The Henceforward Episode 24
Multiculturalism – A Performative Distraction

[0:00:00]

Eve: Aang aang. This is Eve Tuck, and this is The Henceforward, a podcast about connections between Indigenous and Black life on Turtle Island. Here we come to the table to discuss settler colonialism and anti-blackness but more, to imagine shared futures and the practices of theory and care that it will take to get there, to get elsewhere.

Carey: In this episode of The Henceforward, we're going to spend some time thinking about and problematizing this Canadian rhetoric of multiculturalism, basically the idea that Canada is a place where citizens can both keep their diverse identities and take pride in their ancestry and culture, while simultaneously enjoying a sense of national belonging.

Bea: On June 27th, 2016, Justin Trudeau issued a statement in celebration of Canadian Multiculturalism Day. The statement reads, in part:

"I join Canadians across the country today to celebrate multiculturalism and our long and proud tradition of inclusion and diversity. As the first country in the world to adopt a major policy of multiculturalism 45 years ago, Canada has shown time and time again that a country can be stronger not in spite of its differences, but because of them.

"As Canadians, we appreciate the immense freedom we have to show pride in our individual identities and ancestries. No matter our religion, where we're born, what color our skin or what language we speak, we are equal members of this great country. Multiculturalism is our strength, as synonymous with Canada as the maple leaf."

Carey: So today we're going to talk about this rhetoric in terms of both the conversations that it encourages and the conversations that is shuts down, about the histories that it highlights and the histories that it erases. Before we begin, we just want to take a moment to introduce ourselves and say a little bit about how we come to this work and who we are.

Bea: My name is Bea, and I come to this work as a white settler woman living on land under the Toronto Purchase. I have lived in Toronto now for the past five years, and I moved here from Singapore where I lived and worked for a few years. Living outside of my culture for that time and then coming back to Canada and living in Toronto specifically, I've certainly bought into the multicultural discourse that surrounds both our nation and our city. Seeing how this same discourse functions in Singapore where it's referred to both as multiculturalism and racial harmony, as it clumsily is deployed in attempts to avoid race rioting, this helped me cast the

same critical gaze towards how it works here in Canada. Coming to this work has helped me to more deeply engage with ways that multiculturalism functions and who it works to serve.

Carey: I'm Carey, and I am also a white settler woman living on land Treat 3 and First Purchase Territory in Toronto. Like Bea, I moved here for graduate school but before that, I was living in Chicago.

For me at least, when I moved to Toronto, the multiculturalism of the city really stood out to me because on paper, if you look at the population of the City of Chicago, it's quite diverse. There are people living in that city from all over the world, but my experience of living there really did not reflect that diversity.

In fact, in Chicago, I found that the neighborhoods were extremely racially segregated and socially bound by the city's own infrastructure. So, the way that social services works, the way the subway lines would run, even the way the streets were laid out, everything about that city seemed like it was built to keep people apart.

When I moved to downtown Toronto, I really relished how non-segregated it felt and the way that Korea Town would melt into Little Italy, would melt into Chinatown all on my walk to school. I talk about it constantly when I was home in Colorado where I'm from, originally, about how Toronto is so great and so multicultural, and it's so much more progressive than the US.

Lately, and in light of work that I've begun to undertake with my Black and Indigenous colleagues here in Toronto, I've come to really question my initial easy acceptance of this Canadian multicultural narrative. What's become increasingly noticeable to me is a slippage from a discourse that celebrates multiculturalism and diversity, to a characterization of Canada as free from problems of racism and settler colonial violence and xenophobia.

I think there's this rhetorical move that begins with championing the ideal of multiculturalism and then slips into a celebration of our supposed achievement of multiculturalism and then ultimately just becomes a complete erasure of the forms of violence and domination and dispossession that exist in Canadian society. I think that we see this in Trudeau's address that we used to open the episode.

[0:05:11]

Trudeau makes this problematic slip when he claims that no matter our religion, where we're born, what color our skin or what language we speak, we are equal members of this great country. I think there are three problems with this statement.

The first is that it's not true. Racism and exclusion are alive and well in Canada. The second problem though is that this statement erases the colonial violence on

which the country of Canada was founded. Third, this congratulatory attitude of having already achieved multiculturalism really functions to foreclose on important conversations about the injustices that exist in what is now Canada.

Sandi: Welcome to the kitchen table where Indigenous folks and Black folks come to meet to discuss some very serious topics. I'm Sandi Wemigwase.

