Carleton University

Staging Queer Differences in the Entrepreneurial City:

The Politics of Pride Toronto

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree
Masters of Arts

Institute of Political Economy

By

John Grundy

Ottawa, Ontario

May 2003

© John William Grundy

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitons et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89045-7

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89045-7

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

This thesis synthesizes urban political economy with lesbian and gay studies in an analysis of Toronto's queer pride festival. Shifts in the production and reception of Pride Toronto are contextualized within the City of Toronto's implementation of urban entrepreneurialism. Under this mode of governance, queer difference has become exploited as a material and semiotic resource in destination marketing strategies. This thesis traces the ways in which Pride Toronto has traditionally been used as a forum for queer social movement organizing and the articulation of political demands, but is increasingly organized as both an economic generator for the local tourist economy and as a venue for queer niche-marketing. Such forms of commodification have been deeply contested. Pride Toronto is thus theorized as an unstable site of struggle between processes of commodification and depoliticization, and emergent forms of resistance and repoliticization. By placing an emphasis on the contested nature of Pride Toronto, this analysis presents a challenge to the literature on entrepreneurial urbanization that too rarely acknowledges the possibility of agency.

Acknowledgements

Many people have helped me complete this thesis. I am extremely appreciative of the superb supervision I received during this project. I would like to extend the deepest thanks to Prof. Miriam Smith for her patient and illuminating guidance, and to Prof. Alan Hunt for his insightful commentary and diligent editing. I would also like to thank Prof. Daiva Stasiulis for sharing such astute observations at the defense in the role of external examiner. I have been fortunate to benefit from Prof. Rianne Mahon's assistance in the early stages of this project, and from the introduction she provided to the fascinating world of social policy research. I am especially thankful for the ways in which Donna Coghill has assisted me at Carleton. Her support was instrumental in my ability to complete this degree.

I also wish to extend gratitude to my family and friends. I am deeply indebted to Dad and Karon for the countless ways they have supported me during my time at Carleton; to Jane for the provision of the apartment; to mom for her constant concern for my well-being, and to Grandma and Bill Grundy for my second home in Cobden. I would also like to thank my Carleton colleagues Haeli Goertzen and Mike Graydon, with whom it was an absolute pleasure to study. Many thanks to my dearest friends Paul Halferty, Elio Iannacci, Nina Arsenault and Cathie Pak for their encouragement and patience, to Christopher Smith for his inspiring engagement with my work, and most of all to Alison Howell for the push I needed to get over the hill.

I am grateful for the financial support provided by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the Lambda Foundation For Excellence. This research was supported in part by a grant from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Kahanoff Foundation entitled "Bringing Identity In: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Voluntary Sector Organizing in Toronto," Miriam Smith, Principal Investigator.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Theoretical Issues: Bringing Queer Critique into Political Economy.....	7
Methods of Data Collection.....	13
Chapter Outline.....	14
Chapter One: Urban Entrepreneurialism and the City of Toronto.....	17
The Entrepreneurial City: State Restructuring, Globalization, and Enterprise Culture.....	18
Toronto's Entrepreneurial Governance: Forming (and Contesting) the Globally Competitive City.....	28
Branding Toronto.....	40
Unity of Vision?.....	46
Conclusion.....	49
Chapter Two: The Politics of Pride Toronto.....	51
The Politics of Queer Visibility.....	52
Pride Events and Queer Visibility.....	55
Producing Queer Visibility in Toronto: The Early Years.....	59
Conclusion.....	73
Chapter Three: Queer Space and the Entrepreneurial City: Commodification and Regulation.....	74
Trends in Tourism.....	75
Tourism in Toronto.....	79
Cultural Tourism and the Commodification of Difference.....	82
Constructing the "Gay Friendly" Tourist Bubble: The Play of Queer Difference.....	89
The Ongoing Marginalization of Queer Difference.....	93
Conclusion.....	99
Chapter Four: The Shifting Politics of Pride Toronto.....	101
Entrepreneurialism and Visions of Difference.....	102
The Entrepreneurial Politics of Pride Toronto.....	106
Contesting Pride Toronto.....	118
Conclusion.....	127
Conclusion.....	129
Bibliography.....	134

Introduction

Canaries of the New Economy?

In 2001, an urban economic development policy analyst by the name of Richard Florida began travelling the lecture circuit with a revelation for municipal authorities seeking to ensure their city's successful transition to the new economy. Florida claimed that the projection of cultural diversity is now a requisite factor in successful entrepreneurial economic policy. Florida substantiated his claim through reference to "the gay index," a measurement of economic performance that links a thriving high-tech economy with a large lesbian and gay population. According to Florida, "Gays not only predict the concentration of a high tech industry, they are also a predictor of its growth...Gays can be thought of as canaries of the knowledge economy. They signal a diverse and progressive environment that fosters the creativity and innovation necessary for success in high-tech industry" (Florida and Gates, 2001, 3).

Florida's idea, which was an immediate sensation in urban economic development circles, prompts a number of questions. Why the sudden interest in queer difference? Does urban entrepreneurialism advance or exploit queer political struggles? How are non-heteronormative sexualities configured within discourses of urban entrepreneurialism? How might this be studied? The following is the result of these initial questions.

In this thesis, I seek to locate the staging of queer¹ difference in relation to the entrepreneurial reorientation of municipal governance in Toronto. This aim is realized through an analysis of Pride Toronto, Toronto's annual queer cultural celebration.² Indeed, Pride Toronto has become a critical forum for the expression of queer identities and politics. What began as a small gathering of gay liberation activists held far out of public view in 1971 has evolved into a major urban spectacle and media event. In 2002, over one million people attended Pride Toronto festivities to witness, as a *Toronto Star* headline reported, "Gays celebrate freedom" (Petrunic, 2002, A1).

In many ways, Pride Toronto reflects the political successes enjoyed by gays and lesbians. Both the event, and the broader lesbian and gay social movements, have largely overcome cultural abjection. Public interest in Toronto's Pride Parade and the unanimous support of Ontario's Superior Court for the legality of same-sex marriage are powerful markers of queer political progress (Wallace, 2002, 1). While the expansion of Pride Toronto is often narrativized as a product of the political progress enjoyed by lesbians and gays, another narrative is made possible when the dynamics of entrepreneurial urbanization are brought into the analysis.

Urban entrepreneurialism is a model of urban governance that has been widely implemented and observed across Europe and North America. Most generally, urban

¹ I use the terms lesbian/gay and queer interchangeably throughout this thesis. I recognize that this is a contentious practice as the term queer is often theorized as an attempt to destabilize essentialized gay and lesbian identities. Consistent with the popular usage, however, I use "queer" as an umbrella term that signifies lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgendered people.

² The name Pride Toronto refers to both the event and the organization.

entrepreneurialism refers to the mobilization of local governance in support of economic development. This reorientation of local government is part of an inter-urban competition in which cities seek to improve their respective positions within the spatial division of both production and consumption. This entails a form of institutionalized reflexivity whereby cities are auditing whatever assets will enhance their status in the new urban hierarchy.

Urban entrepreneurialism is largely based upon strategies that commodify the city via urban 'imagineering' projects. The aestheticization of the urban landscape, the mobilization of permanent or temporary spectacle, as well as discourses and practices of civic boosterism are widely cited features of the entrepreneurial city. Cities are more self-consciously multicultural, historically referential and decidedly visual than in previous eras (Jacobs, 1998, 265). The transformation of former industrial areas and declined districts into highly stylized areas of and for consumption are seen to dramatize the retail experience and provide previously industrial cities with a new post-industrial economic infrastructure. Cities increasingly survive, revitalize, and grow from the careful manipulation of events and spaces around which shopping and tourist programmes can be constructed (Lowes, 2002, 117). Such destination marketing strategies often involves the use and abuse of local cultural traditions.

Toronto is in the midst of an experiment in entrepreneurial governance. Over the past two decades, Toronto's privileged position atop the urban hierarchy in the east-west national economy has been undermined, and the city has been pushed into a global urban

hierarchy. Faced with new economic uncertainties, the City of Toronto is pursuing a brand of urban entrepreneurialism that is steeped in the ideals of neoliberal economics. Numerous measures have been taken to minimize government and maximize the “business friendly” climate of the city. Discourses of global economic competitiveness have come to frame economic and cultural policy debate. Such discourses are deployed in order to legitimate the shift in local government away from the provision of welfare toward a new role as a stimulator of economic development.

The City of Toronto’s adoption of urban entrepreneurialism entails new modes of place marketing and ‘imagineering.’ The proliferation of newly gentrified retail and residential spaces in the inner city, as well as the construction of spectacular tourist bubbles and entertainment complexes have transformed Toronto’s landscape in ways that provide for the spatial infrastructure of the postmodern, global city. Notions of multicultural diversity figure centrally in discourses constructing Toronto as a tolerant and cosmopolitan second tier global city. Spaces of ethno-cultural difference, such as Chinatowns, are now viewed as cultural and economic assets that support both Toronto’s cosmopolitan profile and the emergence of a cultural tourism industry.

Literature on urban entrepreneurialism provides a useful conceptual lens that captures the ways in which queer difference is implicated in the commodification of the city under a regime of urban entrepreneurialism. Like other forms of ethno-cultural difference, queer difference is now exploited as a material and semiotic resource in the commodification of the city. This is evidenced in the marketing of Toronto’s queer

spaces as an exotic identity-based entertainment district in which multiple forms of difference may be negotiated and consumed.

In this thesis, I argue that the growing importance of Pride Toronto in the city's civic calendar reflects not only the political advancements made by queer communities, but also the commodification of queer spaces and spectacles under a regime of entrepreneurialism. I begin by demonstrating the ways in which Pride Toronto has long served as a vehicle for queer political mobilization throughout the seventies, eighties and early nineties. Indeed, early Pride events in Toronto were instrumental in social movement organizing, resisting social conservatism and politicizing state-mandated heterosexism. I then describe recent shifts in Pride Toronto organizing that indicate a movement toward what David Harvey refers to as the "play" of queer difference. I discuss the ways in which Pride Toronto is increasingly divorced from queer social movement politics and is now organized as an economic generator for the local economy and as a venue for queer niche marketing. Indeed, Pride has evolved into a lucrative "world class" cultural festival and tourist destination. These developments demonstrate the relevance of urban political economic narratives of the commodification and appropriation of difference in the entrepreneurial city.

While narratives of the unilateral appropriation and commodification of difference enjoy wide currency within urban political economy, feminist geographers are making a critical intervention into such accounts (Morris, 1992; Jacobs, 1998; Jacobs and Fincher, 1998). These authors argue that urban political economy's cynical reading

of the entrepreneurial urban landscape reduces difference to another postmodern cultural form operating in the service of hegemony. Such a view, they claim, too quickly dismisses the possibility of a contentious politics of difference. The play of difference in the entrepreneurial city is not denied in this account. Rather, their argument is that the play of difference does not necessarily preclude or undermine more disruptive articulations of difference.

This thesis foregrounds the contested nature of Pride Toronto in light of the feminist criticism of urban political economy. I describe the ways in which processes of commercialization and depoliticization have generated new forms of resistance that are evident in the context of Pride Toronto. New organizations are challenging the commercial nature of Pride Toronto, and are utilizing Pride as a venue to critique mainstream lesbian and gay social movement politics. These interventions bring a productive instability and contingency to the production and reception of Pride Toronto. Therefore, the event cannot be explained away as one of many spectacles in the entrepreneurial city. Rather, Pride Toronto is theorized as a site of struggle between the play of queer difference, and emergent counter tendencies of resistance and repoliticization.

Theoretical and Methodological Issues: Bringing Queer Critique into Political Economy

This study, which addresses queer politics through the lens of urban political economy, is informed by the interdisciplinary aspirations of political economy. Rooted in a critical Marxist theory of capitalism, political economy is a body of thought that seeks to draw linkages between the economic, the political and the cultural in analyzing power relations. Wallace Clement describes political economy as, at its best, a “holistic approach” to understanding the world (Clement, 1997, 3). Nevertheless, particular difficulties are faced when working within a political economy framework in order to develop what might be called a “queer political economy.” While there are attempts made within political economy to incorporate difference in terms of race, class and gender, there is remarkably little engagement with queer critique and queer politics. Gender is viewed in Marxist traditions as structuring the division between paid and unpaid labour, and race is implicated in the social organization of classes and labour markets, but sexuality is not so easily configured in relation to the mode of production. The relationship between queer struggle and political economy thus remains ambiguous at best.

At present, queer critique is conceptually ghettoized within much political economy. This is perpetuated by a distinction between the material and the cultural in which queer politics are cast in cultural terms. As Judith Butler argues,

within much political economy, queer struggles are understood not only to be cultural struggles, but to typify the “merely cultural” form of contemporary social movements. Within this logic, heteronormativity is thus obscured as a fundamental political structure (Butler, 1997, 267).

The marginalization of queer critique is, for example, evident in the work of Ellen Meiksins Wood. Meiksins Wood invokes a cultural/material dichotomy to assert the primacy of class politics over the emergence of “merely” cultural, identity-based social movements. Moreover, Meiksins Wood views the latter as potentially regressive in that they fragment and undermine the possibilities of an emancipatory universal anti-capitalist politics. The result, she argues, is that “politics in any traditional sense of the word, having to do with the overarching power of classes or states and opposition to them, is effectively ruled out, giving way to the fractured struggles of ‘identity politics’ or even the ‘personal is political’” (Meiksins Wood, 1997, 7). In this account, reconceiving the political by taking into account the diverse and situated knowledges emerging from various struggles produces nothing other than “a deep epistemological scepticism and a profound political defeatism” (Meiksins Wood, 1997, 7). This brand of political economy has obvious implications for queer theory and politics. Queer critique is dismissed as secondary, derivative and less fundamental than class politics.

Alternatively, Nancy Fraser provides a more nuanced analysis of queer politics while still reproducing a material/cultural dichotomy in which queer politics are relegated to the cultural realm. In *Justice Interruptus*, Fraser argues that injustices occur either in terms of recognition or redistribution. Class politics represent the paradigmatic form of redistribution politics. Struggles around race and gender represent a “bi-valent” mode of politics that involves redistribution and recognition concurrently. Lesbian and gay politics, however, are presented as the paradigmatic mode of a cultural politics of recognition. Class and queer politics are thus situated at opposite ends of the redistribution recognition spectrum as polarized and irreconcilable forms of contemporary politics (Floyd, 1998, 170). However, as Miriam Smith has noted, the constitution of lesbian and gay political struggle in non-material cultural terms is certainly questionable given that material interests are so often at stake in lesbian and gay political struggle (Smith, 1999, 7).³ The largely invisible epidemic of homeless queer youth in large cities, struggles around access to health care and reproductive services, and struggles against discrimination in the areas of employment and housing are but a few examples that attest to the material implications of queer political struggle.

While much political economy has yet to incorporate queer critique, an analogous criticism may be leveled against the majority of lesbian and gay social movement analysis and queer theory. After thirty years of lesbian and gay studies, and well over a

³ Smith makes this claim in response to European literature on “post-material” social movements. However, it also applies to Fraser’s analysis of queer politics as a cultural politics of recognition.

decade of queer theory, there remains little engagement with the analytic imperatives of political economy. While queer theory's analysis of heteronormativity has served to explicate the discourses and practices of heterosexism and homophobia in their exactitude, queer theory has been criticized for its disengagement from political economy. Rosemary Hennessey (1995) contends that queer theory fetishizes deconstructive textual analysis while maintaining an eerie silence on the devastating impact of neoliberal economic and state restructuring. Kevin Floyd concurs with Hennessey, suggesting that what was once a healthy queer skepticism about political economy has developed into a dismissive and phobic orientation to Marxist traditions (Floyd, 1998, 171).

As a result of the current state of mutual disengagement between much political economy and queer scholarship, there exists a lack of analysis exploring the possibilities for bringing political economy and queer studies together in a productive association. There are, however, a few notable exceptions. John D'Emilio's essay, *Capitalism and Gay Identity*, represents an important early contribution to the development of a queer political economy. D'Emilio argues that the emergence of gay and lesbian identities is a function of the free labor system of capitalism that provided for some degree of freedom from the family as a basic economic unit of production. The ability of individuals, primarily men, to construct a personal life outside of the family unit based on attraction to one's own sex, represents, according to D'Emilio, the precondition for the consolidation of queer communities. The importance of this analysis lies in the assertion

that lesbian and gay identities is not only the product of self-liberatory efforts, but are also related to specific shifts in the historical evolution of capitalism. D'Emilio thus provides an important supplement to Foucault's theory of the emergence of the homosexual in volume one of *The History of Sexuality*, which also undermines narratives of self-liberation, but which places a great deal of emphasis on the psychological, psychiatric and medical discourses of the late nineteenth century.

D'Emilio's insight has influenced subsequent scholarship examining the commodification of queer subjectivity under late capitalism first explored by Danae Clark in *Commodity Lesbianism* (1993) and shortly thereafter by Rosemary Hennessey in *Queer Visibility in Commodity Culture* (1995). Both authors assert that the production of queer identities must be situated in relation to the stylization of identity under late capitalism. Clark examines the proliferation of images of lesbian consumer lifestyles and argues that capitalist appropriation of lesbian style in the form of "lesbian chic" complicates notions of lesbian political resistance that are premised upon various forms of transgressive self-representation. Hennessey builds upon this argument to contend that the various theorizations of the fluid and decentred subject within queer theory uncritically reproduce late capitalist consumerist ideology promoting a version of identity as malleable and constituted through a range of consumer choices regarding one's clothes, leisure activities and household items. Like Clarke, Hennessey argues this position in order to complicate simplistic understandings of queer visibility politics. In both accounts, queer visibility is thus reconstituted as no longer simply a matter of

display, but as the result of complex social conditions not always immediately evident at first glance. These conditions, Hennessey argues, involve processes of commodification and consumption that rely upon the lives and labour of invisible others.

The influence of D'Emilio, Clarke and Hennessey in developing a queer political economy is further evident in yet more recent analyses of queer tourism and queer consumption. In a special issue of *GLQ* devoted to these issues, Dereka Rushbrook argues that the commodification of queer spaces as identity-based consumption zones requires analyses that draw connections between the commodification of queer sexuality, exclusionary practices in the queer community and the ramifications of the consumption practices of queers themselves (Rushbrook, 2002, 200). Jasbir Kaur Puar addresses such ramifications in a study of queer tourism. Kaur Puar attempts to “unravel the fetish” of queer tourism by foregrounding the relations of production that precede the queer tourist experience, and by focusing on the “queer others” who are maintaining the queer tourist infrastructure while falling outside normative parameters of consumption practices, legal recognition, and citizenship (Kaur Puar, 2002, 126).

The work outlined above moves queer studies away from what Lawrence Knopp (1998) calls the “naive” mappings of queer spaces and identities toward an account that conceptualizes queer politics within material power relations operating at local and international scales. These analyses confound the cultural/material dichotomy that structures a division between queer scholarship and political economy. This thesis represents an attempt to contribute to such a project. Locating Pride Toronto in relation

to a neoliberal form of entrepreneurial urban governance, and the related commodification of queer spaces and spectacles, provides one way to begin thinking through the articulation of queer difference as it is shaped by the political economy of urbanization.

Methods of Data Collection

Archival Research

I construct a historical narrative of Pride Toronto from the seventies to the present using historical papers housed at the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives in Toronto. I have researched back issues of lesbian and gay publications such as the *Body Politic*, *Rites!* (both defunct) and back issues of *Xtra!* held at the Archives.. These publications provide a crucial point of access into the debates that took place regarding Pride organizing.

Textual Analysis

This thesis entails the textual analysis of several policy documents produced by the City of Toronto including *Toronto Competes: Assessing Toronto's Global Competitiveness* (2000), *The Economic Development Strategy Paper* (2000) as well as a cultural policy document titled, *The Creative City: A Culture Workprint* (2001). These documents reiterate discourses of entrepreneurialism and operate as authoritative texts

that shape policy debate. I examine these documents in order to demonstrate how they invoke a selective narration of past events and current problems facing Toronto, and posit future possibilities defined in entrepreneurial terms.

Interviews

I conduct in-depth interviews with four individuals involved in the organization or contestation of Pride events in Toronto. The information gathered from these interviews supplemented the material gathered from archival research.

Chapter Outline

Chapter one begins with a discussion of urban entrepreneurialism. The most widely noted features of entrepreneurial urban governance are described. This chapter then outlines recent shifts in the City of Toronto toward an entrepreneurial model of urban governance. Economic development and cultural policy documents that provide an insight into the decidedly neoliberal governance of the City of Toronto are cited. I discuss how the process of urban ‘imagineering’ accompanies entrepreneurial urban renewal in Toronto.

Chapter two is the first of two chapters addressing Pride Toronto specifically. The chapter opens with a discussion of the importance of Pride organizing within queer social movement politics. I then describe the historical development of Pride Toronto

from 1971 onward. The event's origin as a gathering of gay and lesbian liberation activists is noted. Particular attention is paid to the long struggle for official recognition from the municipal government. Early forms of commercialization and contestation are also outlined.

Chapter three applies the insights of urban entrepreneurialism to the study of queer politics in Toronto. The chapter begins with a discussion of trends in tourism and place-marketing. I discuss the ways in which images of cultural difference function as a semiotic resource in Toronto's place marketing strategies. My argument is that the commodification of cultural difference constitutes a form of exploitation given the increasing marginalization of many cultural minorities in Toronto. The second section of this chapter addresses how Toronto's queer communities and spaces are commodified as cultural and economic assets. Specifically, I consider the construction of a "gay friendly" tourist/entertainment zone in a new destination marketing magazine titled *Gay and Lesbian Toronto*. This chapter concludes by citing the recent police regulation of queer spaces as evidence of the ongoing political disempowerment of Toronto's queer communities.

