion, and the international police of aliens. *Citizenship*

    Studies, 6(3), 265-292.

Walters, W. (2015). Reflections on migration and governmentality. *Movements: Journal for*

    Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies, 1(1), 1-25.

Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice: A defense of pluralism and equality.* New York, NY:

    Basic Books.

Wehbi, S., & Turcotte, P. (2007). Social work education: Neoliberalism's willing victim?

    Critical Social Work, 8(1). Retrieved from

    http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/social-work-education-

    neoliberalism%E2%80%99s-willing-victim

Williams, M. (2018). How Canada's child welfare system fails refugees like Abdoul Abdi.

    Maclean's. Retrieved from

    https://www.msn.com/en-ca/news/canada/how-canada%E2%80%99s-child-welfare-

    system-fails-refugees-like-abdoul-abdi/ar-AAuPa8z

Wimmer, A., & Feinstein, Y. (2010). The rise of the nation-state across the world, 1816 to 2001. *American Sociological Review, 75*(5), 764-790.

Wimmer, A., & Schiller, N. G. (2003). Methodological nationalism, the social sciences, and the study of migration: An essay in historical epistemology. *International Migration Review, 37*(3), 576-610.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research, 8*(4), 387-409.

Wong, E. H.-S. (2016). "The brains of a nation": The eugenicist roots of Canada's mental health field and the building of a white non-disabled nation. *Canadian Review of Social Policy, 75*, 1-29.

Wong, Y.-L.R. (1999). *In-between nationalism and colonialism: Constructing Hong Kong-Chinese Identities in the development of China.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Wong, Y.-L. R. (2002). Going 'back" and stay 'out': Articulating the postcolonial Hong Kong subjects in the development of China. *Journal of Contemporary China, 11*(30), 141-159.

Wong, Y.-L. R. (2004). Knowing through discomfort: A mindfulness-based critical social work pedagogy. *Critical Social Work, 5*(1). Retrieved from http://www1.uwindsor.ca/criticalsocialwork/knowing-through-discomfort-a-mindfulness-based-critical-social-work-pedagogy

Wright, C. (2013). The museum of illegal immigration: Historical perspectives on the production of non-citizens and challenges to immigration control. In L. L. Goldring, Patricia (Ed.), *Producing and negotiating non-citizenship: Precarious legal status in Canada* (pp. 31-54). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Young, I. M. (1995). Together in difference: Transforming the logic of group political conflict. In W. Kymlicka (Ed.), *The rights of minority cultures* (pp. 155-178). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Zembylas, M. (2015). Rethinking race and racism as technologies of affect: Theorizing the implications for anti-racist politics and practice in education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 18*(2), 145-162.

Zolberg, A. R. (1983). The formation of new states as a refugee-generating process. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 467*, 24-38.

Appendix A: Invitation and Information for Participants

Study name: Working title: The politics of human rights: Social work with nonstatus migrants in the city of Toronto

Researcher: Chizuru Nobe Ghelani (PhD candidate), York University, School of Social Work

Supervisor: Professor Yuk-Lin Renita Wong, York University, School of Social Work

What is the purpose of the study?
My thesis seeks to examine how social work practitioners enact their human rights values in their work with nonstatus migrants while maintaining their obligations and responsibilities as professional helpers. Increasingly hostile attitudes towards migrants are reflected in significant funding cuts to settlement services and policy changes that have made it difficult for migrants to obtain permanent residency and citizenship in Canada. Consequently, there is an increasing number of people who live without full legal status. While the human rights values ingrained in social work would imply that all migrants regardless of their legal status would be treated equally, the reality of funding structures and institutional barriers mean otherwise. I am interested in talking to social work practitioners who work with nonstatus migrants in the city of Toronto. I hope to examine how they negotiate the contradictions embedded in their social work practice with nonstatus migrants. Through the analysis, I hope to develop an in-depth understanding of the limitations, constraints, and possibilities in working with migrant communities. The findings from this study will suggest directions for critical social work education, research, and practice.

Who are "nonstatus migrants"?
In this study, "nonstatus migrants" refers to migrants who do not have the legal status that would allow them to stay permanently in Canada. These individuals include those who are considered legal (e.g., refugee claimants waiting for decision, temporary workers), illegal (e.g., rejected claimants, expired visa holders), or undocumented (e.g., people without identity documents).