Sandy: I am Sandy Hudson.

Jade: I'm Jade Nixon.

Cornel: I'm Cornel Grey.

Michelle: I'm Michelle Forde.

Megan: And I'm Megan Scribe.

Eve: Okay, so the opportunity here is to talk about how multiculturalism has been a bit of a set-up or has been a way that actually makes the conversations that we are trying to have at this table, more difficult to even get to; so, the official policies in multiculturalism and then also generally, diversity practices; how those two frameworks of multiculturalism and diversity undermine or draw away, distract from the kinds of things that might make material differences in the lives of Indigenous people and in the lives of Black people.

Cornel: I'm really suspicious of people who say that Canada is multicultural when they talk about all-encompassing or uncritical way. I think particularly for folks in Toronto, this is idea that is multicultural, but they're speaking specifically to the experiences of Toronto, what are the experiences of Black and Indigenous people living in other parts of Canada.

The other thing that I'll say about that is how multiculturalism is mostly mobilized as a modified practice. This is this idea that, oh, well, we can go to these particular restaurants or participate in these kinds of festivals, but we aren't necessarily invested in the lives of Black and Indigenous people.

Michelle: That is what I think of that as well, just having the festivals, having tokenism taking place. Oftentimes, what you see -- even if you look at Toronto as an example, yes, we have a variety of communities, there's diversity, but then when you look at how powers negotiate it, look at our city council and the representational lack thereof on city council, which is making decisions about the resources and the ways in which communities within the city receive those resources, have access or don't have access to it.

If you look at it on even the federal level, who do we see represented in the senate? It's overwhelmingly white male. So, yes, we have multiculturalism that allows us

to feel good about the fun, the food, the festivals, but it doesn't require a conversation about power and decision-making and ensuring that there's equal access at the very least to power and agency for representatives through different communities.

Cornel: To Sandy's point, I was just thinking, since she brought up the matter of different government, I think the furor over Justin Trudeau's cabinet is one of those enigmatic examples of how multiculturalism functions. He's like, gee, I'm going to have these "diverse" groups of people in my cabinet, but there aren't any Black people.

Michelle: Well, diversity, usually when you talk about representation and parity and equity, it's creating a space for white women.

Cornel: My depiction about multiculturalism is the fact that it pivots around whiteness, so it's like you're diverse or you're cultural in relation to this unnamed whiteness.

Jade: The scholar that really helped me think through multiculturalism was Rinaldo Walcott, and he talks about the way that multiculturalism makes Black presence seem new to Canada. It points it elsewhere. It points this Blackness as elsewhere, and like really new. Also, English settlers and French settlers is the --

Sandi: Has been the foundation.

Jade: -- foundation. Exactly, and totally erasing Indigenous lands. So, I think that he really helped me to think through…

Megan: Sorry, I think diversity is kind of gross because it's feeding people into a system that doesn't work. It's not about wanting to be included in the system, it's about wanting to dismantle it.

[**End of Kitchen Table Talk**]

[0:10:12]

Carey: So, one of the most interesting parts of this conversation, for me, is the way that multiculturalism emerges as a performance, as a strategic presentation that has the function of distracting from the reality of unequal power. As Cornel and Michelle point out, the state narratives of multiculturalism are performed at the national level during commercial cultural festivals or by Trudeau's parading of a cabinet that seems not really diverse but really is a reflection of dominant groups in power.

So, for me, the key insight here is that state performances of multiculturalism can take the place of combating injustice. Even apart from the issue of whether political rhetoric maps onto political action, these performances and the rhetoric that

surround them may distract from or may get harder to begin conversations about racism and dispossession and unequal power in Canada. They operate at the level of symbolic action, and perhaps may make more difficult the possibility of material action in that they suggest that the hard work has already been done. I think the issue of tokenism fits with this. These performances of multiculturalism and diversity allow for a problematic slippage into thinking that actual equality exists, exists already or exists right now.

Bea: Another theme that came up in the kitchen table discussion is the issues of inclusion and exclusion of Black and Indigenous people within discourses of Canadian national identity. It's speaks to a balancing that happens between the idea of multiculturalism, between citizens keeping their diverse identities while simultaneously enjoying a sense of unity and belonging to the nation. Our Black and Indigenous colleagues took up these questions of longing and belonging at the kitchen table.