Chapter four addresses the ways in which Pride Toronto is implicated in urban entrepreneurialism. I demonstrate how Pride Toronto operates as a site of appropriation and commodification, in short, the play of queer difference. The second section of this chapter discusses new organizations that are emerging to resist the commercialization and depoliticization of Pride Toronto. Pride Toronto is theorized as a site of struggle

between the play of queer difference, and emergent counter tendencies of resistance and repoliticization. In foregrounding the processes of contestation, this analysis thus presents a challenge to the literature on the entrepreneurial urbanization that too rarely acknowledges the possibility of agency.

Chapter One

Urban Entrepreneurialism and the City of Toronto

This chapter provides an outline of urban entrepreneurialism. The first section describes how the hyper-mobility of capital and the denationalization of advanced capitalist states forces cities to compete amongst each other for the kinds of investment that will secure their position within a global economy. While policy officials tend to extol the virtues of urban entrepreneurialism, there are many disturbing aspects of this trend. I outline how the competitive rationalization of cities mobilizes urban governance behind economic growth and less around more traditional social welfare functions. New institutional arrangements are “streamlining” decision making in ways that circumvent democratic processes and often subjugate community interests to economic development. I then describe how urban entrepreneurialism entrenches forms of social polarization that are reflected in urban design. The proliferation of newly gentrified spaces of consumption immediately adjacent to chronically under-resourced areas is widely observable, as are the modes of regulation designed to manage this polarized spatial order.

The second section describes recent shifts in the City of Toronto toward an entrepreneurial model of urban governance. I address the way in which increasing global competitiveness emerges as a primary function of the local state. Drawing primarily on the work of Roger Keil and Engin Isin, I argue that the amalgamation of the

municipalities that comprised Metro Toronto into the City of Toronto marks an important shift toward an entrepreneurial local state. Immediately after amalgamation, the administration commissioned two major economic development policy documents that reiterate discourses of urban competitiveness; *Toronto Competes: Assessing Toronto's Global Competitiveness* (2000), and *The Economic Development Strategy Paper* (2000). These policy documents provide an insight into the decidedly neoliberal economic development policy priorities of the City of Toronto.

The third section demonstrates that urban entrepreneurialism is not simply a matter of economic development policy, but is reshaping the social and moral landscape of the contemporary urban order (Kipfer and Keil, 2002, 235). This section outlines the process of urban 'imagineering' that accompanies entrepreneurial urban renewal in Toronto. I trace an increasing emphasis on quality of life in Toronto coextensive with the policing and criminalization of people and practices seen to disrupt quality of life.

Section One

The Entrepreneurial City: State Restructuring, Globalization, and Enterprise Culture

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief account of urban entrepreneurialism. Urban entrepreneurialism generally refers to the increasing mobilization of local politics in support of economic development. There is a consensus among urban scholars that urban entrepreneurialism is related to capitalist restructuring

and the decline of the Fordist-Keynesian welfare state system, although the details of this relation are the source of much disagreement.

Broadly speaking, the economies of North America and Europe were transformed by shifts in the momentum of economic growth during the early seventies characterized as the crisis of Fordism. Large-scale manufacturing experienced declining rates of investment, productivity and profit during this period. Lowering production costs, especially wages, assumed increasing importance. The relocation of production to cheaper regions, particularly East Asia, resulted in mass deindustrialization in advanced capitalist states and a sharp decline in the manufacturing base for many North American cities. As well, new communications technology and the globalization of finance accelerated the mobility of investment and disinvestment between and across states in ways that increased the economic uncertainty of national and regional economies.

The post-Fordist successor to the national Keynesian-Fordist welfare state may be understood as an attempt to reactivate productive forces in response to the structural crisis of capitalism (Hunt, 2001, 77). In the post-Keynesian, post-Fordist system, urban centres and regional economies have become increasingly distinct from their national economies as national systems of production are undermined. National urban policies that insulated certain cities from the uneven nature of capitalist development by distributing resources from advantaged to disadvantaged locations are in decline (Leitner and Sheppard, 1998, 294). As a result, disorder, rapid change and uncertainty mark contemporary urban economic landscape (Hall and Hubbard, 1996, 159). Areas that

flourished as centres of manufacturing are now engaged in inter-local competition to improve or maintain their respective positions within the spatial division of both production and consumption. New global cities have emerged, specializing in service or technologically based economies, while other cities are undermined as their economic roles within a globalizing economy become less secure (Hall and Hubbard, 1996, 159). The latter regions are faced with a set of compounding crises, as other more competitive or established cities continually outmanoeuvre them.

David Harvey develops an account of entrepreneurial governance that includes three general trends. The first trend involves the exploitation of competitive advantages for the production of goods and services within the international division of labour. This includes the exploitation of a unique resource base, a desirable location, or the strategic re-skilling of the local labour force. Also included here are various forms of regulatory undercutting and subsidy packages for investment, innovation and growth.

Urban entrepreneurialism also entails the attempt to improve the competitive position of the region in the spatial division of consumption. New urban settings, geared toward consumption rather than production, are designed to provide the previously industrial cities with a new economic infrastructure (Hall and Hubbard, 1996, 162). The physical up-grading of the urban environment, consumer attractions and the organization of urban spectacles on a temporary or permanent basis have all become much more prominent facets of entrepreneurial strategies for urban regeneration (Harvey 1989, 10).

In the course of competing for advantages vis-à-vis other regions, speculative forms of place marketing, as opposed to more bureaucratic and rationalized forms of economic development, have become standard practices. Entrepreneurial policies pursued by localities in competition with other localities are seen to contribute to a cycle in which transnational capital is rendered more mobile and thus empowered to set the terms of investment. In this cycle, localities are seen to become more dependent on investment and are thus willing to make concessions to induce investment. Harvey argues that “as interurban competition becomes more potent it will almost certainly operate as an external coercive power over individual cities...bringing them closer into line with the discipline and the logic of capitalist development while inducing repetitive and serial reproduction of certain patterns of development” (Harvey, 1989, 10).

Urban economic development policy, once limited to land use policy, the provision of physical infrastructure and property-led development to enhance the local tax base (Hunt, 2001, 107) has expanded to assume more entrepreneurial functions, as cities are subject to new demands within state restructuring, globalization and the countertendencies of localization. Numerous metaphors captured in the terms glocalization, glurbanization, and the new urban politics, have come into circulation to express the increasing importance of the local or urban in the context of globalization and state restructuring. Concerns around ‘global competitiveness’ now frame urban economic policy discourse and are understood to necessitate a modification of urban economic policy if cities are to escape the downward spiral of disinvestments.

The new demands placed upon cities and the forms of economic uncertainty they face puts a premium on the forms of institutional organization that enable urban authorities to distribute risks and to cope with uncertainty through a variety social and institutional networks. In order to maximize the entrepreneurial or enterprising capacity of cities, there has been an expansion of the range of actors and expertise within the economic development policy process. Bob Jessop aptly characterizes this transformation in the local state as a shift from government to governance (Jessop, 1997, 36). Engin Isin extends this line of analysis to suggest that municipal politics under advanced liberalism may be characterized as governance without government (Isin, 1998, 175). Both authors are referring to the ways in which the work of governing is carried out through a mixture of new institutional structures such as quasi-public urban development corporations, consultancies, chambers of commerce, boards of trade, business round tables and other private-public initiatives. These new arrangements meld private and public sectors to allow a focus on economic growth while minimizing obstacles. Such obstacles include planning regulations, public participation and social equity considerations. As Lovering points out, the right has long advocated restructuring urban governance in this way. The right has always viewed urban problems as worsened by, if not entirely attributable to, bureaucratic government, and that the solution lies in replacing politicians with managers (Lovering, 1995, 112).

The coordination of different actors within economic development has produced a situation in which previously discrete policy fields are beginning to merge. This is the

case with labour market and social policy domains. Education, environmental and cultural policies have also become more integrated with economic development measures (Mayer, 1994, 319). Creating a positive business climate is no longer simply a matter of reducing costs for business, but rather facilitating a particular quality of life (Mayer, 1991, 115). Quality of life is articulated in economic development circles as a measurement of the general ambiance of a city; including, for example, the physical characteristics of a city such as its built form and environment, the ability of a city to provide a diverse range of cultural and recreational opportunities and other lifestyle amenities.

Urban entrepreneurialism must also be situated in relation to the ascendancy of what has been called the “enterprise culture” (Keat and Abercrombie, 1991). Within enterprise culture, market rationality is privileged as commercial enterprise assumes a paradigmatic status as a model for any form of institutional organization. Moreover, the acquisition of entrepreneurial qualities such as initiative, self-reliance, risk-taking and responsibility are encouraged and constituted as virtues in themselves (Keat and Abercrombie, 1991, 3). In this sense, the enterprise culture is at least as much an ethical and moral project as an economic project.

Subsequent governmentality theorization develops the analysis of enterprise culture through a discussion of advanced liberalism and entrepreneurial subjectivity. Under a regime of advanced liberalism, it is argued that government has been ‘desocialized’ in order to maximize the entrepreneurial conduct of the individual (Rose,

1996, 341). The entrepreneurial subject is the privileged subject under advanced liberalism, possessing the skills of self-governance necessary to become an active individual in the “empire of choice” (Rose, 1999, 269). While the entrepreneurial subject is constituted in a variety of ways, such as the active citizen, the sovereign consumer, and the flexible worker, a number of themes remain constant. The entrepreneurial subject is constituted as highly motivated, competitive, goal setting, risk reducing, and strongly oriented towards free market rewards.

Discourses of enterprise and entrepreneurialism are remarkably elastic and are not only applied to individuals and firms, but to cities as well. Emerging discourses of enterprise culture, enterprise society, innovative milieus, strategic alliances, partnerships, and learning regions play a central role in the reshaping of urban regimes (Jessop, Pick and Tickell, 1999, 152). Within such discourses, cities assume an entrepreneurial economic subjectivity with the capacity to act in an enterprising and entrepreneurial manner (Hunt, 2001, 115). The following passage typifies urban entrepreneurial discourses:

Cities are acting as risk takers and active competitors in the urban economic game, and the key to each city's success is its ability to invest wisely and to market shrewdly. Urban entrepreneurship entails a new breed of municipal official, transcending the traditional local government roles of delivering services and enforcing regulations. The city's entrepreneurial role includes characteristics traditionally viewed as distinct to the private sector, such as risk-taking, inventiveness, self-reliance, profit motivation, and promotion. The bottom line for the public balance sheet is the enhanced competitiveness of the city which is critical to urban rebuilding and economic revitalization. (Duckworth, Simmons and McNulty cited in Leitner and Sheppard, 1998, 296).

The privileging of entrepreneurial discourse is further evidenced in municipal self-representations. Entrepreneurial slogans abound in place marketing literature. New York becomes the, “business city that never sleeps.” Baltimore markets itself as having “more services, more choices.” Kansas City describes itself as “America’s Smart City,” (Short, 1999, 49). Ottawa has also attempted to capture its splendour in the slogan “technically beautiful”

As entrepreneurial discourses assume a privileged status in the political discourse framing urban policy debates, alternative conceptions of the role of urban government, particularly those that emphasize redistributive functions, are delegitimated. Under entrepreneurial modes of local governance, welfare is reconstituted in terms of local economic success, rather than universal entitlements to social services (Cochrane, 1999, 123). This reorientation of local state expenditure towards the inducement of capital investment amounts to a subsidy for capital at the expense of those reliant upon eroding social services. Typically, property-led development projects receive public subsidies in the form of tax rebates, land purchase subsidies, low interest loans, loan guarantees, zoning bonuses and other incentives. Meanwhile, as a result of cutbacks in welfare programs, marginalized social populations are no longer socially incorporated through welfare state social policies such as unemployment benefits, rent subsidies, and welfare payments among others (Mayer, 1991, 109).

With the decrease in mid-salary manufacturing jobs, the occupational structure of the post-industrial city has undergone polarization between two growth sectors. The

first sector includes business and professional services, information technology and media production--in short--what Castells (1989) calls the 'informational' economy. The second sector services the former and is made possible through non-unionized, insecure and part-time labour carried out predominantly by women, racialized minorities, immigrants and other non-citizens. This form of polarization has lead Mayer to invoke the dual city metaphor as the defining feature of the post-industrial city (Mayer, 1991, 106).

The dual city metaphor is reflected in the ways in which urban redevelopment programs tend to completely bypass historically depressed urban areas. Central business districts, consumption zones, tourist bubbles, and gentrified enclaves in entrepreneurial cities receive massive investment in real estate and telecommunications while low-income areas are starved for resources, resulting in a geography of centrality and marginality (Isin, 1998, 269). The forms of regulation and defensive urban design that protect these spaces from perceived threats simultaneously function to isolate racialized ghettos within which poverty has intensified throughout North American and European cities.

Maintaining a distinction between these spaces requires the imposition of a 'revanchist' law and order urban regime (Smith, 1996). As Kipfer and Keil argue, the racialized law-and-order policies of the entrepreneurial city are legitimated through moral panics about crime and urban decline that delegitimize the poor and encourage members of the new urban middle classes to re-align themselves to an economic and

social neo-conservative urban politics (Kipfer and Keil, 2002, 237). Law and order policies of the entrepreneurial city are further evident in the proliferation of punitive measures designed for the poor and others who fail to govern themselves according to the ethical norms of advanced liberalism by choosing to live by charity or state welfare (Valverde, 1996; Rose, 1999). This is most explicitly expressed through the participation of urban regimes in workfare programmes, but also in new forms of legislation that govern the conduct of panhandlers, the homeless and street involved youth. Such policies and trends are a standard response of an entrepreneurial regime to the social fallout occasioned by social polarization. They represent an intensification of governmental practices seeking to regulate the poor, and certainly call into question any simple notion of the 'death of the state.' As Isin argues, "Despite all the rhetoric of the reduction of government and the rollback of the state, advanced liberalism has not abandoned its will to govern but merely shifted its focus and, more importantly, rationalized some old and invented some new techniques of government" (Isin, 1998, 174).

Many urban policy makers are re-evaluating the role that cultural policy can play in strategic economic redevelopment. Indeed, culture has become the business of cities (Zukin, 1995, 2). Urban governments and 'imagineers' are promoting 'high culture' by emphasizing the role that arts festivals, concert halls, galleries and museums play in projecting a city's cultural capital. As Hubbard claims, cultural activities are "paraded in the city's shop window, and now appear as crucial to many city governors as the local

labour market or transport infrastructure in enhancing local competitiveness” (Hall and Hubbard, 1998, 199). Cultural industries and events are seen as providing the basis for the ‘creative city,’ a post-industrial and post-modern mecca catering to the highly skilled and educated knowledge workers associated with economic growth. It is this population that enjoys a wide choice when selecting a city to reside in and may place demands on urban authorities to ensure quality of life. For urban ‘imagineers’ cultivating the right sort of urban quality of life requires the right mixture of high tech amenities, exotic consumption opportunities, mass spectacle and more bohemian flavoured urban fare, set against a historical backdrop of industrial grit (Lloyd and Clark, 2001, 357). The proliferation of trendy loft residential and office real estate in restored industrial warehouses exemplifies the way in which images of the industrial past are recycled for their aesthetic potential in the post-industrial city. Developers are regenerating historical areas in order to offer consumers and residents the opportunity to combine shopping and other leisure activities with a touristic voyeurism into previous historical periods (Zukin, 1991, 51).

Section Two

Toronto’s Entrepreneurial Governance: Forming (and Contesting) the Globally Competitive City

This section addresses the City of Toronto’s shift toward entrepreneurial governance. The City’s economic development policy has always been a site of

struggle. During the seventies, struggle over the direction of economic development took place between the reform movement and pro-growth forces that would eventually champion urban entrepreneurialism. Reform politics were lead by ratepayer groups, working-class neighbourhood organizations, tenant activists and the cooperative movement. This constituency often expressed a strong distaste for the kinds of large-scale development that occurred during the 1960s and early 1970s. When urban reformers assumed office in the late seventies under the Mayoral tenure of John Sewell, the Economic Development Department became a target because of its role in traditional growth machine politics, and was suspended for a period of four years (Todd, 1993, 181). During the eighties, however, pro-growth politics resumed popularity under then-mayor Art Eggleton. The Toronto Economic Development Corporation, founded by Eggleton in 1986, represents a movement away from selective forms of economic development that were focused on retaining manufacturing jobs in certain sectors of Toronto's economy, to more entrepreneurial functions promoting the City's competitiveness through a broad range of tax incentives and services for business, increasingly seen as best practice for retaining investment (Todd, 1993, 183). The phenomenon of international place-based competition for investment and growth has since become firmly established as a priority for the local state and as an element in the local relations of governance (Todd, 1993, 208).

The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement of 1989, followed by North American Free Trade Agreement in 1993, had specific repercussions for Toronto's economy, and

intensified concern over the city's competitive status. Between 1989 and 1994, the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area lost one hundred and thirty thousand manufacturing jobs, forty-five thousand construction industry jobs, and ninety thousand clerical jobs (Bromley, 1994, 3). Approximately two hundred and eighty thousand people were receiving some kind of social assistance in Metro Toronto (Todd, 1993, 174). Although a cyclical recovery was underway by the mid nineties, there was a consensus that the recession was symptomatic of a period of transition toward a fundamentally transformed urban economy. Toronto was no longer atop the urban hierarchy in the east-west national economy, but rather was pushed into a much larger continental, even global urban hierarchy. As well, exurban communities around the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) were boasting much lower commercial property taxes, and were consistently attracting business and people away from the urban centre. Metro Toronto's share of the GTA population declined by twenty-three percent between 1961 and 1991 (Friskin, 1993, 157), giving rise to fears that "Metro Toronto would become the impoverished inner core of a rapidly expanding urban region" (Isin and Wolfson, 1999, 56).

In response to these concerns, the provincial NDP government created the Task Force on the Future of the Greater Toronto Area in April 1995. The Task Force's Report, *Greater Toronto*, advanced a set of recommendations for the enhancement of the region's global competitiveness. Most importantly, *Greater Toronto* advocated the establishment of a region-wide government that would be responsible for coordinating economic development across the GTA in such a way as to coordinate regional

competitiveness and minimize the flight of capital from the urban core to the periphery or beyond. This policy review was appropriated by the Tories when they assumed power later that year with an agenda of government downsizing. The original eighteen-month mandate of the task force was reduced to four months by the new government, and the proposals for restructuring local government were interpreted by the Tories to fit into an agenda of less government (Todd, 1998, 196). Global competitiveness was to be achieved not through a region-wide governance structure responsible for coordinating economic development, but through less government. Amalgamating the City of Toronto, York, East York, North York, Etobicoke and Scarborough into a “megacity” with less government was proposed as a means to that end.

Amalgamation was overwhelmingly unpopular in Metro Toronto, and was rejected by seventy-six percent of voters in a non-binding referendum organized by Metro’s lower tier governments. Public hearings into Bill 103, the City of Toronto Act, drew almost six-hundred presenters, the vast majority of whom spoke passionately against amalgamation (Siemiatycki and Isin, 1997, 87). The imposition of the “megacity” was framed by local activists and left-leaning politicians as a threat to local democracy and Toronto’s sophisticated urbanism. Various groups that came to be known as Citizens For Local Democracy (C4LD) coordinated more militant mobilization against amalgamation. Resistance to amalgamation culminated in the Metro Days of Action, the largest political mobilization in the city’s history. Despite this, Isin refers to the C4LD as a failure not only because of the provincial government’s mode of operation

which made amalgamation a foregone conclusion regardless of how resistant the citizenry became, but also because C4LD failed to create a broad base of support in various suburban constituencies (Isin, 1998, 184).

The amalgamated City of Toronto, which came into being on January 1, 1998, was the outcome of decades of struggle over the political direction of the city. In addition to the slow-growth policies, reformers in the urban center constructed a social safety net that provided an extensive array of social services, far more than those provided by other municipalities in Metro, and particularly more for women, the homeless, the poor, immigrants and other marginalized groups. Prior to amalgamation, the City of Toronto provided the most comprehensive array of services and programmes to assist with immigrant settlement in the Greater Toronto (Wallace and Frisken, 2000). While Toronto was not explicitly mandated to run many of these services, it did so partly because of the left leaning reformist political culture, but also in response to specific needs that arose in the city (Isin and Wolfson, 1999, 69). Seventy-one percent of the GTA's immigrant population settled in the former City of Toronto. In addition, the City of Toronto is home to seventy-five percent of the GTA's social assistance recipients, and sixty-nine percent of the region's families living below the poverty line (City of Toronto, 2001b, 23).

To a certain extent, the social services run by the City served to mitigate the effect of provincial and federal funding cuts, and thus represented an obstacle to the uniform imposition of neoliberal modes of governance that had taken hold in most other

liberal democracies (Isin and Wolfson, 1999, 68). As Isin and Wolfson point out, if the Tories were serious about dismantling the social contract in Ontario, the 'reformist' legacy within the City of Toronto had to be undermined and the city brought into line with other municipalities in Ontario. By 'taking on Toronto,' the Tories may have even gained political capital with their constituencies in suburban and small town Ontario (Isin and Wolfson, 1999, 76).