If You:
- have received a post-secondary education in social work (i.e. BSW/MSW)

- have experiences working with nonstatus migrants in the city of Toronto. You may be a frontline worker or manager and involved in a variety of activities including counselling, case work, legal support, advocacy, and activism

- hold human rights as one of your core values and aspirations and/or employ human rights discourse as a tool/strategy in your work

- are willing to share your stories about work experience with this population

Please contact me at xxxxxx or xxx-xxx-xxxx

Date:

Study Name: Working title: The politics of human rights: Social work with nonstatus migrants in the city of Toronto

Researcher

Chizuru Nobe Ghelani (PhD candidate), York University, School of Social Work

Contact Information

Email (xxxxxxx)) and phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx)

Purpose of the Research

My thesis seeks to examine how social work practitioners enact their human rights values and aspirations in their work with nonstatus migrants while maintaining their obligations and responsibilities as professional helpers. Increasingly hostile attitudes towards migrants are reflected in significant funding cuts to settlement services and policy changes that have made it difficult for migrants to obtain permanent residency and citizenship in Canada. Consequently, there is an increasing number of people who live without full legal status. While the human rights values ingrained in social work would imply that all migrants regardless of their legal status would be treated equally, the reality of funding structures and institutional barriers mean otherwise. I am interested in talking to social work practitioners who work with nonstatus migrants in the city of Toronto. I hope to examine how they negotiate the contradictions embedded in their social work practice with nonstatus migrants. Through the analysis, I hope to develop an in-depth understanding of the limitations, constraints, and possibilities in working with migrant communities. The findings from this study will suggest directions for critical social work education, research, and practice.

What You Will Be Asked to Do in the Research

You will participate in an in-person interview with the researcher to discuss your human rights values in relation to your work with nonstatus migrants. With your permission, I would like to tape-record the interview. The interview will take about 60–90 minutes.

Risks and Discomforts

There are minimal risks to participants. The risks may include some uncomfortable feelings when discussing your experiences. You may feel that discussing your experiences at your workplace is uncomfortable. To minimize this, the researcher will agree to conduct an interview at a place that is preferable and comfortable for you.

Benefits of the Research and Benefits to You

This study hopes to provide a space for critical disciplinary reflection for social work in order to develop a more in-depth understanding of the limitations, constraints, and possibilities in working with migrant communities and other marginalized groups in our society. As a social work practitioner, you might find it beneficial to discuss your social work experiences and engage in such critical reflection.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. You are free to skip or not answer any questions that you are not comfortable with. Your decision not to volunteer will not influence the nature of the ongoing relationship you may have with the researchers or York University either now or in the future.

Withdrawal from the Study
You can stop participating in the study at any time, for any reason, if you so decide. Your decision to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions, will not affect your relationship with the researchers, York University, or any other group associated with this project. If you decide to withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed.

Confidentiality
Any information you provide during this interview that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will not appear on the collected data or in any writing that will arise from the research. All collected data will be stored in a locked office. Only the researcher and her thesis committee will have access to these files. The data will be used for academic and research purposes only. All data will be retained for two years following the completion of the study and will be destroyed after the retention period. Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law.

Questions About the Research?
If you have questions about the research in general or about your role in the study, please feel free to contact Chizuru Nobe Ghelani either by telephone at xxx-xxx-xxxx or by e-mail (xxxxxx). Alternatively, you may contact the thesis supervisor, Professor Yuk-Lin Renita Wong, either by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx ext. xxxxx) or by e-mail (xxxxxxx)). You may also contact the School of Social Work Graduate Program Office by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx) or by email (xxxxxxx).

This research has been reviewed by the Human Participants in Research Committee, York University's Ethics Review Board, and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines. If you have any questions about this process, or about your rights as a participant in the study, please contact the Senior Manager and Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, York Research Tower, York University, telephone xxxx-xxx-xxxx or e-mail (xxxxxxx).

Legal Rights and Signatures
I _____, consent to participate in this study conducted by Chizuru Nobe Ghelani. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