Carey: In this discussion, Jade draws our attention to Dr. Rinaldo Walcott's book, Black Like Who?, which takes up the question of how the other is imagined by the Canadian nation state. Walcott builds an argument around the practice of hyphenating identity that is promoted by Canada's multicultural discourse. According to this language of hyphenated heritage, citizens are said to be Portuguese-Canadian or Somali-Canadian or Jewish-Canadian.

The justification behind this practice is that it acknowledges citizens' diverse heritage and resists the collapsing of the population into one homogeneous Canadian identity. Walcott argues, however, that this practice functions to position Blackness and the other as outside the boundaries of what is imaginatively Canadian. By constantly referencing elsewhere, this heritage discourse creates what Walcott calls "migrant ethnicities" in which "national belonging is paradoxically placed outside the nation."

Bea: In this way, Walcott argues, that the official multicultural policy in Canada "works to textually render a continued understanding of people who are not French or British as from elsewhere and that's as tangential to the nation state." He sees this as evidence of Canada's difficulty locating Black presence within.

This brings us to another point that Cornel brought up to the kitchen table, the insight that multiculturalism, in his words, "pivots around whiteness." This idea connects Walcott's argument that this heritage discourse provides a constant reminder that "an understanding of the Canadian nation exists in which Blackness is not present as a constituent element."

Carey: This discussion of multiculturalism as constructing national belonging brings us to perhaps the most provocative question raised at the end of the kitchen table conversation, which is about whether belonging and inclusion in the Canadian

project is actually a desirable goal for Black and Indigenous people. We'll just play back the question.

Megan: Sorry, I think diversity is kind of gross because it's feeding people into a system that doesn't work. It's not about wanting to be included in the system, it's about wanting to dismantle it.

Carey: This dramatically shifts the scope of the problem and the solution. Is the problem that Canada is doing a bad job implementing its multicultural ideals, or is the problem that multiculturalism, along with the rest of the projects of liberal democracy, is predicated on empire and needs to be dismantled?

Bea: We spoke with Dr. Tiffany King, an Assistant Professor of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies at George State University, about multicultural discourses and how they intersect with her work and her lived experience.

[0:15:09]

Tiffany: The way that I think about it, or your question, in terms of the research that I do, I definitely think about multiculturalism as masking or disavowing the violent ways that we're structured to relate to one another, particularly the ways that folks might understand themselves as arrivants or immigrants are required, not just conditioned, but required to enact Indigenous genocide, anti-black racism upon arrival to this country. Definitely if you want to be incorporated or an assimilated citizen, it's a part of the citizenship project, definitely of the US, certainly of Canada, and I'll say a number of nation states.

Whether they call themselves separate or not, who are worked out of a particular legacy of genocide, of Indigenous genocide that requires that kind of disavow and the disappearance of Indigenous people and the persecution, generally incarceration, criminalization of Black folks. So, definitely, people who imagine themselves a being full citizens of a multicultural nation, want to escape any kind of absorption into the category of Indigenous or Black and figure out how to be a multicultural citizen which assumes some kind of stability, way of participating in a public sphere, however that's a long time, and these community acts where people can participate through the media, have social media right now for voting, to other kinds of acts that make you a citizen.

The multicultural nation state likes to pretend that those projects are innocent and not violent at all. So, I think multiculturalism is a discourse for, what Eve Tuck is calling, this move to innocence. So I won't actually use those terms. Multiculturalism, but I do talk about a particular kind of self-actualization or an ascendancy into whiteness, which I think certainly a lot of the projects in multiculturalism, for sure.

I don't know if that Pepsi commercial circulated with Kylie Jenner, up to Canada and folks are ripping it up there, but that into my, immediately, when I started thinking about multiculturalism. The blowback has been intense and necessary actually. I haven't seen too many people defending it, but that might speak more to who I follow and my posts on Facebook, but I think that particular kind of appeal to colors all come to the table under the terms of white upper-middle classness, and white upper-middle class folks like Kylie Jenner will mediate the relationship between the state and Indigenous people, Black folks and other folks of color who are targeted and surveilled by the state right now.

Again, it's like, if we all get together in discussion about the state, it has to happen around these terms, that middle class whiteness dictates for us. Again, okay, yeah, this is the way that we can probably think about this type of masking public sphere that Kendall Jenner is trying to create through a corporation, right? Pepsi, the police state, her body. These are the folks who are the arbiters, who will decide what peace looks like, what justice looks like and what civility looks like in the streets. You can trust us.