Amalgamation diluted the left presence on Toronto's city council. As the number of elected representatives on the new megacity council decreased from 106 to 57, the size of the wards increased. Fewer elected councilors representing more people and larger, suburban areas rendered municipal elections more competitive and expensive. The result is the current council which, as Isin and Wolfson claim, is comprised of politicians who are often backed by commercial interests and sympathetic to the needs of big business, especially the development industry (Isin and Wolfson, 1999, 73).

Pro-business and development groups such as the Board of Trade have always supported the amalgamation of Toronto. These groups had the most to benefit from the elimination of local governments, which, through height bylaws and neighborhood preservation plans, had proven to be impediments to unbridled urban growth (Todd, 1998, 205). The significance of amalgamation can be understood, therefore, as a shift in civic regimes.

Amalgamation...(is) part of a conflictual, power-laden process of reshaping urban governance in Toronto. This restructuring of urban governance is driven by an alliance of the strong mayor's office, the city managers in the senior bureaucracy

and the alliance of suburban Councillors and conservative downtown politicians that control City Council. The emerging new political realities at City Hall can be understood as a yet incomplete process of consolidating "the competitive city", a path already traveled by similar global cities (Kipfer and Keil, 2000).

The amalgamation of the City of Toronto in the name of increased global competitiveness has resulted in a local state that increasingly resembles a company. Kipfer and Keil identify several new corporate management principles that have been introduced since amalgamation. These include the "centralization of financial control based on cost-unit accounting, the introducing of market relationships between different city departments, the benchmarking departmental operations to private-sector 'competitors,' decentralizing service delivery into 'customer-focused' 'cost centres,' and the introduction of market pricing of public services such as recreation services" (Kipfer and Keil, 2000).

The Toronto Board of Trade is a leading advocate of this transformation. In the Board's 2002 pre-budget presentation to the City, *Working Together for a Competitive Toronto*, the Board stressed that the City ensure that 2002 collective agreements allow for privatization.

New collective agreements should also provide room for any systemic changes designed to bring cost efficiencies into line with private sector norms. We recognize that many municipal workers equate alternative service delivery (ASD) with "contracting out" and loss of job security.... Successful transitioning from the public to the private sector calls on employees to make a "cultural shift" that is often accompanied by anxiety. It will be important for the city to prepare employees now, well in advance of ASD implementation, by providing background information on the reasons for exploring public-private partnerships. This will help them gain an understanding of the differences between working in the public and private sectors. (Board of Trade, 2002b)

The City's attempts to implement these recommendations during collective bargaining in 2002 resulted in the largest municipal workers strike in Canadian history. Under the guise of averting a public health crisis, the provincial legislature reconvened for an emergency session to introduce back to work legislation. These initiatives, and the resistance they generate, may be understood as part of the contested reconstruction of urban governance toward enhanced urban 'competitiveness.'

While amalgamation has served to entrench urban entrepreneurialism, the business class's dissatisfaction with amalgamation as a solution for consolidating the 'competitive city' has become evident recently with the Toronto Board of Trade's calls for yet another overhauling of Toronto's governance structure. The Toronto Board of Trade, in conjunction with the CEO Forum On Urban Competitiveness, is pressuring the provincial government for a new system of governance that will allow for more streamlined decision-making through a 'strong mayor' leadership model as well as the increased use of private management boards. Restructuring urban governance in this way is viewed as necessary to enforce the 'competitive austerity' measures that amalgamation promised, but never realized.

Immediately following amalgamation, The City of Toronto produced two economic development policy documents, *Toronto Competes: Assessing Toronto's Global Competitiveness* (2000) and the *City of Toronto Economic Development Strategy Paper* (2000), that exemplify the City's new neoliberal urban entrepreneurialism. These

documents construct urban entrepreneurialism as a necessary response to capitalist globalization. *Toronto Competes* begins by stating that “this is an economic context unlike any other Toronto has faced before. Economic development in such a new situation requires both an understanding of the competitive advantage of cities like Toronto and a reorientation of private and public actions to support and extend that advantage” (City of Toronto, 2000a, ii). According to the Report, cities may achieve a competitive status “when they start to understand the market forces driving their economic transition, and realize their strengths and weaknesses in a new competitive context “ (City of Toronto, 2000a, 71). Emerging as a “winner” is entirely dependent upon the degree to which private and public resources are coordinated in economic development. Failure to engage in this competition strategically will result in a downward spiral of “weak competitiveness, disinvestments, emigration and fiscal crisis” (City of Toronto 2000a, 71).

Toronto Competes repeatedly stresses the need for more private sector input in the City’s economic development policy process. The Report states that,

Successful economic development strategies are...characterized by a single important feature, namely, the dominant role of public-private partnerships...Toronto not only needs private sector input to help design or fund its strategies; it needs private sector to take a leading role in adjusting the economy to the new requirements of competition. The City’s first action is to take this analysis to the private sector, in particular to private sector leaders” (City of Toronto, 2000a, 58)

The document can thus be read as advocating, in conjunction with the Board of Trade, a less accountable regime of urban development and governance.⁴

The City's global competitiveness strategies focus mainly on the identification and development of economic clusters to serve as the site of continual innovation and investment. Because Toronto is at an obvious disadvantage in the area of traditional mass-production manufacturing, the clusters cited as the basis of Toronto's economic competitiveness include typical global city industries such as financial services, business and professional services, information technology, telecommunications, media, and tourism (City of Toronto 2000a).

In the economic development texts produced by the City of Toronto, Toronto is depicted as beset by a competitive lag in infrastructure modernization, falling far behind the waves of urban renewal evident in American competitor cities such as Los Angeles, Boston, Chicago, New York, Atlanta, Detroit, Washington, Philadelphia and San Francisco. These cities are held up as the measure of good urban governance in the era of post-industrial redevelopment. American urban policy is applauded for providing generous infrastructure investments from the federal and state governments, facilitating administrative efficiency via the privatization of formerly public services, the implementation of user fees for a wider range of services, and policing practices that make inner cities safe for tourists, gentrifiers and office workers. These factors are cited as the cause of the so-called "urban renaissance" currently sweeping the United States.

⁴ For more on the de-politicization and privatization of urban governance and planning see Keil, 1998.

The high regard for American urban policy in Toronto's economic development policy represents a radical shift from the anti-American undertones of Toronto urban planning to a pro-American urban neoliberalism (Kipfer and Keil, 2002, 252).

Previously, American city planning was typically viewed as resulting in a nightmare of urban decay and wasteful sprawl from which Toronto could be distinguished. An economic development document produced by Metro Toronto in 1994, *An Urban-Centred Economic Strategy for Greater Toronto*, illustrates this point. The document states that it is "alarmist to compare the situation in Metropolitan Toronto to that in major U.S. cities- but that is exactly the point. The situation here is not nearly as problematic, and with a concerted effort we can avoid the entrenched and perhaps insurmountable problems of urban America" (City of Toronto, 1994, 3). The problems of urban America, namely racialized segregation and poverty, are presented as so vast and so entrenched, that a comparison with "Toronto-the-good," presumed to be free of such problems, seems "alarmist." Currently, however, American urban crises previously constituted as "insurmountable" no longer even register in Toronto's neoliberal urban planning discourses. The persistence of hyper-segregation along side spectacular downtown redevelopment in American cities is conveniently ignored.

This recent pro-American urban policy stance gestures towards a declining concern for social polarization. In the City's economic development planning documents, social polarization is constituted as an afterthought to entrepreneurial development; seen merely as potentially undermining the "urban competitiveness" that

entrepreneurial urban authorities seek to cultivate. According to *Toronto Competes*, “the issue of income and social polarization is a *potential* concern for the City that should be *monitored*. Adopting a concerted strategy to include all Torontonians in the knowledge economy will result in enhanced competitiveness, greater prosperity, and a higher quality of life for the future” (City of Toronto, 2000a, 72, emphasis added). Elsewhere in the document, intensifying social polarization is rendered slightly more explicit than a “potential concern” that should be “monitored.” The Report reads, “high levels of income inequality raise the social overhead costs of government... social divisions and tensions associated with income polarization will ultimately affect the City’s quality of life, a key ingredient to competitiveness” (City of Toronto, 2000a, 29).

Statements in these documents regarding the need to include the “least advantaged” in the “knowledge economy” are framed not in terms of equality and social justice, but rather within a neoliberal rationality of enhancing competitiveness and reducing social overhead costs of government. Within these documents, the uneven form of entrepreneurial economic development is never implicated in the production of social polarization and poverty. The trickle-down theory of urban development prevalent in these documents continues to deflect attention from social displacement, rent inflation, and polarizing employment patterns that stem, in part, from the City’s economic strategies.

While the City of Toronto rehashes a trickle down economics in policy documents, Toronto’s poverty rate continues to grow. The poverty rate in Toronto stood

at twenty three percent for the year 2000 while the national average was nineteen percent (United Way, 2002, 14). The median income in Toronto's twelve poorest neighbourhoods declined by more than fifteen percent, and the median income in Toronto's twelve wealthiest neighbourhoods increased by ten percent. Also, while one hundred thousand people wait for social housing in Toronto, the price of one bedroom rental units have increased in price by six percent annually over the past decade (Board of Trade, 2002a). This trend reflects the imposition of neoliberal social and economic policies in conjunction with the entrenchment of low-wage employment in the service sector (Kipfer and Keil, 2000).

Section Three **Branding Toronto**

Entrepreneurial economic development in Toronto is now seen as much more than a matter of reducing business costs. As Mayer states, "instead of luring investors into the city with tax cuts and reduced governmental regulations, the new municipal economic development programmes...encompass strategies to enhance the city's over all ambience" (Mayer, 1991, 115). The sources of competitiveness outlined in the City's *Economic Development Strategy Report* include not only the cost of doing business, skilled labour and infrastructure, but also less tangible criteria such as quality of life that reference urban ambience. Quality of life concerns are outlined further in *Toronto Competes*,

Highly skilled, innovative and entrepreneurial knowledge-economy workers are very much in demand and highly mobile. As trade barriers fall and special provisions within NAFTA allow easier movement of skilled labour across international borders, knowledge workers have a high degree of choice and flexibility in determining which city they would like to live. Often this decision is based on a number of factors, not just related to the work itself, but to quality of life. The quality of life a city has to offer is an important factor determining its ability to attract knowledge workers that drive the new economy (City of Toronto, 2000a, 67).

Quality of life is continually cited as one of the City of Toronto's key strengths and is instrumentalized for the purposes of promoting Toronto (Kipfer and Keil, 2002, 249). The meanings currently associated with quality of life in Toronto's urban planning discourse are qualitatively different from previous reformist articulations that emphasized social welfare concerns. As Ley remarks, "the slogan of quality of life has remained, but has been substantially emptied of its redistributive content...The key terms of reform politics - quality of life, public space - no longer mean what they used to. The discourse of the 1970s is retained largely as a rhetorical gesture" (Ley, 1996, 29).

In the current context of urban entrepreneurialism, quality of life operates as a rhetorical trope used to legitimate neoliberal urbanization, and signifies the degree to which commuters, tourists and the inner-city gentry can enjoy urban lifestyles without being disturbed by signs of destitution and poverty (Kipfer and Keil, 2000). Maintaining quality of life for select constituencies in the midst of social polarization and poverty requires the imposition of revanchist policies. Throughout the nineties, police budgets were largely exempt from the fiscal austerity programmes that undermined municipal funding of social services. In fact, social policy advocates routinely claimed that

resources were channelled out of social programmes such as daycare and funnelled into policing budgets (Swainson, 1995, A4).

Moreover, by actively complying with provincial welfare policies, the City of Toronto has been instrumental in carrying out the neoliberal restructuring of social assistance resulting in a punitive workfare regime. Also, with the strong support of the City's administration, the Ontario government in 1999 passed the Safe Streets Act. According to the official press release produced by the Ministry of the Attorney General, the legislation aims to "protect the public's ability to use the streets and other public spaces without intimidation... The proposed legislation makes illegal squeegeeing; aggressive panhandling and other types of solicitation and panhandling" (Ministry of the Attorney General, 1999). The official rationale of the legislation relies upon a distinction between the public and the growing body of non-public others who are seen as disrupting urban quality of life. The central component to the Safe Streets Act, however, is the license it affords to police officers, who are now empowered to arrest if only for identification.

The Safe Streets Act was implemented in conjunction with a new policing initiative known as Community Action Policing. Framed in the rhetoric of community policing, CAP sought to intensify the policing of certain areas in Toronto, and came to be known as targeted policing. Initiatives such as the Safe Streets Act and CAP exemplify a "law and order" response to neoliberal restructuring, and function to criminalize a broad section of Toronto's population including low income people, people

of colour, Aboriginal peoples, the homeless, youth, queer people and psychiatric survivors (Committee To Stop Target Policing, 2000).

The political and economic restructuring that transformed the city during the nineties is now accompanied by a symbolic restructuring of Toronto as a global city. Increasing emphasis is placed on the staging of Toronto's cultural capital. The *Economic Development Strategy Report* identifies the "branding of Toronto both locally and globally" (City of Toronto, 2000b, 107), as a strategic area for future economic policy. This branding, it is argued, must take place in two ways. The first is through the cultivation of a global presence and profile through urban image enhancement. The Report reiterates that image enhancement will allow Toronto to assert a competitive advantage vis-à-vis other cities since "the attraction of the mobile capital and intellectual labour that drives economic development is highly dependent on making that region an attractive place to be" (City of Toronto, 2000b, 10). Considered a top priority in strategic redevelopment, the Report calls for the administration to "invest in design excellence to make buildings, facilities and spaces inspiring and memorable" (City of Toronto, 2000b, 85). There are currently several urban spectacularization projects underway, including the Yonge-Dundas project modeled after Times Square and the Royal Ontario Museum overhaul, among others.

In addition to urban aestheticization, a second and related aspect of branding called for in the Report is the facilitation of tourism to "support Toronto's unique

identity”(City of Toronto, 2000b, 108). According to the *Economic Development Strategy Report*,

We need to appreciate how uniquely wonderful a city Toronto is - to celebrate our successes, of which we have many - and to share our story with the world. Toronto should host major international events, such as the Olympics, and World Expositions, conventions and congresses, World Youth Days and International Aids Conferences to show off our city to world audiences...to actively promote and ‘brand’ Toronto, locally and around the world as a vital, globally connected, centre of innovation, creativity, excellence and investment opportunities (City of Toronto, 2000b, 73).

In order to enhance Toronto’s unique identity, the Report advocates the celebration and support of “arts and culture as a key industry within the City and as the epicenter of creativity that inspire ideas and innovation in many fields and an important factor in retaining and attracting knowledge workers” (City of Toronto, 2000b, 63). The Report calls for the creation of an Official culture plan “with a vision and strategies designed to enhance Toronto’s position as a leading cultural centre and build an internationally competitive industry that creates quality jobs and attracts new investment to the City” (City of Toronto, 2000b, 84). The use of cultural policy to further economic development reflects Mayer’s (1991) contention that entrepreneurial urban governance blurs the traditional boundaries between different policy areas as urban governments combine and coordinate new resources in the proactive pursuit of business investment.

In response to the recommendation outlined in the *Economic Development Strategy Report*, the City’s Cultural Division produced a strategy paper, *The Creative*

City: A Culture Workprint, outlining the City of Toronto's culture plan. Arts and culture are treated as means to the end of civic boosterism. Mimicking entrepreneurial economic policy documents, *The Creative City* reiterates narratives of entrepreneurial competitiveness and globalization. The document immediately invokes neoliberal narratives of the brain drain as the goal of the culture plan is to "position Toronto as a creative city, a leading international cultural capital that keeps it brightest and best at home while putting out a siren call to the rest of the world" (City of Toronto, 2001a, 2). Even more explicitly neoliberal are the references to inter-urban competition as the reader is reminded that "from various studies conducted already, we have learned that Toronto is the leading engine of the Canadian Economy...our cultural communities and creative industries are key elements that give Toronto a competitive advantage in the global market place"(City of Toronto, 2001a, 2).

Remarkably absent from the culture plan is a recognition of the intrinsic value of cultural industries and the arts outside of the project of civic boosterism. The Report offers little in the way of substantive recommendations for improving the poor state of arts funding. Instead, the culture plan's explicit focus is the symbolic reconstruction of the city. According to the culture plan, cultural policy "really boils down to one question: how do we transform ourselves into a productive, creative attractive global city with a sharply delineated vital identity?" (City of Toronto, 2001a, 20). Recommendations include "selling Toronto to ourselves and the world," through strategic investment in, and commodification of, district neighbourhoods and urban festivals. In another section

titled “Telling The Toronto Story”, the Plan advocates the establishment of a museum that would function as a “research institute and tourist destination where the Toronto story is told” (City of Toronto, 2001a, 15).

Section Four Unity of Vision?

A rich body of literature exists to account for the ways in which dominant actors and groups advancing urban entrepreneurialism manipulate the universe of political discourse framing urban policy debates in order to reconcile the narrow interests which underpin a local accumulation strategy with a wider set of actors and material interests (Hunt, 2001, 117). This process is the subject of Molotch’s *The City as Growth Machine* (1976) and later in Logan and Molotch’s *Urban Fortunes* (1987). Logan and Molotch define growth coalitions as a group of local elites, including politicians and bureaucrats, rentiers, property interests and other business groups. The coalition exists to shape local politics in ways that will facilitate the growth of the local economy and the accumulation of wealth. More specifically, growth coalitions view urban space as primarily a commodity and work to maximize the exchange value of the land and the rental income it generates. However, this agenda often functions against the wishes of local residents wanting to preserve and enhance the use value of the land as a place of living. Hence, Logan and Molotch identify value free growth as the central ethic and ideology espoused by locally hegemonic growth coalitions in order to negotiate the tension between these

factions. By this the authors are referring to the ways in which pro-growth ideologues tend to de-emphasize the relation between economic growth and exchange values such that large-scale development is seen to benefit everybody. According to the authors, “the overall ideological thrust is to de-emphasize the connection between economic growth and exchange values and to reinforce the link between growth goals and better lives for the majority” (Logan and Molotoch, 1987, 62).

Cox and Mair’s (1988) discussion of the politics of local economic development extends the analysis of local hegemony by looking more closely at the ways in which pro-growth ideology or urban propaganda projects are deployed by local hegemonic growth coalitions. According to Cox and Mair, urban propaganda projects strategically invoke representations of community and civic Pride that downplay race and class cleavages, and draw on local histories, cultures and images. Consisting of a range of discourses and practices such as civic jingoism, discourses of place promotion and civic pride, flagship projects and festival events, urban propaganda projects organize the legitimacy of urban capitalist elites and the uneven forms of economic development they advance. According to Cox, they “provide the necessary degree of unity behind the programme of the growth coalition...an appeal to a local identity that can be realized by marching behind the banner of ‘progress’ and ‘modernity’ in the direction of a ‘national profile’ or even becoming ‘a major league city’” (Cox, 1999, 22).

In economic development documents and subsequent policy discourse, Toronto is represented as “our” city and its success within the competitive context of globalization

up to “us.” This discursive strategy is utilized to enforce the idea that we all benefit from the direction the city is moving in, and is standard practice in hegemonic pro-growth politics. Among the criteria that are said to enhance urban competitiveness, the unity of vision assumes equal importance along side quality of life and cultivating a good business climate. The *Economic Development Strategy Report* reads, “[i]t is increasingly recognized that the degree to which the residents and decision-makers of a region share a common vision, and act consistently according to that common vision, is a significant factor determining the competitiveness of that region” (City of Toronto, 2000b, 19). The Report calls for the implementation of “policies, programs and initiatives that will foster economic growth and improve our quality of life by establishing a common vision and broad base of support [for economic development policy]” (City of Toronto, 2000b, 119).

Furthermore, the framing of entrepreneurial economic development in terms of urban vibrancy and quality of life is a discursive strategy that further marginalizes and disqualifies dissent. To articulate resistance to the current form and direction of economic development is to speak out against a vibrant Toronto, against quality of life, and ultimately all the narratives of progress and renewal typically mobilized to sustain the momentum of entrepreneurial global city formation. While the construction of a debt and deficit crisis in the eighties and nineties provided a forceful rationalization for neoliberal social and economic policy at the federal and provincial levels, ideologues of urban competitiveness are now utilized to support neoliberal policy at the urban level.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to outline the emergence of entrepreneurial modes of urban governance. There is a consensus among urban geographers that the collapse of the Fordist-Keynesian national economic system, and the related processes of capitalist globalization, has undermined the stability of regional and urban economies. Under the current post-Fordist system, cities are engaged in competition with each other for the kinds of investment that will secure their position within a global economy. Urban entrepreneurialism is largely concerned with the cultivation of a distinctive urban profile. This involves the creation of spectacular urban spaces, the reprioritization of events-led planning, and the projection of a post-industrial, post-modern urban cosmopolitanism.

The City of Toronto is in the midst of an experiment in entrepreneurial urban governance. Amalgamation marks a major turning point in this endeavour, reducing the left presence on city council, and hastening the implementation of corporate management principles in the public service. The subsequent pro-growth “megacity” regime has elevated discourses and practices of urban entrepreneurialism to a hegemonic status. Increasingly, economic imperatives of urban competitiveness are the premise upon which economic, social and cultural policy is formed. The documents cited in this chapter consistently reiterate demands for the City to mobilize its economic, political and cultural capital in order to upgrade Toronto’s status in the global economy. Yet, as Todd

warns, when urban planning initiatives are oriented towards adjusting urban governance to the market, less attention is paid to broader questions concerning equity and democratic accountability (Todd, 1998, 194). The City of Toronto's regime of urban governance is characterized by less democratically accountable forms of semi-private governance and the further entrenchment of neoliberal social and economic policies that contribute to the intensification of social polarization. Meanwhile, new discourses and practices proliferate, aiming to imagineer the City of Toronto as rich in cultural capital and as a bastion of multicultural tolerance and diversity.