_____ _____
Signature of Participant   Date

Signature of Principal Investigator   Date

268

Appendix C: Research participants

Participants	Interview date	Sector
Interviewee 1	October 5, 2015	Settlement, School Board
Interviewee 2	October 12, 2015	Mental Health, Migrant advocacy
Interviewee 3	October 14, 2015	Settlement, Refugee Resettlement
Interviewee 4	October 16, 2015	School Board, Settlement
Interviewee 5	October 17, 2015	Community Health Centre
Interviewee 6	October 21, 2015	Settlement, Grassroots organization
Interviewee 7	November 3, 2015	Community Health Centre
Interviewee 8	November 13, 2015	Shelter, Mental Health
Interviewee 9	November 22, 2015	Community Health Centre
Interviewee10	November 23, 2015	HIV/ AIDS
Interviewee 11	February 10, 2016	Settlement and advocacy
Interviewee 12	February 16, 2016	Settlement, mental health
Interviewee 13	March 14, 2016	Social Services
Interviewee 14	March 15, 2016	Child welfare
Interviewee 15	March 18, 2016	Settlement, mental health
Interviewee 16	May 12, 2016	Employment services
Interviewee 17	May 14, 2016	Grassroots organization Community legal clinic

Appendix D: General Background Information

Thank you very much for participating in my research. The following questions are asked to gather general background information about the participants. I would be grateful if you could answer as many questions as possible. But please note that you have the right to refuse to answer any of the following questions you do not feel comfortable with.

Age   ☐ < 21   ☐ 21-30   ☐ 31-40   ☐ 41-50   ☐ 51-60   ☐ above 60

Number of years living in Canada   _____

Language(s) you feel most comfortable speaking   _____

How would you like to self-identify?

- Gender   _____
- Ethnic heritage(s)   _____
- Spiritual/Religious affiliation(s)   _____
- Sexual orientation   _____
- Others (feel free to elaborate if you wish)

  _____

Social service experience:

	Employment	Volunteer service
Number of years		
Areas of service (e.g. mental health, child welfare, settlement, hospital, etc.)		
Job nature (e.g. management, direct services, case management, counselling, policy analysis, advocacy, etc.)		

Appendix E: Interview guide

Recruitment
- Explain the purpose, content, and duration of interview.
- After confirming the commitment from an interviewee, set up a meeting place that is convenient for an interviewee.
- Send an informed consent form so that an interviewee can go through it before the interview, and allow her/him to raise any concerns.

Introduction
- Thank the interviewee for agreeing to meet.
- Explain who I am and why I am doing this.
- Explain that the interview will take about 60 to 90 minutes.
- Explain the informed consent form and provide her an opportunity to read and double-check she is okay with participating in the study. Make sure to provide a copy of the informed consent form.
- Provide the contact information of the interviewer.
- Ask for permission to tape-record the session.
- Reassure the confidentiality of the interview.
- Prepare a method for recording data (e.g., taking notes).

Key interview questions and possible opening and follow-up questions:

- **How and why did you get into the field of social work?**
    a. Can you describe any life events, influences, or experiences you think might be related to your decision to pursue a social work career?
    b. How did you get into the work with migrant communities and nonstatus migrants in particular?
    c. Can you tell me about your work in general and in particular with nonstatus migrants?

- **What does human rights mean to you and your work with nonstatus migrants?**
    a. How/where does this meaning come about? Social work education? Any particular life event that you can recall?
    b. How do you apply human rights values to your work? How does it help with your work with nonstatus migrants? Any success stories to share?
    c. Have you faced any challenges in applying your human rights values in your work with nonstatus migrants? Where do you think these challenges come from? How did you deal with these challenges? What do you tell yourself when you face these challenges or when you're unable to apply your human rights values to your work?

- **How do you think that recent changes in immigration and citizenship policies have affected the lives of nonstatus migrants, your work, and your values and aspirations in human rights?**

271

a. Have you experienced any emerging tensions in your practice related to recent changes? If so, can you tell me the specific case?
b. Tell me a story about how have you managed these tensions and how have your human rights values and aspirations been helpful (or not)?

Closing
- Allow the interviewee to express additional points or go back to what has been discussed.
- Make sure the interviewee is not feeling any discomfort from interview process.
- Explain again the purpose of the interview.
- Ask if there is anyone else they would recommend for this study.
- Let them know that the interview transcripts and early analysis will be available to view if they are interested.
- Provide contact information for any further questions.
- Thank the interviewees.

Appendix F: The list of policy documents reviewed

Bill C-31: An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, the Balanced Refugee

    Reform Act, the Marine Transportation Security Act and the Department of Citizenship

    and Immigration Act (2012). Retrieved from the Parliament of Canada website:

    https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/41-1/bill/C-31/royal-assent

Bill C-43: Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act, An Act to amend the Immigration and

    Refugee Protection Act (2013). Retrieved from Justice Laws website: https://laws-

    lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/annualstatutes/2013_16/page-1.html

Bill C-50, Budget Implementation Act (2008). Retrieved from the Open Parilemnet website:

    https://openparliament.ca/bills/39-2/C-50/?singlepage=1

Canada Border Service Agencies. (2008). *Removals processed by region by year.* Retrieved from

    https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/87ccfc74-1065-4399-aeb7-34a07de25c0b

Canada Border Service Agency. (2014). *Removals processed by region by year*. Retrieved from

    https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/87ccfc74-1065-4399-aeb7-34a07de25c0b

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2008). *Annual report to parliament on immigration*.

    Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Retrieved from

    http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/immigration2008_e.pdf.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2010). *Report on plans and priorities 2010-2011*. Ottawa:

    Government of Canada. Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rpp/2010-

    2011/inst/imc/imc-eng.pdf

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2012). *Discover Canada: The rights and responsibilities of citizenship*. Retrieved from

https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/pdf/pub/discover.pdf

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2015). *Canada facts and figures: Immigrant overview temporary residents*. Retrieved from Ottawa: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/2014-Facts-Figures-Temporary.pdf

Department of Finance Canada. (2006). *Advantage Canada: Building strong economy for Canadians*. Retrieved from http://www.fin.gc.ca/ec2006/pdf/plane.pdf.

Employment and Social Development Canada. (n.d.). *Stream for lower skilled occupations.* Retrieved from

http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/lower_skilled/index.shtml

Government of Canada. (2010). *Backgrounders - Marraige fraud - have your say*. Ottawa Retrieved from

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2010/2010-09-27.asp.

Government of Canada. (2011). *Summary report: Consulting the public on marriages of convenience* Ottawa Retrieved from

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/consultations/marriagefraud/.

Government of Canada. (2012a). *Archived - Conditional permanent residence proposed to deter marriage of convenience* Ottawa Retrieved from http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=4&crtr.dpt1D=6664&nid=661969&crtr.tp1D=&crtr.kw=conditional+spouse&crtr.yrStrtVl=2006&crtr.dyStrtVl=1&crtr.mnthStrtVl=6&crtr.page=2&crtr.yrndVl=2016&crtr.dyndVl=23.

Government of Canada. (2012b). Archived - Minister Kenney introduces sponsorship restriction to address marriage fraud [Press release]. Retrieved from http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=4&crtr.dpt1D=6664&nid=660599&crtr.tp1D=&crtr.kw=conditional+spouse&crtr.yrStrtVl=2006&crtr.dyStrtVl=1&crtr.mnthStrtVl=6&crtr.page=2&crtr.yrndVl=2016&crtr.dyndVl=23

Government of Canada. (2012c). Archived - Minister Kenney introduces sponsorship restriction to address marriage fraud [Press release]. Retrieved from http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=4&crtr.dpt1D=6664&nid=660599&crtr.tp1D=&crtr.kw=conditional+spouse&crtr.yrStrtVl=2006&crtr.dyStrtVl=1&crtr.mnthStrtVl=6&crtr.page=2&crtr.yrndVl=2016&crtr.dyndVl=23

Government of Canada. (2012d). Archived - "The jig is up on marriage fraud", says Minister Kenney [Press release]. Retrieved from http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?mthd=advSrch&crtr.mnthndVl=4&crtr.dpt1D=6664&nid=703499&crtr.tp1D=&crtr.kw=conditional+spouse&crtr.yrStrtVl=2004&crtr.dyStrtVl=1&crtr.mnthStrtVl=1&crtr.page=1&crtr.yrndVl=2016&crtr.dyndVl=27)

Government of Canada. (2012e). *Speaking notes for The Honourable Jason Kenney, P.C., M.P. Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism* Ottawa Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2012/2012-06-20.asp.

Government of Canada. (2013a). *Backgrounders - The Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act*. Ottawa Retrieved from http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2013/2013-06-20.asp.

Government of Canada. (2013b). *Backgrounders - Top 5 reasons for Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act*. Ottawa Retrieved from

http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2013/2013-06-

20b.asp?_ga=1.165586489.746428531.1470948899.

Government of Canada. (2014). Archived - Speaking notes for Chris Alexander, Canada's

Citizenship and Immigration Minister for a keynote address in honour of International

Women's Day.   Retrieved from http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=831839

Government of Canada. (2018). *Estimates of non-permanent residents, quarterly.* Retrieved from

https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1710002301.

Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. An Act respecting immigration to Canada and the

granting of refugee protection to persons who are displaced, persecuted or in danger

(2001, c. C-27). Retrieved from the Justice Laws website: https://laws-

lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/i-2.5/