Kendall Jenner is like, I've got your back, or I've got colored cultural people who are trying to assimilate into the US and not get fucked up by the state, I'm going to handle this. I'm going to do it through a particular kind of capitalist transaction, and make you feel like it's modern and sexy. People recoiled immediately.

Bea: This kind of stabs of Canadian exceptionalism, that Canada is somehow different or better, how does that map onto your experience of living in both places?

Tiffany: That feels accurate. I don't think I have a language for it. I don't think I was there long enough to -- well I certainly felt the difference, particularly this idea that you can be your -- you can express your discrete kind of cultural experience in a nation-based narrative of how you got here. That can be present, but it has to be present in a particular kind of harmony that still faces conflicts of the experience, particularly how we experience state violence or the distribution of resources.

[0:20:12]

We can all be present. We could be speaking in one voice, a harmonious kind of voice; whereas the nuance we created around, that you drew my attention to, is normally, US, we have to evade that difference. We can't speak other languages. There is the actual Franco community in Canada in which there is not one, not a viable one in the US. Everyone has to speak English as a first language to be able to survive and have access to a less-than-minimum wage job. So there is a narration of placement of ethnic identity or it's a kind of stew that generally has the same kind of flavor. That is that kind of distinction. I think what both projects are still doing is managing conflicts**.**

Now that you talked about that, I'm thinking about when I used to teach, as a graduate student, American Studies, Diversity of America, we'd always read a 2006 article by Angela Davis, called "Gender, Class and Multiculturalism." She's always talking about the ways that diversity and multiculturalism are around institutions who employ them in order to manage conflicts because they don't want to talk about stolen lands, exploited labor, state deaths. They don't want to talk about, let's all get together and talk about our differences and how they can complement one another, and only present it in a mosaic where all tastes good together in a stew or a melting pot. So, I like the way that you nuanced, covered different discourses work in Canada and the US. That makes sense to me.

I don't know you all are tracking some of the protests that happened in response to Trump's Executive Order which was the Muslim ban, that they're trying to deny, saying that it had nothing to do with race or religion, but an important critique that came up, which is a critique of the lack of multiculturalism, was Indigenous folks here, were like this whole nation of immigrants thing, that shit is not working. That, as a multicultural gesture, hides the violence and the genocide that goes on every day that certainly arrivants, settlers, newcomers are implicated in.

So, let's not show up at these airport protests and start also building this particular kind of multiculturalism around, we're a nation of immigrants, because that's not the truth. So that's the way that the left might use this multicultural discourse too, particularly doing something really progressive. I think there's been this impulse particularly in radical native Indigenous stubbornness thought that has resisted this particular project of multiculturalism, of coming together to this fundamentally fucked up project and trying to be a part of it instead of dismantling it.

Bea: We brought this question to Dr. Dumas, an Assistant Professor at the University of California, Berkeley in the Graduate School of Education and the African American Studies Department.

Michael: Right, so what we're talking about? These different theories of change, that's one piece, right, we're talking about here, is to be included in the system. A number of my colleagues in Education who have self-described as pragmatic. I've been thinking about this a lot recently because they were contrasting their own projects with mine, but they were not doing so in a way that was dismissive of mine.

Basically they said all this thought about dismantling and reordering or decolonization, all these things are provocative and we can appreciate for being provocative, but at the end of the day – not as a kind of temporal thing -- when all that is over, what's really left is that we have to be pragmatic.

Education as the type field is even more immersed in this pragmatic logic because we're about applying. There's actually something one has to do with authentic thing, is often providing the schooling function for the nation state. So, there are a lot of ways that we're judged, where the money comes from, is it safe for the kid,

this can prove these learning objectives and these kinds of outcomes and this kind of social advancement in the existing society.

You don't do diversity because you really believe in sustaining various communities' abilities to mobilize around their politics. No. Diversity is largely about improving opportunities for advancement. So, to speak -- I forget what the end of the quote was where the student pretty much made clear.

[0:25:04]

Carey: It's not about wanting to be included in the system. It's about wanting to dismantle it.

Michael: Right. That's already a contentious position because, like I said, if you go to the education association, that's not really the aim of most of the research or most of the policy work or most of the practice. Most educators are not, and most schools do not say, "Hey, we're going to dismantle."

Carey: Right.