Chapter Two

Pride Politics in Toronto

Over one million people attended Pride Toronto festivities in 2002 (Immen, 2002, A1). Pride Toronto's finale, a four-hour parade winding through the heart of downtown Toronto, has evolved into one of the largest queer cultural celebrations in the world. Undoubtedly, the current massive scale of Pride Toronto would have been inconceivable for organizers of the first Gay Day picnic held far out of public view on Toronto Island over thirty years ago.

This chapter provides an outline of the historical development of Pride Toronto in order to contextualize subsequent developments in the production and reception of the event. The chapter begins with a discussion of notions of visibility within queer social movement praxis. I note how Pride events have evolved into an important venue for queer visibility and for resisting the spatial organization of heterosexual hegemony. The chapter then turns toward the historical evolution of Pride events in Toronto from 1971 onward. I describe Pride Toronto's origins as a gathering of gay and lesbian liberation activists, and outline the struggle undertaken by activists for official recognition in the form of a municipal proclamation. Additionally, this chapter addresses early forms of commercialization and the various criticisms of the event that became increasingly vocal in the early nineties.

Section One

The Politics of Queer Visibility

Pride events such as Pride Toronto represent a critical venue for staging queer visibility. It is not possible to understand the centrality of Pride events within queer social movement praxis without a discussion of the politics of queer visibility.

Notions of visibility enjoy wide currency within lesbian, gay and queer social movement politics. While different political and theoretical formulations come in and out of fashion, an emphasis on visibility remains constant within efforts to assert the existence of queer identities and communities. Metaphors of visibility were certainly central to gay liberation discourse and practice throughout the seventies. Visibility was an imperative as homosexual identity was to be avowed publicly until it was no longer a shameful secret but a legitimately recognized way of being in the world (Jagose, 1997,38). The accent on visibility – encapsulated in slogans such as “Out and Proud” signified the belief that visibility is a source of power (Fraser, 1999, 114). Coming out of the closet, a place hidden from view, into an “authentic” and “visible” gay or lesbian identity was framed as a revolutionary act.

Partly because of the forceful reassertion of neo-conservative politics, the AIDS crisis, as well as new opportunities for the articulation of gay and lesbian equality rights, the more politically modest ethnic model of gay and lesbian identity eclipsed the politics of liberation during the early eighties. This ethnic model of gay and lesbian politics took from gay liberation a conception of an essential identity and the need to render that

identity visible. Gay or lesbian visibility was not, however, framed by revolutionary narratives. Rather, gay and lesbian visibility was constituted as a means to social and political enfranchisement.

Within the ethnic model of identity, representation became a crucial field upon which political battles were to be waged. A new emphasis emerged around the “proper” forms of lesbian and gay visibility that had assimilationist undertones. The equation of “positive” lesbian and gay visibility with social and political enfranchisement has produced a new form of queer activism. Countless groups have emerged across the West to keep track of gay and lesbian visibility in the media and advocate for “positive” representations. In Canada, during the nineties, a number of organizations have sprung into action, including Halifax-GWM (Gays Watching the Media), OutSpoken in Vancouver, and the GLB Media Watch Foundation in Ottawa. Whereas visibility signifies empowerment, a lack of visibility is constituted as a form of disenfranchisement. For example, Fraser cites an organization of bisexuals mobilizing around the slogan “invisibility is how we experience oppression” (Fraser, 1999, 115).

Queer theory offered a reformulation of the ways in which strategies of power and resistance are deployed. In contrast to liberationist or ethnic models that affirm identity, queer theory and politics began to question and resist identity categories and their promise of political efficacy (Jagose, 1997, 91). This reflected a deepened understanding of the discursive structures and representational systems that maintain and reproduce the underpinnings of heterosexist privilege (Halperin, 1995, 32). A politics

around 'gay is good' or 'positive representations' was not sufficiently sophisticated to account for, and counter, the intensification of gay and lesbian scapegoating that occurred through the eighties and early nineties. New theorizations that built on the tenets gay liberation, yet critically reconceived the way in which homophobic discourses were deployed and heterosexual privilege maintained, were necessary. This involved an increasingly nuanced political analysis that not only identified homophobia, but explicated the much more subtle social practices that contribute to the reproduction of heteronormativity. The term heteronormativity entered into discourse to address the "institutions, structures of understanding and practical orientations that make heterosexuality seem not only coherent, that is organized as a sexuality, but also privileged" (Berlant and Warner, 1993, 355).

Despite the novelty that seemed to characterize queer theory and activism throughout the nineties, queer politics was still a politics organized around the production of visibility in the face of what Butler refers to as an the "epistemic blindness to homosexuality" (Butler, 1993, 232). Throughout the nineties, organizations such as Queer Nation, Lesbian Avengers and Act Up (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power) pursued visibility activism through a range of practices seeking to insert queer visibility into everyday spaces such as shopping malls, streets and sporting venues. Butler's widely circulated theorization of gender and heterosexuality as performative effects of reiterative acts led to a premium being place on the visibly queer body as a site of agency and subversion. Queer body modification, androgyny, transgenderism, and the parodic

reiteration of butch or femme gender identities (realized through drag for example) are often cited as destabilizing the discursive production of heteronormativity. The aim of more recent queer visibility activism, however, is not to include queers in heteronormative social structures, but to continually pressure and expose such structures as heteronormative (Hennessy, 2002, 36).

Section Two

Pride Events and Queer Visibility

Pride events serve as a critical site for the production of queer visibility. No longer restricted to major urban centres, Pride events now provide opportunities for smaller, more vulnerable queer communities to articulate themselves. Pride events now take place in Victoria, Windsor, London, St John, St. John's, Kelowna,⁵ Nanaimo, Prince George, Kitchener-Waterloo, Kingston, Yellowknife, Sudbury and Charlottetown, in addition to events in larger cities. The staging of Pride in smaller cities typically involves sidewalk processions and community picnics. Yet, there is nothing quaint about these events. As Warner argues, Pride events symbolize the celebration of queer sexuality and challenge heterosexual hegemony in a local context by exposing heterosexism and homophobia (Warner, 2002, 348). In an interview, Gary Kinsman placed Pride events at the centre of Canadian lesbian and gay movement building and community formation. "They have played a crucial historical role in the development of

⁵ For a detailed analysis of media coverage of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day in Kelowna, see Stone 2001.

movement organizing by providing a context for people to come out and find out about other queer people, and by providing for a moment of celebration in the context of oppression and violence” (Kinsman, December 2002).

The visible and public celebration of queer sexuality that Pride events entail serves to disrupt the spatial organization of heterosexual hegemony. This refers to the ways in which public spaces are constructed and reproduced as heteronormative in ways rarely noticed by those who conform to hetero-norms. The spatial organization of heterosexual hegemony relies upon a private/public dichotomy. For example, the cliché that queers can do whatever they want in private, provided they do not flaunt their sexuality in public, reflects a hegemonic or “common sense” understanding of space which mobilizes the private/public dichotomy to marginalize queer sexuality. The public/private mode of queer marginalization serves as a means to negotiate the contradictory demands of pseudo-tolerant liberal morality. To paraphrase Gary Kinsman, queer sexuality may be tolerated in a highly confined “private” social space, while preserving heterosexual hegemony in the broadly defined public sphere (Kinsman, 1996, 258). In temporarily transforming urban space into queer space, Pride events are crucial in disrupting this process.

Along with struggles to have sexual orientation included in human rights codes as a prohibited grounds of discrimination, securing municipal proclamations of lesbian and gay Pride days represents an attempt to have the existence of lesbian and gay movements and communities officially recognized, and the forms of discrimination they face

officially and publicly condemned. This represents perhaps the most contentious aspect of Pride organizing. In many cases, municipalities have been less than willing to recognize local queer communities through Pride proclamations. The symbolic significance attached to municipal proclamations of Pride events is underscored by the fact that obtaining proclamations regularly involves drawn out litigation in human rights tribunals complete with impassioned testimony from “expert witnesses” and other interveners arguing both for and against Pride proclamations.

One such example took place in London Ontario in 1995. That year, Mayor Dianne Haskett found herself embroiled in a high profile dispute with local queer activists after rejecting a request for a Pride Week proclamation. Haskett initially rationalized her decision as in the interests of local queers who, she claimed, would be subject to a backlash. A local activist then filed a complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission. During the ensuing inquiry, Haskett admitted that her decision to refuse to proclaim Pride was based on her religious views of homosexuality rather than any concern with an anti-queer backlash. Haskett was quoted as saying that homosexuality is “against God’s will...I don’t believe it’s the best way, the way that was intended. I know that people fall into it. I don’t condemn them, but it’s not the way God intended and I believe people should be set free from that.” Haskett further stated that making a proclamation of Pride Week would require her to, “turn (her) back on God” (Haskett cited in Money, 1997a, 22).

The enquiry served to disclose the depth and extent of homophobic beliefs held by the Mayor, validating Warner's contention that Pride events have been crucial methods of exposing homophobia. The Commission eventually ruled against the Mayor and ordered the City to "make a statement of recognition that the lesbian and gay and bisexual communities are integral and important communities within the City of London and that the City make a commitment to investigate ways of fostering a positive relationship between the City of London and the gay, lesbian and bisexual communities" (OHRC ruling cited in Money, 1997b, 17). In protest of this ruling, Haskett took a three-week unpaid leave of absence in total seclusion.

Many mayors have learned from the London episode not to invoke religious values when refusing proclamations. Instead, municipal officials have begun to deploy populist appeals decrying a militant gay and lesbian minority forcing an agenda upon a resistant public. For example, when Fredericton mayor Brad Woodside refused to recognize the local Pride event in 1997, two groups (Fredericton Lesbians And Gays and the New Brunswick Coalition For Human Rights Reform) filed a complaint with the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission. When the Commission ruled in favor of these organizations, Woodside announced that his freedom of speech was in danger and that it "is a travesty to order somebody to make a statement they do not believe" (Woodside cited in Jiminez, 1998). Similarly, Kelowna Mayor Walter Gray offered to declare "Gay Day" but refused to include the term "Pride." According to the Mayor, including the term Pride amounted to a violation of his freedom of expression, as he did

not approve of homosexuality. Instead of issuing the proclamation, Gray decided to stop issuing proclamations of any sort (Warner, 2002, 351). The president of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities also entered into the fray when he announced that gays and lesbians were “two percent of the population... trying to force their agenda down the throats of the rest of society” (Schmal cited in Edelson, 1995).

These episodes have become typical across the country. Proclamations remain an important area of struggle, especially in smaller areas where these proclamations have not been made or are resisted by officials. The following section describes the evolution of Pride events in Toronto from a small gathering of gay and lesbian liberation activists to a major urban festival.

Section Three

Producing Queer Visibility in Toronto...The Early Years

Pride events in Toronto can be traced back to 1971, when the University of Toronto Homophile Association, Toronto Gay Action Now and the Community Homophile Association of Toronto organized a Gay Day Picnic in order to raise funds to send activists to a demonstration in Ottawa. In Ottawa, these organizations would join with a number of other organizations to articulate a set of demands to the federal government.⁶ These demands included amendments to the criminal code to further

⁶ Organizations participating in the Ottawa demonstration included Montreal’s Front de Libération Homosexuel, Guelph University’s Homophile Association, the Vancouver Gay Activist Alliance, the

decriminalize consensual homosexual sex, ending the discrimination of gays and lesbians in the areas of housing and employment, and lifting the ban on gays and lesbians in the RCMP and the Army (Warner, 2002, 76).

In 1972, the Gay Day Picnic was held as part of an expanded series of events known as the first Gay Pride Week. Gay Pride Week included a Pride dance, a film night and what is considered to be the first Gay Pride March to Queens Park. The following year, Pride Week organizers were emboldened enough to ask Toronto Mayor David Crombie to recognize the event through a municipal proclamation. Such recognition was denied, as was permission to march on Yonge Street.

Pride Week garnered mainstream media coverage for the first time in 1974, when, without permission, approximately one hundred activists marched across College Street to Queen's Park. The *Globe and Mail* falsely reported gay and lesbian marchers as "beating a hasty retreat" from the police presence that awaited the marchers at the provincial legislature (Pride Toronto, 2002). In addition to citing the 1974 march as the beginning of an ongoing practice whereby mainstream newspapers distort the Pride Parade by "stereotyping its participants and misidentifying its goals," Wallace argues that the nationally publicized 1974 march forced into public discourse the acknowledgement of a sexual minority claiming human rights (Wallace, 2002, 8).

No events were organized from 1975 to 1981, except for Gay Days in August of 1978, planned by a lesbian and gay liberation organization, Liberated Energy, and members of the Lesbian Organization of Toronto. This period was characterized by the mobilization of the new right, and the importation of a virulently homophobic family values movement that was consolidating in the United States. Numerous “pro-family” organizations such as Renaissance, Metro’s Moral Majority, Positive Parents, the League Against Homosexuals and the Pro-Family Coalition became active in Toronto, determined to stem the lesbian and gay equality movement. Ross cites a lesbian activist who captures the political climate of the period by stating, “[t]he forces trying to push us back into the closet of the nuclear family, taking away our children, denying us jobs, harassing us on the streets are getting stronger...and this backlash makes it a lot harder to survive. It also makes things a lot clearer as to who we are and who our enemies are” (Gottlieb cited in Ross, 1995, 218).

Social conservative organizations were successful in forcing mainstream politicians at both the municipal and provincial levels to renege what moderate support for gay and lesbian human rights existed and assume a “family values” platform. Those politicians who continued to publicly support lesbian and gay rights were subject to intense targeting. Warner cites one widely distributed Positive Parents leaflet which announced that “an NDP sign on your lawn means that you support homosexuals” (Positive Parents cited in Warner, 2002, 140).

The right wing backlash in Toronto involved several key events. In 1978, *The Body Politic*, an influential gay liberation publication based in Toronto, was raided and charged under Section 164 of the Criminal Code for the "use of the mails to transmit immoral, indecent and scurrilous material" after an article on youth sexuality and the age of consent scandalized readers both in and out of the gay and lesbian community. The timing of the article is important since only a few months earlier, the murder of a youth in a Yonge Street establishment incited a full-blown moral panic, amplified through the media and the police, that came to be known as the "clean up Yonge Street campaign." Yonge Street, and its developing gay and lesbian community, came to be blamed for the murder during a moral panic that would have "a lasting effect, defining the political terrain for discussions of the character of the city, Young Street, sexual permissiveness, prostitution and homosexuality for years to come" (Kinsman, 1996, 338).

In addition to these events, Toronto police raided The Barracks bathhouse in 1978, arresting twenty-three men. Immediately after the Barracks raid, the Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC) was formed to mobilize against the repressive policing of gay sexuality. With the exception of the Right to Privacy Committee, the lack of public outcry against the Barracks raid empowered the police to end a period of grudging toleration in which bath owners negotiated "deals" to keep police away. At this point in time, police began to utilize bawdyhouse laws more systematically against gay establishments in an effort exclude gays and lesbians from any place to congregate in the city.

With a title that signified the cleansing of homosexuality from the social body, "Operation Soap" was the culmination of a six-month investigation carried out by the Toronto Police Force, the Police Intelligence Bureau and the Attorney General's Office. On the evening of February 5 1981, one hundred and fifty police officers raided four bathhouses. Over three hundred men were charged as bawdy-house "found-ins" during the largest mass arrest since the War Measures Act was implemented in 1970. Evidence of police brutality immediately surfaced. The immediate response to the raids was unexpected by both gay and lesbian organizers and the police. Three thousand people took to the streets in a spontaneous protest. "Operation Soap" was condemned by queers, feminists, unions, civil libertarians, some religious groups, progressive members of city council and other organizations of the mainstream left as a vindictive and unwarranted assault. The Right To Privacy Committee organized major demonstrations and press conferences, produced widely circulated reports for different levels of government, and helped move gay (and to a lesser extent lesbian) political issues from the margin toward the centre of municipal affairs. As well, the Right To Privacy Committee was highly successful at defending individuals charged under bawdyhouse legislation; of those arrested in bath raids between 1978 and 1981, nearly ninety percent were acquitted (McCaskell, 1988, 143).

During this period, gays and lesbians with no previously expressed political consciousness were enlisted into militant activism, releasing a tremendous surge of energy in the years after 1981 (Grube, 1997, 143). In the midst of a newly coalesced gay

and lesbian community, a number of other gay and lesbian activist organizations were formed. Gays and Lesbians Against the Right Everywhere (GLARE) was formed to organize against social conservatives through such actions as leafleting in neighbourhoods and staging demonstrations. GLARE was known as an ultra-leftist, feminist and anti-racist organization. Another group, Lesbians Against the Right (LAR), emerged from a lesbian rally in 1981, sharing the radical political orientation of GLARE while seeking to define a lesbian presence in Toronto.⁷ However, neither GLARE nor LAR ever attained the status afforded to the Right to Privacy Committee, which was dominated by white gay men organizing around a more clearly defined sexual libertarian focus. Both GLARE and LAR were subject to a significant degree of red baiting from many gay business owners and other members of the gay and lesbian community (Kinsman, December 2002).

Despite GLARE's more marginal position within Toronto's emergent gay and lesbian community, the organization took a leading role in the planning of Lesbian and Gay Pride Days when members decided to reinitiate the celebratory events that had occurred sporadically through the seventies. Kyle Rae, a former member of GLARE and an early Pride organizer recalled in an interview that, "at one point we stood back and said, 'we're out every weekend opposing the police, city hall, and the

⁷ As Becki Ross indicates, many other organizations became active at this time. Such organizations include the Gay Community Council, Gay Community Appeal, Gay Counselling Centre, the Lesbian and Gay History Group, Take Back the Night, and Political Lesbians United Against the Media, among others (Ross, 1995, 201).

province...constantly protesting.' It was time to stand back and celebrate rather than keep reacting to the state" (Rae, December 2002).

Whereas previous Gay Day events were held in August to commemorate Trudeau's retreat from the nation's bedrooms in 1969, Lesbian and Gay Pride Day 1981 was moved to a June date in order to be integrated into a larger circuit of American Pride events commemorating the Stonewall raids in New York. Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Toronto was legally incorporated and fifteen hundred people turned out to a picnic in Grange Park in downtown Toronto. In an interview, Gay Kinsman stated:

The first Pride event was obviously designed to be a celebration, but it was clear it had a different character than a celebration... because of all the booths that existed, to provide a context for movement organizing, and to address the divisions between gay men and lesbians at that time. Pride Day was consciously used as a day to build a movement, and a day to build community organizations and to get people involved in political campaigns (Kinsman, December 2002).

Attendance almost doubled the following year when twenty-seven hundred turned out for the picnic in Grange Park only to find it too soaked for use: for unexplained reasons the park's sprinkling system had been left on throughout the previous night (Wallace, 2002, 12). This soaking was all the more suspicious given that Grange Park area residents had been complaining about the congregation of gays and lesbians in their neighbourhood, fearing that the picnic and parade would become an annual event. City Councillor John Sewell successfully had the event barred from that park through a legal

technicality.⁸ Thus, the nomadic event was relocated in 1983 to the University of Toronto campus before being “brought home” (Rae, December 2002) to Church Street in 1984. The newly constructed Cawthra Park on Church Street provided a space for eight thousand attendees to partake in celebrations. As Kyle Rae pointed out, “prior to that year there was no green space (on Church Street). There was no opportunity to come together for a picnic or celebration, and with the creation of the park on the north side of the 519 Church Street Community Centre, we then created a space” (Rae, December 2002).

1985’s theme, “Coming Together” was indeed predictive. Rae expanded Pride Day beyond the confines of Cathraw Park by securing a municipal permit to close off Church Street as gay space. Valverde and Cirak outline the significance of this moment:

It may not be too far fetched to see that 1985 permit-getting activity as the end of the era of spontaneous street marches and physical fights with police - the end of that first era, and the beginning of the contemporary Toronto gay/lesbian movement, a movement characterized by excellent commercial, public-relations, legal and bureaucratic know-how. What might appear to the average news consumer as a spontaneous outburst of celebratory energy is the carefully assembled product of numerous regulations and clever manoeuvres to use or circumvent those regulations (Valverde and Cirak, 2003, 110).

The movement of Pride events from Grange Park to Church Street in the early eighties also represents an important shift toward the commercialization of Pride events. By that time, Church Street was becoming a major centre for white gay male commercial establishments. According to Kinsman, the relocation of Pride within the context of

⁸ Sewell had said that gay and lesbian Pride day was not a neighbourhood event, but a regional event, and

white gay male consumer spaces introduced “a gradual shift away from more activist political commitments to a much more vague politics of celebrating ‘community’” (Kinsman, December 2002). Reflecting the partial privatization of Pride Day occasioned by the event’s new location on Church Street, Kinsman added that “Pride became about constructing an image of being gay that was defined by the commercial establishments we hung out in and the things that we consumed” (Kinsman, December 2002). This early development had detrimental consequences for those not reflected in this new location, primarily women, queers of colour and those unable to consume in such venues.

Another early pivotal moment in the commercialization of Pride Day occurred shortly after 1987’s festivities, when the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee voted to pursue corporate sponsorship as a means of fund raising. Soon after that decision was made, a major debate occurred over a licensing arrangement negotiated between the Committee and Molson’s Beer. Molson’s held the brewing rights for Coors beer, which provided funds for the Moral Majority and numerous conservative Senators in the United States. Simultaneously, Coors was involved in a marketing campaign to court gay drinkers and had even sought to sponsor New York City’s Gay Pride Day. Queer activists in the United States responded by mounting a boycott of Coors products. Various groups in Canada, such as the Lesbian Dance Committee in Toronto, began boycotting Molson’s (deemed “Coors Canadian Pimps”) in a demonstration of solidarity.

only neighbourhood events could take place in Grange Park (Rae, 2002).

The Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee did not follow suit, prompting *Rites Magazine*, the local gay and lesbian publication at the time, to editorialize that the “Pride Day Committee had been bought off by a corporate entity,” and that this was evidence of “a clear deviation from progressive politics and organizing” (*Rites* editorial, 1987, 7). Variations of this criticism have been reiterated against Pride Toronto ever since and are discussed in detail in chapter four.

Despite the growing popularity of the event, and the legitimization afforded by the procurement of municipal permits and corporate sponsorship, Toronto Mayor Art Eggleton consistently refused to proclaim Pride Day. In a letter to the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee in 1989, Eggleton stated,

I have declined these requests, citing my belief that the celebration of sexual orientation is a private matter, and not a matter for government proclamation. My position has not changed and I must respectfully decline your request....I have consistently combated discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, and will continue to do so (Eggleton, 1989).

How exactly Eggleton was combating discrimination against lesbians and gays was a mystery to activists. What was clear, however, was Eggleton’s belief that sexual orientation was a personal issue unworthy of public support. This had been his stance throughout his Mayoral tenure. As early as 1980, when George Hislop, an openly gay candidate, was running for a position as Councillor, Eggleton announced his fear that Toronto would become like San Francisco “where the gay community pushed its way into city hall.” Eggleton then qualified his position by stating, “I am a tolerant person

but also traditional in my values. I can't agree with flaunting sexual preference"

(Eggleton cited in Warner, 2002, 139).

In the absence of Mayoral support, Kyle Rae, then Executive Director of the 519 Church Street Community Centre, requested that City Councillor Jack Layton move a motion to have City Council declare Pride Week 1990. The proclamation passed on the first vote. Councillors opposing Pride reopened the motion at the following Council meeting when they formed the majority, and proceeded to vote the motion down.

Members of Pride Toronto then filed a complaint of discrimination with the Ontario Human Rights Commission, frustrated by the fact that the Mayor had previously proclaimed "Official Muppet Baby Day" while continuing to deny the existence of what was by then a major urban event with attendance of over forty thousand. In an effort to improve relations with Toronto's increasingly vocal lesbian and gay community, Eggleton announced the beginning of "Equality Day," an annual event that would showcase an equality-seeking minority. Gays and lesbians were the first minority group to be the focus of Equality Day. Unimpressed by Eggleton's patronizing gesture, activists vowed to boycott any activities associated with Equality Day and the initiative was cancelled due to lack of support.

The Ontario Human Rights Commission eventually ruled against the Committee, leaving the organization radicalized, and with ten thousand dollars in legal fees (Pride Toronto, 2002). 1990's Pride theme, "By Any Means Necessary," not only reflected the determination to have Pride Day officially proclaimed in 1991, but also the

determination to hold Justice Minister John Crosbie to his promise to use “all means necessary to ensure that sexual orientation is a prohibited grounds of discrimination in relation to all areas of federal jurisdiction”(Government of Canada, 1986). That year, the Pride pamphlet read like a political manifesto:

By Any Means Necessary reflects our determination to seek justice and recognition for ourselves as individuals and as a community. This includes ensuring that: people with AIDS live in dignity and have the choice and access to the best social and medical care; the streets are safe for everyone; lesbian/gay relationships acquire eligibility for health/pension benefits and; the political process recognizes our needs and strengths (Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee, 1990).

The following year, Rae tried again to circumvent the Mayor and have Council proclaim Lesbian and Gay Pride Day. With a few less openly hostile city councillors voting against the motion, the proclamation was passed and the municipality officially recognized Pride.

In 1994, Lesbian and Gay Pride Day was utilized to make specific demands against the state in light of the defeat of Bill 167. This bill would have recognized same sex relationships under fifty-six different laws in Ontario. It went down in defeat on June 9th during the second reading after the NDP government allowed a free vote on the matter. Chaos ensued at the legislature. The evening news conveyed images of police shoving outraged advocates out the doors of Queen’s Park while wearing rubber gloves.

Later that month, the spectacle of the Pride parade was channelled to make a profound political statement. The parade departed from its usual route to encircle Queen’s Park in ways that referenced the militancy of earlier Pride marches to the

legislature. Activists unfurled a pink ribbon around the legislature with the slogan "We Are Family" draped across the front of the building. The front page of the *Globe and Mail* read "Gay Parade Mixes Rage with Pride" (Renzetti, 1994, A1).

Lesbian and Gay Pride Day soon broke the one hundred thousand mark to become one of the largest Pride festivals in North America. However, the expansion of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day throughout the nineties was not uncontested. By 1992, the Committee had become conscious of the criticism that it had turned into an "old boys club" that tended to drown out other voices (Lesbian and Gay Pride Committee, 1992). Several measures were introduced to stem this criticism including new gender parity requirements on its various sub-committees and educational workshops on racism and sexism for committee members. The committee also attempted to expand public participation in Pride organizing through the establishment of policy and planning focus groups. Such groups were open to any member of the community who wished to discuss concerns regarding Pride events, and have their concerns forwarded to the general committee. In addition, in 1992, Pride Day was expanded into Pride Week to increase the number of events so that the diverse constituencies of Toronto's queer communities would find a home at the event.

Such measures proved to be insufficient. In 1994, the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee came under a scathing attack from the Organization to the Pride Committee Accountable. The organization began holding public consultations to consolidate and mobilize various grievances against the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day

Committee. These grievances reflected the criticisms of marginalized groups who felt that Pride Day was still unrepresentative of the multiple diversities of Toronto's queer communities. For example, at one consultation, members of the Ontario Bisexual Network complained that the Pride Committee "treat us worse than heterosexual people. They're willing to take our money and pay for a table...but will not include us in the community, calling us instead 'supporters' of Pride Day" (Nestle cited in Organization to Hold the Pride Committee Accountable, 1994). Representatives of Bisexuals in Community further suggested that Pride Toronto educate itself on bisexuality by organizing a public forum on bisexuality and by holding workshops for committee members.

Individuals representing ethno-racial queer organizations articulated similar criticisms. Through the Organization to Hold Pride Toronto Accountable, there were calls for the implementation of a quota system to ensure adequate representation from different racial and cultural communities on the Pride Day Committee, and the establishment of an official committee to investigate complaints of racism and sexism at Pride Day. As well, citing the gay male domination of Pride Day, women's groups used the Organization to Hold Pride Toronto Accountable as a vehicle to press for the establishment of a separate lesbian event to take place the day before the Pride Day. This event would eventually become the annual Dyke March beginning in 1996.

The criticisms advanced by the Organization to Hold Pride Toronto Accountable were never addressed, as the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee fell apart in 1995

over allegations of incompetence, disorganization, bad relations with the gay business community, as well as a legal dispute with the 519 Church Street Community Centre over missing funds. These issues were resolved when the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee was dissolved. Pride Toronto was immediately established and continues to organize Pride events. Over the past few years, Pride in Toronto has assumed a profile very different from previous Pride events. This is discussed in detail in chapter four.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to outline the evolution of Pride events in Toronto. Such events have been instrumental in the formation of Toronto's queer communities. Pride Day in Toronto was conceived of as a way to celebrate queer lives with a context of violence and oppression, and as a vehicle for staging queer visibility and social movement organizing. For almost twenty years, Pride organizers struggled against stigmatization to have the event officially recognized by the municipality. The following two chapters address the commodification of queer spaces and spectacles under the City of Toronto's entrepreneurial regime, and the implication of Pride Toronto in this process.

Chapter Three

Queer Space and the Entrepreneurial City: Commodification and Regulation

This chapter returns to the discussion of urban entrepreneurialism in Toronto.

The chapter begins with a discussion of trends in tourism characterized by the diversification of tourist attractions and the emergence of cultural tourism. I draw from the work of John Urry to outline the place-marketing strategies that cities enact in order to maximize tourism revenue.

The second section focuses on tourism in Toronto and addresses the ways in which images of cultural difference function as a semiotic resource in Toronto's cultural tourism marketing strategies. Within place promotional literature, spaces of ethno-cultural difference are deployed to provide evidence of Toronto's new, energetic and exciting identity. My argument is that current attempts to brand Toronto as the "City of Difference" constitutes an exploitative pattern of appropriation and marginalization of difference in Toronto. The recent self-conscious emphasis on multiculturalism, I argue, has more to do with new economic development strategies that manipulate multicultural symbols than with any substantive multicultural or anti-oppression policies within the local state.

The third section specifies how Toronto's queer communities and spaces are drawn into cultural tourism marketing strategies. Specifically, I consider the construction of a "gay friendly" tourist/entertainment district in a new destination

marketing magazine titled *Gay and Lesbian Toronto*. I demonstrate the ways in which queer difference is implicated in the simultaneous appropriation and marginalization of multicultural difference. Queer spaces and identities are commodified in ways that do not preclude or even address ongoing processes of oppression. Specifically, the recent repressive policing of queer spaces is cited as evidence of the continuing political disempowerment of Toronto's queer communities.

Section One

Trends in Tourism

Tourism is now central to global, national and urban economies. According to statistics produced by the World Tourism Organization, there were 25 000 000 tourists world wide in 1950 compared to 693 000 000 tourists in 2001, corresponding to an annual growth rate of seven percent (World Tourism Organization, 2002). Local authorities are pursuing tourism investment as an important opportunity for generating employment and restoring downtown regions in the face of deindustrialization, and the domination of the suburbs in retailing trends. The inter-urban competition for increased tourism revenue leaves a distinct mark on the urban landscape. Mullins utilizes the concept of "tourism urbanization" to describe the late twentieth century phenomenon whereby cities are built for the "satisfaction of wants and desires - for fun - rather than for production" (Mullins, 1999, 246). Tourism urbanization is most visible in the serial production of domed stadiums, mega-malls, restored waterfronts, convention centres,

aquariums, festival marketplaces and entertainment districts. For Mullins, the magnitude of tourism urbanization in reshaping cities parallels that of industrial urbanization.

There is a consensus among tourism scholars that the global tourism industry is undergoing transformation. Lash and Urry cite a shift from “old tourism” that involved packaging and standardization, to “new tourism” which is segmented, flexible and customized (Lash and Urry, 1994, 273). The diversification of tourist offerings corresponds to broader shifts from Fordist mass production to the “manufactured diversity” and “flexible specialization” of post-Fordism. Tourism is now an archetypal post-Fordist industry, able to vary price, quality and content by niche. The last two decades have seen the emergence and growth of cultural tourism, eco tourism, sex tourism, adventure tourism and disaster tourism.

The transformation of tourism is generating new, diverse modes of tourist urbanization. Urry theorizes the growth of “tourism reflexivity” as the standard response of local governments to the emergence of new tourism. Whereas Giddens uses “reflexivity” to describe the ways in which the individual in late modernity constructs his or her identity within a context of fluidity, anxiety and risk (Giddens, 1990), Urry appropriates the concept to explain how local authorities are attempting to position their locale favourably in a context of disorder and uncertainty. This involves the reflexive auditing of local facilities to identify actual and potential material and semiotic resources that maximize the region’s location within the turbulent global order (Urry, 2002, 142).

Tourism reflexivity entails a heightened concern over the images, meanings and narratives associated with the local. It is thus consistent with claims made by scholars of urban entrepreneurialism regarding the consolidation of a new regime of urban signification that privileges the sign value of urban spaces over their use value (Harvey, 1989; Zukin, 1991; Stoker and Mossberger, 1994; Jacobs, 1998). The transformation of former industrial areas and declined districts into spectacular, highly aestheticized areas of and for consumption is the subject of much urban political economy, and is often cited as central to entrepreneurial modes of urban governance. Cities are seeking to be represented in more attractive terms that emphasize “the new rather than the old, the fashionable postmodern rather than the modern, the post-industrial rather than the industrial, consumption rather than production, spectacle and fun rather than pollution and work” (Short, 1996, 46).

Place marketing has evolved from a relatively amateur and informal activity into a professionalized and specialized industry organized around adapting, reshaping and manipulating images of places to be desirable to the targeted consumer (Fox Gotham, 2002, 1743). For Judd, the aim of place marketing is to produce “tourist bubbles” which operate like theme parks, providing entertainment and excitement within reassuringly clean and attractive surroundings (Judd, 1999, 43). The proliferation of themed tourist bubbles and the increasing reliance upon image, simulation and cultural consumption prompts Hannigan to announce the era of the fantasy city:

The fantasy city is theme-o-centric in that theme enhancement is employed in which an ambience is created around a distinctive geographic locale, historical period or type of cultural activity. Multi-themeing is implemented in which the city is divided into a series of zones each with its own thematic focus. The fantasy city is solipsistic; isolated from surrounding neighbourhoods, physically, economically, and culturally...a metropolis which ignores the reality of homeless, unemployment, social injustice while eagerly transforming sites and channels of public expression into promotional spaces. The fantasy city is post-modern inasmuch as it is constructed around technologies of simulation, virtual reality and the thrill of spectacle (Hannigan, 1998, 3).

Notions of culture are central to the production, marketing, and consumption of tourist environments. Cities are developing cultural and historic sites in order to invoke a cultural or historic identity that tourists can experience through the consumption of spaces and events. While some cities, such as Venice or Athens, invoke a cultural or historical identity with ease, many second and third tier cities face difficulties when attempting to market themselves as tourist sites of cultural and historical significance. In such cities, increasingly reflexive local authorities are enumerating whatever cultural, historical, architectural and ethnic attractions may enhance urban themeing and place marketing. In a study of Melbourne's Chinatown, feminist geographer Kay Anderson describes the various ways through which municipal authorities attempted to refashion and revitalize Chinatown such that it would come to function as Melbourne's 'window on the east.' Underwritten by state and local governments, the project was carried out through a variety of 'orientalizing' motifs, such as Chinese style decorative lanterns and other such paraphernalia signifying an 'oriental' otherness. By bringing a sense of ambience and excitement to locales, identity-based entertainment zones, night-time

pleasure-scapes, trendy loft zones, arts districts, historical spaces and ethnic enclaves assume centrality in the symbolic economies of new tourist cities.

Section Two

Tourism in Toronto

This section addresses the ways in which the forms of new tourism urbanization discussed above are evident in Toronto. Like many North American and European cities, the City of Toronto now counts tourism as one of a few industries that will enhance the city's entrepreneurial economic development strategies. With the establishment of the Department of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism in 1999, the municipal bureaucracy was restructured to reflect the centrality of tourism to entrepreneurial strategies of economic development. This new bureaucratic form that combines culture and tourism with economic development supports Mayer's (1991) contention that entrepreneurial regimes combine and coordinate traditionally distinct policy fields in their strategies of accumulation, as well as broader claims regarding the de-differentiation of the cultural and the economic in post-modernity (Lash and Urry, 1994).

In 1992, the City of Toronto commissioned a competitive tourism development strategy. The plan announced a strategic vision "to be a leading leisure/pleasure destination in North America" (City of Toronto, 1992). Subsequent documents cite the city's failure to realize this vision. Such failure is attributed to the recession in the early nineties, and the forms of fiscal austerity practiced in the latter half of the decade that

undermined the development of leisure tourism infrastructure. The downturn in tourism investment during the nineties coincided with a period of significant public and private investments in tourism, cultural and heritage assets in many second and third tier American cities. As a result, Toronto is identified as falling behind twelve regions in the United States in generating leisure tourism industry revenue (City of Toronto, 2000a, 47). Lacking the heritage invoked by Quebec City, or the scenic landscapes that demarcate Vancouver's urban profile, private and public tourist entrepreneurs in Toronto are left with a limited range of options for cultivating tourist interest. According to *Toronto Competes*, the greatest challenge for the city's sagging leisure tourist industry is to develop new strategies of destination marketing (City of Toronto, 2000a, 47).

Tourism planning documents produced by the City of Toronto exemplify an entrepreneurial form of tourism reflexivity. This tourism reflexivity is premised upon a heightened dissatisfaction with, and perhaps even anxiety over, the city's image and sign value under a tourist gaze. One planning document announces that tourism is suffering because of "a general sense that the bloom may be coming off Toronto's rose" (City of Toronto, 2001a, 17). The *Tourism Investment Report* produced in 2001 reiterates this sentiment, suggesting that the lagging tourist industry is the result of an urban image crisis. Denouncing traditional images of Toronto as no longer positioning the city favourably under a tourist gaze, the Report advocates a new urban identity and narrative to be forged by private and public urban authorities. The Report argues that the city must develop tourism products that will "move Toronto's image away from the safe,

conservative position to one of more excitement, energy and innovation” (City of Toronto, 2001c). This new identity will be implemented through an “image awareness” campaign coordinated by the Toronto Board of Trade, the Department of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, and other marketing agencies (City of Toronto, 2001c).

Toronto’s tourism planning documents cite investment in signature cultural festivals as one means to enhance the city’s status as a cultural tourist destination. Signature events are the image builders of modern tourism (Hall, 1992) and are used to re-image or redevelop places no longer considered worthy of the tourist gaze. Festivals and special events contribute to the image of the postmodern city as the site for pleasure, fun and conspicuous consumption (Markwell, 2002). The 1992 *Competitive Tourism Development Strategy* advocates that the municipality “initiate a process to create an image for Toronto that is supported by a signature event.” Such an event should “develop an image of Metro as a fun, safe and exciting place ...and stimulate an urgency to visit” (City of Toronto, 1992, 10). In order to stay competitive in the market of hallmark festival retailing, the City of Toronto's Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department established the Special Events Division to produce numerous annual events, including the Celebrate Toronto Street Festival.

According to the *Toronto City of Festivals Fact Sheet*: “With major performing arts and cultural festivals, sporting events and lifestyle shows scheduled to take place in 2002, as well as hundreds of street fairs and community festivals in our diverse

neighbourhoods, Toronto is indeed Canada's 'City of Festivals'" (City of Toronto, 2000b). The emphasis on festival events planning in Toronto reflects the theorization of "the convivial city" (Ley, 1996) or the "entertainment machine" (Lloyd and Clark, 2001) as privileged forms of tourist urbanization. It is within this context that Pride Toronto is increasingly viewed by the city as an important economic generator.

Section Three

Cultural Tourism and the Commodification of Difference

There can be no doubt that the City of Toronto is home to a remarkably diverse populace, more so than most other cities in North America. In 1993, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization declared Toronto to be the most culturally diverse city in the world. As of 1997, immigrants accounted for forty seven percent of the population of the City of Toronto, the majority of whom come from Asia, the Caribbean, Africa, Central and South America. In comparison, immigrants account for thirty-five percent of Vancouver's population and eighteen percent of Montreal's population (Siemiatycki and Isin, 1997, 75). As well, Toronto receives forty-eight percent of all immigrants coming into Canada, and the Toronto region receives almost all of Canada's refugees, an estimated 10,000 or more per year (Simich, 2000).

Toronto's evolution as a centre for immigration in Canada, and the subsequent globalization of the population, is being utilized as a semiotic resource in promotional imagery and civic boosterist narratives. Such narratives are mobilized in order to assert

Toronto's "unique identity" as a cosmopolitan, global-city-of-difference that transcends any specific locality (Sassen, 2000, 154). Evidence of this abounds. The *Economic Development Strategy Report* outlines the "branding of Toronto as the most ethnically, culturally, socially and economically diverse city in the world" as a strategic priority that will delineate Toronto's "unique identity" (City of Toronto, 2000b, 74). The Report stresses that cultural difference must be encoded into the built form of the city: "Urban design must emphasize streetscapes that showcase Toronto's multi-dimensional cultural and ethnic heritage" (City of Toronto, 2000b, 85). Toronto's new official motto is "diversity is our strength" and the official slogan of Tourism Toronto promises prospective tourists the "world within a city." The Report further states,

Toronto truly is one of the world's great cities...Nowhere else in the world do so many people from so many different cultures, different ethnic backgrounds, different religions, races, creeds, colour, sexual orientation...live together in peace, harmony and mutual respect. It is this diversity of ideas, beliefs, knowledge and experience makes Toronto a great city (City of Toronto, 2000b, 73).

Consistent with the long-standing mythologization of Toronto as a peaceful, tolerant, and orderly city (Croucher, 1997; Kipfer and Keil, 2002), urban planning star Richard Florida recently proclaimed Toronto as North America's most tolerant city in a *Globe and Mail* feature on Toronto's economic future. According to Florida, tolerance is Toronto's defining feature. "Toronto is a place where gay couples feel comfortable holding hands on city streets...where gays and straights reside comfortably side by side,

where ethnic groups do not feel they have to fit in...where women can walk safely down city streets at midnight" (Florida, 2002, T8).⁹

The reflexive branding of Toronto as the exceptionally tolerant and multicultural "world within a city" is crucial to the city's attempt to cultivate a new identity for itself within new tourism trends characterized by the diversification of tourism products and the rise in "authentic" cultural tourism. The 1992 *Competitive Tourism Development Plan* refers to these changes:

Consumers are becoming more sophisticated resulting in increased interests in less traditional vacations and more special interest travel...preference for authentic and genuine experiences and products. Consumers, and in particular, the baby boomer crowd, are moving away from "schlock" in preference for the authentic (City of Toronto, 1992, 34).