Michael: What does it mean to do that from within the system if that's possible? How does one refuse systems that we're part of, in some kind of way? Part of the reason why we're here is because that's where people are, a very well reason why those would want to dismantle the system, would still be working in those system's bases.

We're still having that hard conversation. It's an ongoing tension and a necessary tension for those who are still working within or at. Because the critique is, here I am on a university computer, why am I trying to dismantle the university? Why am I trying to imagine something else other than what -- doesn't this work?

We need spaces to have that conversation that begins at a place of understanding that it's irredeemable and violent but then realize that most of our conversations, we interview people who are not there at all. It's not the way they see their relationship to the nation state or to change. What conversation are we having now, if at all? Sometimes you just say, "Well I'm not interested in that conversation." We begin here. I don't know.

In our spaces, yes, we're doing radical work about really thinking otherwise, thinking about, what is the henceforward in terms of our understanding of the need for the henceforward? Most people are not there, so for them, this is progress. Basically, a few will be included. In other words, then the creation of a multicultural society has either it's already the evidence of having the anti-racist because those individuals will then reach back and they'll bring a few more and then they'll bring a few more and they'll bring a few more.

There's no evidence to support this, but it's definitely the commonsense of, if you make it, you'll reach back. Reality is a bit -- of course it is true that those of us who find ourselves in elite spaces do make pathways. Some of us, we believe it's our responsibility to do that work, to extend those things. That's seen as evidence. See, this is the way it's supposed to work. This shows this is working. We're not where we need to be right now, but we will naturally get there if we just keep doing this thing.

I'm thinking of the National Geographic had a cover story on what would it be like in 50 years, what society would look like, and it had these images of celebrating the future of what we would look like. So, one, it's very visual-heavy, and most of the people there were very medium -- the darkest were medium complected. There was no dark. It stopped at a certain point.

In most cases, what the article is celebrating is multicultural mixture. There's some of this. There's some of that. Part of that is, that they're nobody, in a sense. Everybody is a little bit of something, so therefore nobody really has any claims to actually make in terms of redress or anything like that because we're all so mixed. Isn't this then also the advancement of racial understanding because if we can't tell who you are anymore, then there will be no bias. Bias will no longer make sense that you'll be able to locate.

Carey: There's no culpability for violence. There's nobody to blame.

Michael: Exactly, exactly. There's no one. Since no one has claim to it -- what I'm thinking about here is it's interesting the way whiteness hides in that. In this National Geographic piece, part of it was about having a bit of the other in terms of -- again, it was very heavy on image. It was, like, here's this space, and it's more beautiful because it still retains -- whiteness was still hanging. There wasn't a lot of celebration of things outside of having somethings to look like. That's the future. That's the desire. It's also a place of desire.

So the desire for multicultural future is one without Blackness in it. Blackness is the impediment to progress in that way. One, it just won't get lighter. There's this visual thing that is stubborn about it. Also the group is seen as least human or anti-human in this organization that you chose, so therefore, it's behind. It's anachronistic to the extent that native folks of a race is seen in the past. The persistence of any kind of Blackness is seen as this pull toward savagery or a pull toward a sense of primitiveness. So, if we can get away from that but retain a bit of that for ourselves, but not necessarily those who have darker bodies.

[0:30:24]

Carey: I'm wondering if you could talk just a little bit about the way, not even so much in scholarly settings, but the way that this discourse gets employed and the functions that it serves in everyday conversations. Multiculturalism is now employed just as

part of everyday discourse and the kind of slippage that can happen where people can go from saying, "Oh, we live in Toronto. It's so multicultural here." It is a kind of slip where the thought is that then there isn't racism, or there isn't settler violence, or there isn't xenophobia. Or we have this training on whatever it is, sexual harassment, and so therefore, this isn't a problem anymore.

Michael: I'll talk about this in two ways, one is a specific example because it's very much on a lot of people's minds right now, which is this latest Pepsi ad – it's more specific, I'll go more general after this. Again, multiculturalism has a theory of change, and sometimes, some strange multiculturalism, the change is just being multicultural, just actually doing that. So depicting the difference, all these different roots across is the achievement itself. Or if we can get rid of diversity together, you have it naturally evolve over time, a kind of gradualist approach. In other words, multicultural heralds either is the end of racism or heralds the end of racism. That's where you get this kind of conflation of multiculturalism as anti-racism. That's when it becomes multicultural. It becomes anti-racism or at least it becomes the pathway to a gradual, incremental change as long as we're patient and don't disrespect the process and the best case of it because then you'll be to blame.