The Economic Development Strategy Report is also explicitly recognizes trends in new tourism:

A key trend in tourism, as in so many other industries, is a movement away from mass produced tourism towards a more diversified set of offerings such as eco-tourism and cultural tourism. Over the long term, Toronto will bolster its competitive position by finding new ways to creatively package previously overlooked aspects of the city to tourists... which could be packaged for tourists throughout the year (City of Toronto, 2000b, 48).

Cultural minority neighbourhoods and districts, previously unaccounted for in the city's promotional imagery, are mobilized in a re-imaging exercise designed to brand Toronto

9 A major survey on queer bashing conducted by the lesbian and gay victim assistance programme of the 519 Church Street Community Centre in Toronto bears out the exact opposite in brutal detail. Seventy-eight percent of survey respondents experienced verbal assault, thirty-eight percent had been followed or chased, twenty-one percent had been punched, hit, kicked or beaten, seventeen percent had been spat upon, seven percent had been assaulted with a weapon. Also, seventy-eight percent of respondents admitted the threat of violence forced them to act 'straighter' in public by changing their behaviour, speech, and clothing. For more on this study, see Hasselriis, 1997.

as a tourist destination of cultural significance. Many immigrant communities and other populations that have long been subject to marginalization are now simultaneously seen to be 'cultural assets' providing diverse opportunities for cultural consumption.

According to the *Tourism Investment Report*:

Toronto's great strength is its many unique neighbourhoods, where you can experience a range of dining, retail and entertainment experiences from diverse cultures. Toronto has an outstanding opportunity to build on its cultural diversity...Future tourism investment development in Toronto must...showcase indigenous assets, emphasize culture and...create linkages to neighbourhoods...that provide visitors a first hand experience with Toronto's cultural diversity (City of Toronto, 2001c).

Current municipal tourist literature beckons visitors to see "the world in Toronto; to take in the raucous Hong Kong ambiance of Chinatown (and)...the Latin beat of the Danforth" (Tourism Toronto, 2001). In this account, Toronto is envisioned as an exciting succession of districts and quarters that function as authentic exotica in a pastiche of cultural difference that facilitates a micro-version of international tourism where the signs of geographic and ethno-cultural difference can be gazed upon within one location (Urry, 2002, 136). Multiculturalism in Toronto's tourism documents operates as a "global postmodern" aesthetic, appealing to new middle class and cultural-tourist sensibilities (Kipfer and Keil, 2002, 236). As Kay Anderson argues, spaces of ethno-cultural difference are "turned into spectacles in a power relation that constitutes a cultural and commercial appropriation of meanings" (Anderson, 1999, 210). Through such co-optation and appropriation, cultural/historical/political legacies of marginalized

populations are removed from context, and a potentially disruptive politics of difference morphs into a far more benign and celebratory play of difference.

What makes much of the discourse on multiculturalism and diversity merely symbolic is the ongoing, and, in some instances, intensifying marginalization of ethno-cultural minorities. While celebratory discourses of multicultural difference abound, there has been a regression in the policy areas of equity, anti-racism and immigration settlement services throughout the nineties. Despite the efforts of New Voices for the New City to sensitize the amalgamated City of Toronto to multicultural issues, anti-oppression initiatives and equity policy are peripheral within the local state and are relegated to an under-resourced 'diversity management' unit and powerless citizen advisory committees (Kipfer and Keil, 2002, 137).

Much of this policy regression stems from provincial funding cuts. In 1995, the provincial government reduced funding to Ontario's main settlement programme, the Newcomer Settlement Program, by nearly fifty percent, replaced core funding with project funding, and eliminated other much needed and popular programs. Reduced government funding for settlement services and barriers such as the lack of access to suitable employment and housing in the Toronto region combined to make settlement much more difficult for immigrants and refugees since the late nineties (Simich, 2000). The situation is much worse for refugee claimants. The fifty percent of refugees who arrive without sponsorship do not initially receive federal support and are not eligible for existing settlement services. In the waiting period for federal documentation, refugees

are not eligible for social assistance or health care and often have no option but to live in city-run emergency shelters (Simich, 2000).

Uzma Shakir, executive director of the Council of Agencies Serving South Asians expressed frustration toward the City of Toronto's version of multiculturalism at the recent People's Summit in Toronto. Shakir stated:

You can wear your sari and eat your samosa, but don't ask for power-sharing...They say the city of Toronto is going to the dogs. Of course it's going to the dogs, because you're doing absolutely nothing about the people who happen to be forming the City of Toronto. This is a multicultural haven, in a global environment, (and) all they want from us is restaurants so people can eat exotic food...How can you have any teeth to multiculturalism if all these multicultural people are doing nothing but getting poorer and more marginalized? Given the (federal) immigration policies we have now, which is setting the bar of education and skill at such a high level...Canada is becoming not a place where they and their children will do better, but a place where they and their children are likely to do worse (Shakir quoted in Gillespie, 2002).

Despite high levels of education and skill, recent immigrants are poorer than ever before in the City of Toronto. The extent of this trend is the focus of Michael Ornstein's (2000) study commissioned by the City of Toronto, yet ignored by the Mayor's office upon completion. Through an analysis of the 1996 census, Ornstein demonstrates social polarization in Toronto taking place between a European majority and 'visible minorities.' For example, non-European families make up approximately thirty-six percent of the population in Toronto yet account for nearly sixty percent of all poor families. The rate of poverty for East and Southeast Asians in Toronto is twice that of the European majority. For immigrants from Africa and the Caribbean, family poverty rates are nearly forty-five percent. For Arabs and West

Asians, poverty-rates stand at forty-five percent, three times the European average.¹⁰

Ornstein indicates that groups classified as “other African nations” on the 1996 Census Form, including Ethiopians, Ghanaians and Somalis are the poorest populations in Toronto. Seventy percent of families from these groups live on an income level below Statistics Canada’s low-income cut off (Ornstein, 2000, 2).

The declining living standards of many recent immigrants, and the increasingly punitive policies enacted against refugees provide an ironic comment on the discourses of ethno-cultural diversity, harmony and tolerance that predominate official depictions of the city in mayoral speeches, policy documents and publicity stunts. As Sheila Croucher’s (1997) analysis suggests, the construction of tolerance and multicultural harmony in Toronto relies upon downplaying, distorting or the outright denial of the voices of people and communities supposedly represented in the City’s multiculturalism policy.

¹⁰Ornstein also develops statistics to demonstrate the differing degrees of poverty that affect different ethno-‘racial’ groups from the same global regions. For example, the incidence of poverty affecting the Vietnamese is five times greater than levels of poverty experienced by Japanese in Toronto. Thus Ornstein is careful to point out that ‘disadvantage’ does not derive from essential differences among cultures, but rather from particular historical processes and the conditions under which immigration takes place.

Section Four

Constructing the “Gay Friendly” Tourist Bubble: The Play of Queer Difference

Toronto’s gay quarters fit easily into an array of playful difference as a quasi-ethnic space in which cultural capital can be displayed by the ability to negotiate difference, and the ability to manoeuvre in exoticised surroundings (Rushbrook, 2002, 4). The commodification and exoticization of difference, particularly sexual difference, is consistent with recommendations outlined in the *Economic Development Strategy Report* to seek out opportunities that punctuate the “sexiness of city -- new urban cool— young businessperson to young businessperson” (City of Toronto, 2000b, 110). Queer visibility, which has been so central to queer political struggle, becomes a tourist sight and is exploited as an urban spectacle that is emblematic of the “new urban cool.” Tourism literature describes the “pulsating heart of Toronto’s gay community...seeing men and women chatting in the eclectic mixture of cafés and restaurants or holding hands as they walk down the busy streets, gives an indication of the relaxed and open-minded attitude Torontonians have towards the gay and lesbian community” (Tourism Toronto, 2001). As Rushbrook points out, in tourist representations of queer scenes, it is unclear exactly what constitutes the tourist spectacle; same-sex couples holding hands on city streets, or the tolerance they are afforded by ‘relaxed’ and ‘open-minded’ observers (Rushbrook, 2002, 188).

In 1999, on the recommendation of the Task Force on Community Access and Equity, the City of Toronto established the Advisory Committee on Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgender Issues. The mandate of the committee is to advocate for the equality of treatment of lesbian gay bisexual and transgendered people, providing queer communities with a rare opportunity for the articulation of queer specific issues within the post-amalgamation local state. Despite the array of issues facing Toronto's queer communities, the already under-resourced committee has been drawn into the process of marketing and promoting the city's gay quarters as an identity-based entertainment zone. This suggests that an entrepreneurial agenda is encroaching upon the ways in which queer issues are addressed within the local state. As Quilley observes, under entrepreneurial regimes, the political institutional presence of the queer community is supplanted by a more pervasive cultural-aesthetic presence in which the queer community is organized as a market rather than a political constituency. Quilley states,

The gay village is valued as a feature of the emerging post-industrial cultural-economic landscape...whilst lesbian and gay issues have, to an extent, been squeezed off the formal agenda of local government. Queer culture is legitimated as it finds a place in the official representation of the city. However, it remains defined as an asset from the perspective of a very specific economic project (Quilley, 1997, 287).

In 2001, the Advisory Committee began working with Tourism Toronto in order to produce *Gay and Lesbian Toronto*, a promotional magazine distributed to travel agencies, visitor centres and through the mail. The magazine is organized around representations of "the village" as a gay-friendly tourist bubble. The "village," like all

tourist bubbles, is “writ large with signifiers, where the representation of experience is at least as important as its actuality” (Judd, 1999, 46). Pride Toronto provides a critical semiotic resource in the representation of a gay-friendly tourist bubble. Spectacular photographic images of Pride Toronto festivities, oriented toward the tourist’s gaze, compose the urban landscape into a collage of fantasy images that permit a visual knowledge of Toronto’s status as “gay-friendly” through what appear to be unambiguously accurate modes of representation (Urry, 1999, 76).

Gay and Lesbian Toronto includes numerous descriptions of the “Gay Village” as a night-time pleasure-scape facilitating dramatized, identity-based consumption. For example,

Canada’s most vibrant gay neighborhood is a celebration of life, diversity and...shopping. Sip a non-fat-extra-foamy latte in a café, install yourself in a restaurant window, or quaff a cold one on an outdoor patio...Sit or stroll, whichever you choose, the Gay Village is sophisticated, spirited, and a great place to spend some time...Without a doubt, Toronto’s gay and lesbian community plays an essential role in making this a world class city. Be part of it!

Toronto’s energy drenched Gay Village struts her best stuff by night, unveiling irresistible seductions across a pulsating mosaic of orientations...expect the unexpected...beguiling restaurants dazzle...hip clubs beckon...Most seductive of all: when one night ends, a kaleidoscope of new nightlife possibilities in Toronto is just another day away” (City of Toronto, 2002a, 29).

In these passages and many others, notions of leisure, entertainment, sophistication, lifestyle and identity converge in the representation of “gay friendly” space. The “village” operates as a site for conspicuous lifestyle consumption in which everyday consumption practices take place, “as if on a theater stage, to be observed by passers by”

(Shields, 1992, 6). Queerness operates as one playful variant in a plethora of highly aestheticized urban consumer landscapes and lifestyles, the proliferation of which are a characteristic of postmodernity, and an important strategy of urban economic redevelopment (Featherstone, 1991; Zukin, 1998).

The convergence of queer identities with processes of urban lifestylization is all but ignored in queer theory and gay and lesbian studies, with a few notable exceptions (Hennessey, 1994; Fraser 1999; Ingebreetsen, 1999). Fraser notes a potential equivalence between postmodern lifestylization and queer identity whereby their political intentions and effects cannot be distinguished (Fraser, 1999, 117). Hennessey extends this analysis by arguing that queer identity is indeed a consumer lifestyle. Hennessey employs the Marxist concept of commodity fetishism to demonstrate the ways in which queer visibility in late capitalism is fetishized in ways that conceal the violent social relations it depends upon. The ways in which the achievement of lesbian and gay visibility for some rests upon the invisible labour of others represents for Hennessey the “unspeakable underside of queer critique” (Hennessey, 1995, 68).

Hennessey’s analysis is helpful when thinking through the division of labour entailed in the production and reproduction of a gay and lesbian tourist zone in Toronto. As in all North American global cities, Toronto’s tourist infrastructure is subsidized through a “flexible” labour regime comprised of seasonal, insecure, non-unionized and low wage work, performed primarily by women, racialized minorities, immigrants and other non-citizens (Sassen, 1991; Murdie 1996; Walks, 1999). Federal cuts to

unemployment insurance and the implementation of a punitive social assistance regime function to further discipline workers in this sector. The integration of queer spaces into the City's strategies of new tourism urbanization means that queer visibility in Toronto is becoming more closely related to an expanding low wage service sector. This fact represents, to paraphrase Hennessey, the "unspeakable underside" of Toronto's well-developed and highly visible queer quarters.

Section Five

The Ongoing Marginalization of Queer Difference

Urry's conception of the tourist gaze provides a troubling insight into the themeing and commodification of a "gay friendly" tourist bubble in *Gay and Lesbian Toronto*. According to Urry, the tourist gaze is constructed in relationship to its opposite; everyday, non-tourist forms of social experience and consciousness.

What makes a particular tourist gaze depends upon what it is contrasted with; what the forms of non-tourist experience happen to be. Tourism results from a basic binary division between the ordinary/everyday and the extraordinary. Tourist experiences involve some aspect or element that induces pleasurable experiences, which, by comparison with the everyday, are out of the ordinary (Urry, 2002, 12).

The commodification of tolerance as a themed tourist experience assumes meaning as desirable and exceptional only in relation to the homophobic and heterosexist contexts within which the majority of queer lives are situated. Explicit in the magazine is the recognition that "gay people have long traveled...to escape intolerance" (Pritchard, Morgan and Sedgely, 1998, 273). Gay tourists are urged to visit the Toronto in order

to “be yourself and have fun.” Toronto is marketed as “one great place to be gay...discover for yourself what a great, gay-friendly city we have” (City of Toronto, 2002a, 9).

Toronto’s status as “gay friendly” is stressed through repeated references to the safety and security concerns of queers. Church Street is described as “a safe place...an open space for everyone to enjoy being who they are” (City of Toronto, 2002, 10). Playing upon the fantasies and desires of an assumed queer reader, and invoking communality thereby, *Gay and Lesbian Toronto* cites Pride Toronto as “our chance to be/act/look like anything we want”(City of Toronto, 2002a, 11).

While space is signified as “gay friendly” through destination marketing literature such as *Gay and Lesbian Toronto*, the reproduction of this space as “gay friendly” on an everyday basis is always only tenuous. The festival atmosphere of the “village,” achieved through the draping of permanent rainbow banners and the like, is punctuated by evidence of safety and security concerns. Valverde and Cirak reflect on the fact that both the offices of the local lesbian/gay weekly and the local gay/lesbian bookstore have strategized their location in order to minimize the risk of homophobic vandalism. The authors also make note of the promises of anonymity for those fearful of joining queer community groups as well as signs at the local community centre asking for witnesses to come forth and report queer-bashing incidents (Valverde and Cirak, 200, 117).

In the current climate of competition in which cities are attempting to cultivate whatever resources will allow them to assert a competitive advantage and secure investment, policy makers are re-evaluating queer spaces, particularly white gay male spaces, from regulatory problems to market assets that contribute to the leisure economy. *Gay and Lesbian Toronto* makes repeated and detailed reference to sexualized gay male consumption spaces that proliferate during the summer:

Grab a Speedo and water gun for outdoor water parties filled with hunky, mostly naked studs. Strap on your leather or jump into your military gear and check out the sexy Military Ball and Leather Pride Ball. Or gear up for one of Canada's largest full-on circuit parties. And after the parties end, the fun doesn't stop! Toronto's seven centrally located bathhouses will be jam packed featuring a smorgasbord of satisfaction (City of Toronto, 2002a).

The reconstitution of Toronto's queer spaces from regulatory problems to commodities is only partial however. The same spaces marketed as tourist destinations in *Gay and Lesbian Toronto* are subject to repressive policing and constituted as a source of risk within public health discourses and practices. The destination-marketing branch of the local state might be wise to include in its promotional material, if only in fine print, a disclaimer explaining the precarious legal status of such spaces.¹¹

The simultaneous intensification in the commodification and policing of queer spaces in Toronto illustrates the ways in which two distinct but related dynamics of entrepreneurial urban governance shape Toronto's queer spaces and spectacles. The

commodification of queer spaces and identities in tourist literature and civic boosterist narratives is a function of the formation of the entrepreneurial symbolic regime that exploits difference as a material and semiotic resource (Stoker and Mossberger, 1994). Yet, the recently intensified regulation of these spaces and those who enter them may be interpreted as an aspect of the consolidation of a neoliberal law and order regime which manages difference as disorder, criminalizes dissent, and provides little recourse against repressive policing.

At present, no one is predicting an improvement in the chronically poor relations between Toronto's queer communities and the Toronto Police Services. The most recent round of raids on queer spaces in Toronto began in 1999 when police made a series of visits to The Bijou, a popular gay porn theatre. Criminal bawdyhouse charges were laid against patrons and management. The raids sparked a wave of community organizing, culminating in several large meetings and protests. The June 13th Committee formed to advocate sexual libertarian principles and sex law reform—principles identical to those articulated twenty years before by the Right to Privacy Committee. The June 13th Committee worked in conjunction with Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario to apply pressure to policing officials and politicians to drop the charges, and were eventually successful.

¹¹ In January 2003, police raided a Calgary bathhouse. The patrons and management were charged under bawdyhouse legislation. This incident is indicative of continuing criminalization of such spaces.

The Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgendered Community Police Liaison was revived as a means of improving police-queer relations. The June 13th Committee and several other activist organizations immediately articulated their suspicions about the liaison process:

In view of police actions over the past few months, it is neither timely nor appropriate to constitute a liaison committee. Such a committee must be based on respect and community accountability. In the current atmosphere of intimidation and harassment such a committee would be compromised from the start. Rather than offering a public opportunity to seek accountability and raise issues, it seems designed to offer the police a chance to establish a support network in the queer community. The event is poorly timed. There is no new understanding to celebrate, no improvement in policing in our community (June 13th Committee, 2000).

The June 13th Committee's response reflected the concern that where there is little police accountability to democratic bodies, as is certainly the case in Toronto, and where laws such as public indecency and disorderly conduct are perniciously used against queer communities, discussion would only involve queer community representatives in a mechanism through which queer community members assume responsibility for self-policing (Kinsman, 1996, 343). Newly appointed Police Chief Julian Fantino soon entered into the fray with a public relations campaign seeking to conduct damage control. In *FAB*, the local gay men's magazine, Fantino reiterated an appeal for calm in what was both a populist appeal and threat:

I regard all people as equals. We're all on this earth together. I don't differentiate or discriminate...I have nothing but respect for the gay community. I'm hopeful that the community will rise to the vision that I have for it... I won't allow radical elements of any community to jeopardize our efforts to understand each other. I

can't sanction any activity that is illegal. I can't give people immunity from the law if that's what they're looking for... (Fantino cited in Kennedy, 1999, 24)

In September 2000, police visited Club Toronto, a local bathhouse where three hundred and fifty women had gathered. Police wandered through the venue, and recorded the names of patrons for future reference. As with the Bijou raids, police claimed to have received an anonymous complaint of "criminal" sexual activity at a previous lesbian bathhouse event. This alleged violation would have required the police to obtain a search warrant. Acquiring such a warrant was unlikely based solely on the tip they had. Hence, there was widespread suspicion among queer communities, civil libertarian activists and academics that the police had unconstitutionally used the Liquor Licence Act, a provincial statute that entitles police to carry out inspections without a search warrant, as a pretext to conduct a criminal investigation.

Community activists and local politicians immediately condemned the incident. Kyle Rae, who had previously asserted that police were no longer interested in bath raids, referred to police as "cowboys" and "rouge cops" on a "panty raid" and condemned the raid as a waste of police resources. The police involved in the raid demanded that Rae retract his condemnation and issue a public apology. Upon Rae's refusal, the seven police officers involved in the raid filed a lawsuit against the councillor, seeking over three million dollars in compensation for the physical, mental and emotional distress cited as the result of his comments. In a surprise ruling, the jury awarded one hundred and seventy thousand dollars in damages to the police. Rae's high

profile loss upset many who felt that he had been targeted and muzzled by the police and that future instances of repressive policing would go uncontested by elected officials; a situation that seems all the more likely given the ways in which political representatives often fail to support queer communities and issues.¹²

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to outline the City of Toronto's entrepreneurial strategies of tourism urbanization. This involves the reflexive auditing of potential resources that will facilitate a global profile and advance Toronto's potential as a cultural tourism destination. Under such auditing, spaces of ethno-cultural difference are increasingly viewed as cultural and economic assets that contribute to Toronto's symbolic economy. Queer spaces and spectacles operate as a semiotic resource, lending substance to civic boosterist narratives of urban diversity and cosmopolitanism, while also signifying commodified spaces of tolerance for queer tourists. This chapter also demonstrates the exploitation entailed in the changing relationship between the local state and queer spaces and spectacles. The commercialization of queer sexuality as an aspect of tourist

¹² MP Dennis Mills (Danforth-Woodbine) promised his large queer constituency that he would support human rights for lesbians and gays. Shortly after making that promise, Mills refused to support Bill C-41, a law that toughened penalties for hate crimes against minority groups including gay men and lesbians. Mills made amends with gays and lesbians in his riding by promising to support future gay and lesbian equality rights. He subsequently voted against adding sexual orientation to the Canadian Human Rights Act. Mills' lack of support for even the most basic forms of human rights protection prompted a group of gay and lesbian constituents to circulate a petition asking for his resignation. He remains in office. See chapter four for a discussion of provincial MPP Al Leach.

urbanization does not preclude processes of oppression such as the continuing criminalization of queer sexuality.