So, multiculturalism is definitely and hardly, at this point, conciliatory. It's also developmentalist. You have to understand that people are where they are, so you have to create safe spaces for them as one might create safe spaces for a child. It's your responsibility to do that. Often, some people can play innocence. Part of what most innocents are I have the best of intentions. That's embedded, the discourse that everything really had the best of intentions. When you have the Pepsi ad, it's the sense of like, hey, look, why are you critiquing this because everything here has the best of intentions. At the end of the day, everybody really wants to get along. So, whichever Jenner character it is in the --

Michael: Pass a Pepsi to the cop sitting there, and he cracks a smile. Because really, ultimately, we all, as long as we're just welcomed, that if people reach out to us, if they extend their invitation, their arms to us, then harmony will follow.

Multiculturalism also then makes a space for the fact that in that process, one can offer and be met with violence. One can make oneself vulnerable, and if there's a long history of having done so, then you're called in to do it again and again and again. So, please take this violent assault. It may hurt you. It may be tragic, but it's all moving toward greater acceptance for your root.

Therefore, it's your responsibility to continue to make yourself vulnerable to various kinds of assaults, continue to educate which, in many ways, is to confess, make probably some testimonial about your pain because that will change hearts and minds. So, it's gradual, this process, and if you do this work, then multiculturalism promises to take care of you in the end and results in a society with less races.

What's happened, obviously, is multiculturalism has gone mainstream in terms of, like I said, everyone -- I think Melania makes that very clear, thinking about this notion of officially ending racism in nation states. All the nation states, Canada, United States have very overt performances of anti-racism, when they position themselves, maybe a public apology, various kinds of interventions, even to perform it with hugs of the other, apologies, that kind of thing. It becomes difficult then to sustain multiculturalism and have it mean anything if what it means has already been caught in that way.

[0:35:10]

Also because of having this conversation about pragmatism, what's pragmatic, they try to make the case for not feeding the ground of pragmatism or something that's worth our time or is realistic to those things that only, ultimately serve to continue the reproduction of the social order that we have. In other words, to say, it's actually pragmatic to think about the impossible.

Now, we are coming into actions that can be taken right now, whether it's disruptive things or supportive things or certain kinds of initiatives, we believe it creates a site of possibility or something or it's a site in which to think about the impossible. We often will change to do this thing, whether prey on these young people or to do this kind of action right now, have this change in the policy right now. Those are the kinds of things that people -- yeah, that's pragmatic.

No. This is one form of pragmatic. Pragmatic is the broader category, and within that is what I call the immediate or the things one does right now, but there's also this need to have space to imagine otherwise and that that's not impractical or daydreaming. It is pragmatic because one's survival depend -- our survival depends on this time that we spend now, thinking beyond what is possible in this current social order.

Understanding that changes how we think about the other work we do which is about the immediate because you can, like, why am I doing this? Well, I know in many ways -- recently I've just been basically moving furniture around on the deck of the slave ship. To someone, there is a kind of futility to the immediate work we do. There's a way in which, if you're just doing that work, it's, you know, but what if you're doing that work at the same time as you're also imagining otherwise, imagining a henceforward, but you're still doing this work? It will inform that work. It's still a new level of subversion and a new level of vision beyond itself.

So, that may be a way to think about the relationship between those things, but to think about them both as if you want to use the word pragmatic. They're both necessary for our lives. I think what we have to do is make sure that we articulate to folks, ah, no, this isn't the fanciful versus you're more pragmatic or necessary or fundamental, education scholarship and practice. Both of these things are fundamental to anything we want to do.

Bea: Dr. Dumas, Dr. King, and again the kitchen table drew our attention to the reasons in which the or multiculturalism functions to distract from material inequities and ameliorate white settler anxiety. This discourse doesn't actually do what it promises to do, i.e., the differences welcomed so long as it doesn't challenge the political and cultural imaginary of the settler nation as the challenges imaginary are regarded as transgressive, illegal and terroristic.

In this discussion of pragmatic dismantling, however, Dr. Dumas shows us how you might begin to relate differently in social spaces that have been shaped by multiculturalism. He suggests that dissonance is in fact vital to survival in these spaces and should be embraced as part of our practice as citizens and as educators.

Eve: The Henceforward, Indigenous and Black life on Turtle Island.

[0:40:47] End of Audio