Chapter Four

The Contested Politics of Pride Toronto

Many urban political economists acknowledge that analyses of urban entrepreneurialism have not yet sufficiently addressed the question of resistance (Hubbard, 1996; Hall and Hubbard, 1998; Jacobs, 1998). Urban political economy tends to focus on the commodification and appropriation of local cultures while neglecting the ways in which this process is resisted. This chapter addresses recent transformations in the production and reception of Pride Toronto in order to intervene in debates regarding the politics of difference in the entrepreneurial city. I demonstrate how Pride Toronto operates as a site of entrepreneurial appropriation and commodification, as well as a site of resistance to such processes. This thesis thus presents a challenge to the literature on entrepreneurial urbanization that tends to overemphasize a unilateral narrative of commodification and appropriation while rarely acknowledging the possibility of agency.

The first section of this chapter explores the ways in which Pride Toronto is articulated toward and within urban entrepreneurialism and urban tourism. Pride Toronto, like other spaces of ethno-cultural difference, is now organized as a temporary consumption zone. I provide evidence that indicates how the event functions as a commercialized tourist spectacle for visual consumption and a venue for queer niche marketing. I then consider how Pride Toronto has become a site oriented around the “management” of queer difference through the regulation of queer sexualities and

embodiment. The account of Pride Toronto offered here supports the narratives of commodification and appropriation -- in short, the play of difference pervasive in the entrepreneurial city literature. The dynamics of appropriation and political displacement are certainly evident in the context of Pride Toronto, although less unilaterally than the literature on entrepreneurial urbanization tends to suggest.

The second section examines the ways in which the commercialization and depoliticization of Pride Toronto is contested. I cite the emergence of various activist organizations making critical political interventions in Pride Toronto and other Pride events throughout North America and Europe to expose the forms of marginalization that are obscured through celebratory discourses and practices of gay pride. These interventions are discussed to demonstrate that the play of queer difference does not necessarily preclude or undermine more disruptive and contesting articulations of queerness. Far from wholly depoliticised spectacle, Pride Toronto is thus theorized as a site of struggle between the play of queer difference and a disruptive queer politics. This analysis both supports and departs from accepted analyses of spectacularization in the entrepreneurial city.

Section One

Urban Entrepreneurialism and Visions of Difference

Urban political economists have developed a highly cynical account of the postmodern entrepreneurial city. They share a deep suspicion of the “vernacular

traditions, historicist motifs and exotic allusions,” of the “playful” entrepreneurial urban landscape (Crilley, 1993, 237). Urban aestheticization and spectacle in any form is often cited as a red herring of entrepreneurial urbanization. As Harvey claims, postmodern architecture, with its “surface glitter and transitory pleasure, becomes central to the project of entrepreneurial urban redevelopment” (Harvey 1989, 91). Such architecture is implicated in “the reactionary politics of an aestheticized spatiality” that functions to secure legitimacy for urban elites and act as the “mask that diverts and entertains, leaving the social problems that lie behind the mask unseen and uncared for”(Harvey, 1989, 327).

The suspicion of the postmodern urban landscape, and the cultural forms therein, informs the way in which notions of cultural difference are conceptualized in entrepreneurial city literature. There is a tendency in the work of urban political economists such as Harvey, (1989), Zukin, (1991) and Christopherson, (1994) to situate difference within the cultural logic of the postmodern city. Multicultural difference in an entrepreneurial urban context is envisioned as another postmodern cultural form always already appropriated and commodified. Hegemonic forces reduce diversity to surfaces – colours, styles, and tastes that are either packaged in easily consumable forms for the new urban middle class, or incorporated as colourful elements in the visual regimes of contemporary cities. Such accounts go so far as to suggest that difference is mobilized in ways that provide a social democratic “mask” that hides the more “real” undemocratic processes of urban entrepreneurialism. For example, in Harvey’s analysis, the staging of

cultural diversity, particularly in its more aesthetic and spectacular forms, is a crucial means by which entrepreneurial elites attempt to legitimate urban transformation.

Harvey supports this line of argumentation through a study of Baltimore in which he outlines how race riots and inner-city uprisings threatened the vitality of central business districts. He then traces how the 'Baltimore City Fair' was organized by local elites, in response to the fear and disuse of downtown areas resulting from such riots, and to celebrate ethnic diversity in the city. The case study of Baltimore prompts Harvey to claim that the play of difference is a primary feature of postmodern urbanization. Postmodern urbanization provides consumers with "the geography of differentiated tastes and cultures....a pot-pouri of internationalism... Yet the effect is to draw a veil over the real geography" (Harvey, 1990, 87). Within such analyses, the possibility of a contentious and disruptive politics of difference in the entrepreneurial city is negated in favour of accounts of the play of difference.

Feminist geographers and feminist cultural theorists have made a critical intervention into the description of difference in the entrepreneurial urban landscape (Morris, 1992; Jacobs and Fitcher 1998; Jacobs 1998, Anderson, 1998; Gibson, 1998). From the perspective of these authors, urban political economy too quickly dismisses the disruptive and meaningful potential of articulations of difference. They argue that difference is not simply a feature of the postmodern landscape nor can it be explained as the outcome of economic forces. In particular, feminist urban theorists have taken issue with the prevailing view of spectacle and aestheticization as a function of capitalist

accumulation in the entrepreneurial city. This view, they argue, displays an uncritical acceptance of the depoliticising force of aestheticization. Aesthetics, images and signification are not diametrically opposed to the political, as Harvey assumes. Rather, they are viewed by many feminist geographers as intrinsic to political agency and the articulation of difference. Appropriation and political disablement are “but two of the consequences that might be assumed, and depoliticization is never a foregone conclusion” (Jacobs, 1998, 270). Jacobs further states,

The loss of ‘real’ politics is not a pre-given consequence of the aestheticization of contemporary urban landscape. It is, rather, a consequence of the way in which various commentators on postmodernity refuse to see the realm of images and image making as meaningful practice: something which is socially produced, has politics, is material, and is productive” (Jacobs, 1998, 258).

Morris echoes Jacobs’ argumentation by contending that political economy’s assumption that articulations of difference function as a ‘veil’ over more ‘real’ entrepreneurial transformations often precludes the possibility of understanding articulations of difference as always contingent and unstable, conflictual and inherently political (Morris, 1992, 265). Both Jacobs and Morris point to the fact that Harvey provides little sense of the ways in which the concerns of racial and ethnic minorities are not placated by the introduction of spectacular ethnic festivals, nor is there any hint of how such groups might transform these new arenas of play into more familiar arenas of politics (Jacobs, 1998, 258). As Hubbard points out, the result of much urban political economy analysis is a situation in which writers describe urban entrepreneurialism as a politics of exclusion and marginalization while reproducing

exclusion and marginalization in their own theoretical framework (Hubbard, 1996, 1448). The next section explores the effect of urban entrepreneurialism on the production and reception of Pride Toronto. First, I address how dynamics of appropriation and depoliticization inform the organization of Pride Toronto. Following feminist geographers, I then consider how queers are attempting to reclaim Pride Toronto as an important arena for queer politicization.

Section Two

The Entrepreneurial Politics of Pride Toronto

This section examines how Pride Toronto is informed by the dynamics of urban entrepreneurialism. This is most evident in the organization of Pride Toronto as a large scale, spectacular site of consumption. Pride Toronto now serves as an important economic generator for consumption-based industries in Toronto. In 1996, Pride Toronto undertook the first of two studies measuring the event's economic contribution to the local tourist economy. The study concluded that the 1996 festivities brought fifty-six million dollars into the local tourist and leisure economy. This figure was instrumental in securing Pride Toronto's status as a major cultural tourist attraction. Subsequent municipal proclamations of Pride Week were revised to include figures from the study. As well, in 1998, Pride Toronto was designated the city's Best Festival/Event by Tourism Toronto, Toronto's destination marketing arm.

In 2002, Pride Toronto received a nineteen thousand dollar grant from the City of Toronto's Economic Development Sector Initiatives Programme to conduct another economic impact study charting Pride Toronto's evolution as a tourism industry driver. The study shows that while the city's leisure tourism industry is in decline relative to other cities in North America, Pride Toronto continues to attract increasing numbers of tourists and is now worth seventy-five million dollars to the local leisure economy (Pride Toronto, 2003). Thus, Pride Toronto's importance as a tourism industry driver continues to expand. In addition to determining the value of Pride Toronto to the local tourist economy, the 2002 economic impact study sought to refine the science of sponsorship recognition. Pride Toronto spectators were questioned about which corporate logos were most prominent during the event. This data will inform ongoing attempts to position corporate logos more prominently during future parades.

Both of the Pride Toronto economic impact studies include extensive demographic data that reinforce images and stereotypes prevalent in gay niche marketing literature. For example, the 1996 sampled a number of spectators in terms of their expenditures during the event, their education and income levels, their places of residence, and how the event shaped their opinions of Toronto. The study found that typical Pride Toronto attendees are in their thirties, forty six percent earn more than fifty-thousand dollars a year, the majority are working in professional and management fields, forty-six percent of attendees have university degrees, and take an average of five vacations a year (Pride Toronto, 1996).

Since bias is to be assumed in the statistical evidence generated by queer marketing surveys (Kaur Puar, 2002, 110), assessing the validity of this information is not important here.¹³ What is important, however, is Pride Toronto's material investments in the construction and distribution of a class specific image of Pride Toronto spectators as wealthy queer consumer-citizens. The expenses associated with the pursuit of public spectacle leaves Pride Toronto increasingly dependent upon a contrived image of a lucrative niche market of queer consumers that will yield the maximum amount of corporate sponsorship. Pride Toronto attendees are thus commodified as a niche market "demographic" of queer consumers.

The economic impact studies of 1996 and 2002 represent a new mode of commodification, one that is explicitly oriented toward establishing the economic value of Pride Toronto in relation to the local state's economic development strategies. This entails new institutional linkages between Pride Toronto and the network of agencies that constitute the entrepreneurial local state, as well as new relations between Pride Toronto and the leisure tourism industry. A strategic partnership between Pride Toronto and the Department of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism is in development in order to expand the resources available to Pride Toronto when marketing the event to a wider range of tourists. Kyle Knoeck, the current Co-Chair of Pride Toronto, stated in an interview that Pride Toronto is pursuing this partnership with the department based on the recognition that "the real

¹⁶ For a deconstruction of queer niche marketing demographic statistics see Badgett (1997).

benefit of that marketing goes not to Pride Toronto but to the hotel and restaurant industry” (Knoeck, December 2002). Moreover, Pride Toronto is now officially represented on one branch of the local state’s Business Improvement Areas initiative and will participate in the preparation of an economic development business plan for the Church Street area.

The integration of Pride Toronto into the local state’s economic development plans bestows upon the event a limited form of legitimacy that is dependent upon the continued sustainability of an economic development model that identifies queer spaces and spectacles as valuable for their contribution to the leisure economy. In the interview, Knoeck conceded that this mode of legitimacy entails inherent weaknesses:

I’m slightly resentful that we have to...underscore our importance by saying we are an important economic generator. Unfortunately in some political or bureaucratic circles, we need to use those numbers to justify ourselves. I think, ultimately, that this indicates a weakness in the real support for the community... If all they are interested in is the economic generator of the queer community, that is a pretty shallow support for, and acceptance of, the community (Knoeck, December 2002).

Corporate sponsorship is now vital to the existence of Pride Toronto. Pride events have become pervasively commercialized. In working out sponsorship agreements, Pride Toronto effectively functions as a queer niche market gatekeeper; creating opportunities for queer niche marketing, then charging a fee to companies seeking access to those opportunities. The scale of the event provides Pride Toronto with considerable negotiating leverage when working out sponsorship arrangements. Knoeck states, “If companies are not willing to give us an amount of money that we

think is justified by the amount of exposure we are going to give them...that's the main reason we say no...when they are looking for eight hundred thousand people along the parade route to see their logo but aren't willing to pay for that"(Knoeck, December 2002). Pride Toronto thus operates not unlike any large media outlet that sells audiences to advertisers.¹⁴

The extent to which Pride Toronto pro-actively organizes itself as a venue for niche marketing in order to maximize corporate sponsorship revenue is evident in the Corporate Sponsorship Programme produced by the organization in 2001. Within the document, Pride Toronto is constituted as "a great marketing opportunity...the most effective way to reach the valuable gay and lesbian demographic" (Pride Toronto Sponsorship Programme, 2001). The program reiterates narratives of social progress to further entice sponsorship: "It's progressive...sponsoring Pride puts you in the vanguard of positive social change" (Pride Toronto Sponsorship Programme, 2001). Here Pride is constituted as a venue for brand alignment and brand extension. By placing a float in the parade, image conscious corporations, which may or may not extend same-sex employee spousal benefits or other queer-friendly policies, might bask in the "positive social change" that Pride Toronto has come to register. Under the

¹⁴ The organization sought to sell the demographic information contained in the 1996 study to companies seeking access to queer consumer demographic information. Local Councillor Kyle Rae thwarted this attempt on the basis that the study was publicly funded and is thus a public document (Lindstrom, 1997, 14).

heading “Marketing Opportunities That Fit Your Need,” the Sponsorship Programme outlines a plethora of ways in which corporate brand exposure is maximized:

We provide banner spaces for sponsors through the festival site and along the Pride Parade route. Banners are positioned to maximize exposure during television coverage of the Pride parade...Our lively Pride market place attracts more than 100 businesses, and several thousand attendees. We design and position the Pride marketplace to maximize traffic flow and excitement. It's a great way to talk directly with people in our community...We are happy to discuss arrangements for sponsors to provide product samples or promotional giveaways to the public...We work with our sponsors to find the marketing opportunities that fit their needs, and we can provide a customized sponsorship plan for you (Pride Toronto Sponsorship Programme, 2001).

Organizing Pride Toronto as a promotional space and consumption zone reminiscent of a theme park has undermined the ability of grass-roots community organizations to participate in the event. In the mid-nineties, Pride Toronto, looking to maximize revenue sources, began to charge steep admission fees for community groups seeking to represent themselves at the event. The cost of community booths increased from fifty dollars at the 1996 event to three hundred and fifty dollars in 1997. Many community groups operating on little or no money, including the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives, the National Lesbian and Gay Journalist Association, and the Polish Lesbian and Gay Association of Toronto, eventually dropped out citing expense as the reason. In response to growing criticism made by queer community groups unable to afford participation in what was supposed to be a community event, Pride Toronto organizers suggested that community groups secure their own corporate sponsors to raise funds to cover site fees.

The following year, under pressure, Pride Toronto agreed to coordinate corporate sponsorship on behalf of community groups. Those community groups lucky enough to be matched with a corporate sponsor, and thus afford representation, found themselves overwhelmed by corporate logos. In an interview, Greg Pavelich, an activist with the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario and a previous Pride organizer, recalled that, “you would see a booth for a particular organization, and you didn’t know it was for that organization.” Regarding a Toronto People With Aids Foundation booth sponsored by Swatch Watches, Pavelich recalled that, “we thought it was a Swatch set up” (Pavelich, December 2002). One observer further commented in *Xtra!*,

Pride Day is like a shopping mall, every second booth or table was vendors, one might also say straight vendors. You had to search hard to find the community groups and they were really few and far between. The cost of participation made it hard in a really practical way for volunteer run, not for profit organizations to participate in Pride Day. CLGRO, a bedrock of the community, did not participate this year or last year by having a table because the cost is just prohibitive...Pride Toronto has really alienated a lot of the activists within the community and people are giving up and leaving in droves. (Robin Gordon cited in Hill, 1998, 19)

The dynamics of depoliticization inform Pride Toronto organizing in addition to forms of commodification. The pursuit of corporate sponsored public spectacle seems to have occurred at the expense of reflecting actual queer political mobilizations. As Kinsman stated during an interview, unlike Pride events in smaller centres, “Pride Toronto no longer raises the kind of political questions that actually address how heterosexism and homophobia are still pervasive” (Kinsman, December 2002). Although Pride Toronto clearly retains the capacity to reflect actual political

mobilizations, a policy of refraining from articulating political positions is now the practice, and justified in the name of inclusivity. As Knoeck stated, “one of the reasons we’ll never express particular policy preferences is because we view our role as catering to the entire community” (Knoeck, December 2002). The corporate sponsors that Pride Toronto has come to depend upon for funding tend to be unwilling to support anything beyond a vague celebration of community. To continue to use Pride Toronto as a venue to articulate specific queer political demands would potentially jeopardize future funding from corporations who do not support queer social movement politics, but wish to use Pride Toronto to access the so-called pink market.

Pride Toronto’s silence on important political matters has not gone unnoticed. For example, up to and during the amalgamation of Metro Toronto’s seven municipalities into the City of Toronto, when suburban politicians began advocating drastic funding cuts (or the elimination of funding) for organizations servicing the needs of queer people and people with AIDS, Pride Toronto distinguished itself from other queer organizations by refusing to take a stance against amalgamation. While numerous queer groups and agencies were contesting the marginalization of queer issues in the new urban regime, and their powerlessness against proposed funding cuts, Pride Toronto, by far the most powerful expression of queer civic voice in the city, invoked neutrality. In fact, in what was seen by many as a bizarre endorsement and celebration of amalgamation, the theme of 1998’s Pride festivities was “MEGAPRIDE.” Discourses of a “New Pride” for the “New City” abounded. Here, Pride Toronto promotional material

uncritically reiterated the narratives of neoliberal urban renewal that legitimated amalgamation.

The decision to refrain from advancing political positions is, for some, a very political decision in itself. Robin Gordon of the Worker's Organizing Rainbow Coalition, a group of queer trade unionists, summarized the situation by stating that "Pride Toronto claims that they are not political, but refuse to acknowledge the political nature of the decisions they make" (Robin Gordon cited in Noorani, 1998, 43). For Kinsman, the disinterest demonstrated by Pride Toronto when faced with demands for political action is symptomatic of the ways in which Pride politics have become narrowly defined. Kinsman stated that, "Pride politics have been defined such that there is something that is seen as the legitimate proper terrain of what Pride organizing is... while other parts of our community and a series of important political issues fall out of the picture and are not legitimately expressed as queer politics" (Kinsman, December 2002). The extent to which Pride organizing is narrowly defined and then abstracted from queer social movement politics is evident in the promotional material produced by InterPride, an international umbrella organization of Pride organizers which meets annually to "review the state of Pride throughout the world" (Interpride, 2002).

Organizing Pride Toronto as a depoliticised venue for niche marketing entails new modes of management and regulation. In 1999, Pride Toronto introduced metal barriers on either side of the parade as a means to manage the swelling crowds. Such crowd control measures have altered the nature of the event. As Wallace observes,

“these barriers demarcate regulatory zones metonymic of the Parade’s current paradigm; besides preventing spectators from spontaneously joining the procession, the barricades contain participants within boundaries they cannot exceed” (Wallace, 2002, 22). Pride attendees are kept within boundaries in order to facilitate a spectatorial mode of visual consumption. Pride Toronto had even considered erecting bleachers along the parade route and charging a fee to onlookers. They were unable to follow through on that proposal because the permit to close Yonge Street was granted under the condition that all official Pride events remain free of charge. However, a popular vantage point for spectators was transformed into media gallery for registered media only.

While the introduction of different crowd control measures has garnered little controversy, boundaries have been imposed and bitterly contested in other ways. In 1997, Pride Toronto volunteer security marshals began to enforce a moral code that involved the regulation of bodies and practices. Senior organizers within Pride Toronto pressured volunteers to act as auxiliary police and report any instances of disorderly conduct, especially public nudity, to the police. According to an order issued by the Pride Toronto Co-Chair, volunteers who saw nudity were “to proceed to the nearest policeman and inform the policeman that a nude person was seen” (David Clarke cited in Hood, 1998a, 11).

This moral code differed from the previous policy of simply warning nudists that they ran the risk of being arrested. The turn toward moral regulation was prompted out of a concern for securing future permits, as city bureaucrats suggested that complaints

against Pride Toronto could be considered when the permit application was received for the following year's events. According to the Co-Chair that year, "there was no choice...we have to be in the position where we've taken the action that covers our ass...There's a real prospect we won't get our permits -- not this year, but next year" (David Clarke cited in Hood, 1998a, 11). In the effort to meet, in advance, the expectations of regulatory agencies and secure future permits, organizers were enthusiastically complying with the forms of regulation occasioned via licensing, a legal technology deployed to regulate, at a distance, the governance of activities, spaces and bodies (Valverde and Cirak, 2000, 18). A senior organizer went so far as to allude to the efficiency of self-policing by admitting in *Xtra!* that "if it's got to be done, it works better if we police our own" (Laurie Bryson cited in Hood, 1998b).

The will to regulate trumped the spirit of volunteerism that had previously defined Pride Toronto. Potential volunteers were reportedly told to reconsider volunteering if they felt uncomfortable with reporting disorderly conduct to police. However, as Valverde and Cirak point out, this vigilance was pointless, for when complaints were brought by Pride Toronto volunteer security to the police, no action was taken (Valverde and Cirak, 2003, 19).

The policy of policing festival attendees generated much more controversy the following year when Pride Toronto volunteers actively participated in the arrest of a naked woman attempting to gain illegal entry into a beer garden. It was assumed by organizers that this particular woman was not of sound mind, but rather was under the

influence of an unspecified substance (Valverde and Cirak, 2000, 23). As she was dragged off to a police cruiser, onlookers became agitated and gathered around to protest. Five security volunteers were quickly summoned to facilitate the arrest. Greg Pavelich remarked that the Pride Toronto security marshals “were trying to protect the police from us, rather than us from the police” (Pavelich, December 2002). Apart from monitoring potential nudity, a request was made by a senior Pride Toronto member to one of the s/m oriented floats to censor the s/m performance on the float so that the whip being brandished was not actually used on anyone (Valverde and Cirak, 2000, 25).

The micro-management of Pride Toronto participants was widely interpreted as an attempt to control the forms of queerness articulated in the context of Pride Toronto. This practice served as a lightning rod for debates regarding queer self-censorship. On one hand were those who argued that, given increasing media attention, Pride Toronto ought to assume more “family friendly” policies that discourage overt displays of sexuality, and that Pride Toronto be used as a venue for establishing sameness instead of difference. On the other hand were those who believed that Pride Toronto is precisely about the staging of queer sexual diversity, and that any attempt to desexualize and disembodiment articulations of queerness is antithetical to the reason for the existence of Pride events. These ongoing debates speak to the deeply contested meanings of Pride events within both libertarian and assimilationist camps.

Having been burned by criticism in the local queer press, Pride Toronto seems to have stepped out of the business of moral regulation, only for undercover police to

resume the responsibility. In 2002, plain-clothes police officers arrested members of a group called Totally Nude Toronto Men for public nudity. As Wallace points out, the regulation of festival attendees provides an ironic comment on that year's theme of "Uncensored!," Wallace further notes that, unlike the arrest of a nude woman in 1998, there were no protests from on-lookers (Wallace, 2002, 22).

Many aspects of the production and reception of Pride Toronto substantiate claims made within urban political economy regarding the commodification, appropriation and depoliticization of difference in the entrepreneurial city. The displacement of queer social movement politics in exchange for the celebration of queer consumer citizenship, coupled with the policing of overt queer sexuality, certainly suggests this much. These, however, are not the only dynamics playing out in the context of Pride Toronto that are worthy of attention.

Section Three **Contesting Pride Toronto**

This section explores the ways in which Pride Toronto, while organized as a tourist spectacle, remains deeply contested in a multiplicity of ways. The depoliticization and commercialization of Pride Toronto is generating new modes of resistance that open up a new terrain of politics upon which complex questions regarding the politics of assimilation and resistance, queer consumerism, the response (or lack thereof) of queer communities to neoliberal restructuring, and the possibility and

necessity of coalitional politics are explored. In doing so, new groups are invoking a radical queer politics that brings a productive instability and contingency to Pride events as sites of struggle. This analysis of resistance follows from feminist criticism of urban political economy as insufficiently addressing the possibility of a disruptive politics of difference under entrepreneurial urbanization.

The commercialization of Pride Toronto has always been a contentious process. As demonstrated previously, throughout the late eighties and early nineties, the increasingly commercial nature of Pride Day was generating criticism that the event was alienating its community base. The issue came to a head when a group of queer unionists, Workers Organizing Rainbow Coalition (WORC), emerged from a Canadian Labour Congress gay and lesbian conference to contest the increasingly pervasive corporate presence at Pride Toronto. In 1998, WORC intervened in Pride Toronto planning by proposing a Code of Corporate Conduct outlining criteria for screening corporate sponsors. The Code of Corporate Conduct called on Pride Toronto consider six factors when screening private sector sponsors:

1. Lesbian & Gay Rights at Work

Does the company have an anti-discrimination policy which includes sexual orientation? Does the company provide training on these policies?

2. Rights of Workers

Are workers in the company unionized? Do workers receive a fair and living wage? Does the company follow basic workplace law, i.e. employment or labour standards, human rights, health & safety? Does the company sponsor, use or endorse the use of workfare recipients?

3. Access and Equity

Does the company have an employment equity plan and hiring policy? Does the company advertise job opportunities in the lesbian & gay communities and press?

4. Same-Sex Benefits

Does the company have a same-sex benefits plan including medical, dental, adoption assistance, child care benefits, relocation benefits, family/personal sick leave for partner care, bereavement leave, pension plan - in short, equality of benefits?

5. Social Equity

Does the company contribute a substantial part of its revenue to non-profit and/or advocacy organizations supporting the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered communities such as AIDS organizations, social housing and community health clinics?

6. Pride Day Booth Sponsorship (Co-sponsorship with Community Groups)

Is the company willing to donate a portion of money raised on Pride Day to the group that they co-sponsor? Is the company willing to have its sponsorship advertisement smaller than advertisement for the community group it co-sponsors? (Workers Organizing Rainbow Coalition, 1998).

When representatives from WORC presented these stipulations at a Pride Committee meeting in 1998, the proposal was rejected as a leftist diatribe. According to Pavelich, who was a member of WORC, senior Pride Toronto organizers asserted their neutrality on the matter by stating they had no business “telling companies what to do” (Pavelich, December 2002). When pressed further, Pride Toronto then agreed to organize a subcommittee to consider the issue and promised to deliver a report and recommendations. No such subcommittee was ever formed nor was a report ever produced. Pride Toronto’s inaction in the face of demands to implement a Corporate

Code of Conduct prompted the WORC to engage in another intervention by organizing a protest against the presence of Tory MPP Al Leach at that year's Pride festivities.

Leach, who represented the Rosedale riding which includes Toronto's gay quarters, had a long history of homophobia. In 1993, as head of the Toronto Transit Commission, Leach rescinded an agreement to place gay and lesbian counselling service phone numbers on bus transfer stubs. Leach was quoted as saying: "I won't allow it...we have a number of passengers who would be offended by this. And I'm one of them." (Leach cited in Ross, 1998, 19). In response, a local community group, Toronto Area Gays And Lesbians, filed a complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the Commission ruled in their favour.

The fact that Leach was "offended" by the possibility of a social service for lesbians and gays did not bode well for queer communities when he was elected as an MPP in a riding that includes Toronto's queer quarters. That time was marked by a growing number of people with AIDS who were subject to provincial government cut backs that threatened their income security as well as hospital closures and service reductions that limited the availability of extended health services. In addition, the reduction in welfare benefits, coupled with new ways of regulating and disqualifying social assistance recipients, accelerated the descent into poverty for many queer youth who have traditionally had to rely on social assistance when fleeing from their families. This situation was further exacerbated by the escalation of housing costs in Toronto

which have made it much more difficult for many queer youth to stay out of the shelter system and access stable housing.

Only when Councillor Rae went public with an accusation that Leach was not at all interested in representing his large queer constituency did he agree to meet with community representatives. Following the meeting, activists expressed frustration at Leach's lack of concern for queer issues. Alison Kemper, the Executive Director of the 519 Church Street Community Centre concluded in *Xtra!* that, "they [the Tory government] are not terribly interested in advancing our rights. The best we can do is convince them that it's not in their best interest to spend taxpayer's money on reducing our rights." (Alison Kemper cited in Phillips, 1997, 22). Kemper was referring to the provincial government's repeated use of the courts to fight any ruling advancing queer equality.

The critical press that Leach received did not deter him from attempting to utilize Pride Toronto as a promotional space. However, almost as soon as his booth promoting Tory initiatives was set up, a group of thirty-five demonstrators from the Workers Organizing Rainbow Coalition congregated and proceeded to picket. As Greg Pavelich recalled:

The next thing you know, Pride security descended upon us and kept defending Leach's rights to be there. Some of the people who were in Pride Security at the time had a difficult time because many of them were on our side. They found themselves in the position of actually having to defend Al Leach. The booth closed down early at two pm and we achieved our objective. He was gone from the site (Pavelich, December 2002).

By injecting direct action tactics into Pride Toronto, the WORC generated a rupture in Pride politics that organizers attempted but failed to suture through security measures. Gary Kinsman, who participated in the direct action initiative, recalled that the expulsion of Al Leach “was actually quite a useful initiative to try to reclaim some of our own space” (Kinsman, December 2002). Soon after 1998’s Pride festivities, the WORC fell off the queer political landscape, although their code of corporate conduct is still widely circulated throughout Canada and the United States as a model for pressuring Pride organizers to temper sponsorship with ethical concerns.

The attempts made by WORC to unsettle the organization of Pride Toronto as a depoliticized promotional space for corporations and politicians represents a moment of agency that is not taken into account within most urban political economy addressing the commodification of difference under entrepreneurial regimes. This disruption supports the claims made by feminist geographers that spectacular articulations of difference in the entrepreneurial city do not necessarily engender political disablement, but rather that such articulations remain an unstable field of contestation.

There have been more recent examples of the way in which Pride Toronto and other Pride events remain critical sites of politicization. An organization called the Glamorous Outcasts was formed in 2001 with the intention of “reclaiming” Toronto Pride, which they argue, “has been transformed from a celebration of sexual liberation to a common marketplace used to sell products and services” (Glamorous Outcasts, 2002).

In an effort to reassert a left wing presence during festivities in 2002, the Glamorous Outcasts formed a large contingent of several major unions, the Coalition for Lesbian Gay Rights Ontario, queer Palestinians and other leftist groups under the banner "People not Profits." The attempt to "reclaim" Pride Toronto was somewhat thwarted, however, as they became one spectacle among many. As Wallace argues, attempts to register dissent at Pride Toronto are often overwhelmed by the carnival atmosphere that accompanies the sheer size of the event (Wallace, 2002, 21).

Other groups have emerged on the queer political landscape and have been more successful in contesting the commodification and depoliticization of Pride events. A network of anti-Pride organizations under the title Gay Shame is in formation throughout the United States. According to the organization:

Gay Shame is the radical alternative to consumerist "Pride" crap. We are committed to a queer extravaganza that brings direct action to astounding levels of theatricality in order to expose the evildoers who use the sham of gay "Pride" as a cover-up for their greed and misdeeds. We seek nothing less than a new queer activism that addresses issues of race, class, gender and sexuality, to counter the self-serving "values" of the gay mainstream. We are dedicated to fighting the rabid assimilationist monster of corporate gay "Pride" with a devastating mobilization of queer brilliance (Gay Shame, 2002).

The reaction against the commercialization and depoliticization of Pride events has registered in Europe as well. In London, activists have organized Lah Di Dah as an alternative Pride space when organizers of the city's Pride event began charging a fee for admission to the festival. Lah Di Dah organizers viewed this as the "enclosure" of Pride. One organizer states, "Just as years ago authorities enclosed common land and

turned it into private property, Mardi Gras has taken what was a common festival for all of us and turned it into a private paying event with a big fence around it" (Greg cited in Lah Di Dah, 2001). A Gay Shame chapter was formed in Stockholm in 2000. Moreover, at Barcelona's 2001 Pride Parade, a group of gay and lesbian activists blocked the procession with shopping carts and chanted "we are not for sale" (Sanchez, 2001).

New queer activist collectives such as Gay Shame and the Glamorous Outcasts are not simply responding to the commercialized and depoliticized nature of Pride events themselves. Their task is a larger one. They are using Pride Toronto and other Pride events as a venue to advance a critique of mainstream lesbian and gay social movement politics. This critique often cites the white, middle-class domination of lesbian and gay politics and the almost singular focus on same-sex marriage litigation that bestows equality "one relationship at a time" (Gay Shame, 2002). For these groups, the silence maintained within mainstream lesbian and gay politics toward the entrenchment of neoliberalism is unacceptable, as is the common equation of queer consumer-citizenship with political empowerment. According to Gay Shame,

One of the most unsettling aspects of our struggles to 'come out' as queers, trannies, dykes, fags, perverts and the like is, inevitably, not just the battle with what we are coming out of, but the disappointment with what we come into. To articulate non-straight identity in these times means to inherit the meanings that have been attached to queerness by a mainstream gay and lesbian movement focused on consuming, marketing, fitting in, and generally being as non-threatening as possible. So many of us come out as queer, and seek out

opportunities to join forces with others to fight homophobia and transphobia, only to find a series of disappointments as we confront racism, capitalism, profiteering, sexism, investment in binary gender structures, classism, ablism, ageism, assimilation and a profound lack of commitment to radical change in 'gay' organizations and spaces (Gay Shame, 2002).

In addition, these organizations are seeking to politicize the recent serial gentrification and commercialization of white gay male consumer spaces in North American cities by foregrounding the subsequent displacement of women, people of colour, the poor, the old, the disorderly, or those who violate norms of gay male desire and embodiment (Rushbrook, 2002, 9). The San Francisco chapter of Gay Shame now stages a flamboyant yet scathing awards ceremony to coincide annually with the city's Pride festivities. Award categories include, "best white only space," "making more queers homeless" as well as awards for "best body fascism," "best target marketing," and "best gender fundamentalism" (Gay Shame, 2002).

The theatrical praxis of these new queer activist organizations continually unsettles attempts to organize Pride Toronto and other Pride events as an apolitical consumption zone and niche-marketing venue. These groups further exemplify how spectacular articulations of difference in the entrepreneurial urban context do not only operate in the service of hegemonic forces, but may be disrupted and transformed into a site of politicization. Processes of commodification and appropriation do not simply render Pride Toronto into a depoliticized tourist spectacle, nor does its spectacular scale necessarily preclude or deactivate political mobilization and placate its queer participants. Rather, Pride Toronto remains an important and complex venue for the

unstable and contingent articulation of non-heteronormative identities and political positions.

Conclusion

The account of Pride Toronto developed in this chapter both concurs with and departs from analyses of difference in the entrepreneurial city. The first half of this chapter demonstrates the commodification and appropriation of difference in the entrepreneurial city and is consistent with an urban political economy approach. The displacement of queer social movement politics in the increasingly commercialized context of Pride Toronto is undeniable. I have also cited the ways in which producing Pride Toronto as a spectator event and promotional space entails the management of queer difference through the moral regulation of queer bodies and practices.

Yet, I have also sought to demonstrate the ways in which the commercialization, depoliticization and appropriation of Pride Toronto is never absolute. This analysis supports claims made within feminist geography regarding the need to view the staging of difference in the entrepreneurial city as a deeply contested and unstable practice where both the play of difference and a disruptive politics of difference often collide. Such is the case with Pride Toronto. New queer activist organizations are struggling against the displacement of queer social movement politics in the context of Pride Toronto. These groups are using Pride events to make a critical intervention in Pride

organizing as well as broader trends within mainstream lesbian and gay social movement politics. Such interventions generate a contingency and instability in Pride that require acknowledgement. Thus, Pride Toronto cannot be conceived of simply as spectacle intended for tourist consumption so long as a dynamic tension exists between the play of queer difference, and those seeking to disrupt and reclaim Pride Toronto as a venue for advancing a contentious and disruptive queer politics.

Conclusion

This thesis represents an attempt to bring political economy and lesbian and gay studies together in a productive association. Such an endeavour is largely experimental given the lack of engagement between these two bodies of thought. In order to develop what might be called a queer political economy, I have utilized literature addressing entrepreneurial urban governance in order to begin thinking through queer politics in relation to the political economy of urbanization.

This thesis began with a discussion of transformations in urban governance now commonly referred to as urban entrepreneurialism. Within this literature there is a consensus that shifts that occurred in the momentum of economic growth during the seventies, characterized as the crisis of Fordism, transformed urban governance. Municipal authorities have had to deal with new forms of economic insecurity as the manufacturing base of many urban economies has dwindled. National interventionist policies that insulated certain cities from the uneven nature of capitalist development were also in decline. Increasingly disarticulated from national economies and thrust into an arena of global competitiveness, cities are now competing with each other in order to secure economic growth.

Urban entrepreneurialism is a troubling trend for a number of reasons. The mobilization of local governance in support of economic development has occurred at the expense of the redistributive functions of local governance. Welfare is increasingly

constituted as a matter of creating conditions conducive to economic growth, and less as a matter of redistribution. Urban entrepreneurialism is thus considered to exacerbate social and economic disparities in cities. As a means of managing social polarization, many entrepreneurial cities are enacting “law and order” modes of regulation that serve to criminalize and delegitimize already marginalized urban dwellers such as the poor, the homeless and street youth.

Entrepreneurial inter-urban competition entails a new emphasis on marketing and commodifying the city. This typically involves the careful manipulation of city imagery, and the fabrication of ‘playful’ entrepreneurial urban landscapes. Mega-events and mega-projects, spectacular entertainment complexes, revitalized historical quarters and other aestheticized spaces of consumption are now central to the economic and symbolic regeneration of the entrepreneurial city. Such developments are often accompanied by legitimizing discourses and practices of civic-boosterism.

This thesis demonstrates the ways in which the City of Toronto exemplifies a neoliberal urban entrepreneurialism. The role of Toronto’s urban governance is being redefined from the provision of welfare state policies to that of stimulator of economic growth and development. Entrepreneurial discourses of global economic competitiveness, which constitute Toronto as an economic subject capable of acting in an enterprising manner, are now pervasive throughout economic, social and cultural policy documents.

One aspect of Toronto's entrepreneurialism that this thesis focuses on is the reimagining and commodification of the city. This entails the reflexive auditing of assets that will advance a distinct urban profile. "Previously overlooked" elements of the city, including spaces of ethno-cultural difference, are being re-valuated and commodified in this imaging exercise. Such spaces are now identified as material and semiotic resources supporting Toronto's cosmopolitan profile as well as the emergence of a cultural tourism industry based on the commodification of cultural difference.

Queer spaces have become implicated in entrepreneurial urbanization as one element within an array of commodified cultural difference. In discussing the commodification of queer spaces, my argumentation is congruent with the descriptions of difference in literature on the entrepreneurial city. This literature has long emphasized the ways in which local cultures may be (ab)used within strategies of economic development. Under conditions of entrepreneurial urban governance, it is argued that articulations of difference may have more to do with economic development strategies than with social justice concerns. This consideration is crucial in explaining the contradictory state of queer politics in Toronto. Queer spaces and spectacles are legitimated as colourful features within Toronto's post-industrial consumer landscape. This, however, does not preclude ongoing processes of oppression, such as the continuing criminalization of queer sexuality.

Pride Toronto provides a rich terrain upon which to explore the relationship between processes of urban entrepreneurialism and queer politics. The account of Pride

Toronto developed in this study began with an emphasis on the role the event played in local lesbian and gay social movement organizing. Gays and lesbians in Toronto were severely oppressed and found in Pride events a useful venue for creating queer visibility, articulating political demands against the state, and organizing resistance to social conservatism.

I demonstrate that while Pride Toronto has traditionally advanced a disruptive lesbian and gay politics, the event has been redefined in ways that support the play of queer difference characterized by dynamics of commodification and depoliticization. Pride Toronto is increasingly defined by a spectacularly grand and highly stylized presentation of queer sexualities that is largely divorced from queer social movement politics. Indeed, the event is now organized as both an economic generator for the local economy and as a venue for queer niche marketing. In order to ensure an event that is conducive to commodification, Pride Toronto organizers have even sought to govern the conduct of attendees, and place limitations on which forms of queer sexuality and embodiment may be expressed. The analysis presented in this thesis is largely consistent with the script of depoliticized and commodified difference prevalent in much urban political economy addressing difference in the entrepreneurial city.

Yet, in this study, there is an important point of departure between existing analyses of difference in the entrepreneurial urban context. Whereas literature on the entrepreneurial city provides little sense of how processes of commodification and appropriation of cultural difference are resisted, the analysis of Pride Toronto developed

here attempts to foreground such resistance. I have demonstrated that Pride Toronto remains a deeply contested arena for expressing queer identities and political positions. Emergent groups contesting the commercialization and depoliticization of Pride Toronto have been emphasized. These groups make interventions that generate a contingency and instability in the production and reception of Pride Toronto. The event thus cannot simply be conceived of as a postmodern spectacle intended for tourist consumption in the entrepreneurial city. Rather, Pride Toronto emerges from a dynamic tension between processes of commodification and appropriation, and various attempts to disrupt and reclaim Pride Toronto as a venue for advancing a contentious and disruptive queer politics.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Kay. (1998). Sites of Difference: Beyond a Cultural Politics of Race Polarity. In Ruth Fincher and Jane M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Cities of Difference* (201-224). New York: Gilford Press.
- Badgett, Lee. (1997). Beyond Biased Samples: Challenging the Myths on the Economic Status of Lesbians and Gay Men. In Amy Gluckman and Betsy Reed (Eds.), *Homo Economics: Capitalism, Community and Lesbian and Gay Life* (45-67). New York: Routledge.
- Board of Trade. (2002a). *Strong City, Strong Nation*. [Online] Available at: http://www.bot.com/ContentIslands/publicPages/FloatingPages/Press_06_12_2002.asp
- Board of Trade. (2002b). *City of Toronto Pre-Budget Submission Working Together for a Competitive Toronto*. [Online] Available at: http://www.bot.com/ContentIslands/PublicPages/FloatingPages/AdvPolicy_02_18_2002.asp
- Bromley, Ian. (1994). Five Reasons Why the Last Recession Was So Deep, So Long, So Toronto. Toronto: Department of Economics. *Economic Forum on the Future of the Greater Toronto Area* (4-9). Toronto: Metropolitan Toronto: Department of Economics.
- Butler, Judith. (1993). *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. (1997). Merely Cultural. *Social Text*, 52-53, 265-277.
- Castells, Manuel. (1989). *The Informational City*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chasin, Alexandra. (2000). *Selling Out: The Gay and Lesbian Movement Goes To Market*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Christopherson, Susan. (1994). The Fortress City. In Ash Amin (Ed.), *Post-Fordism* (409-427). Oxford: Blackwell.
- City of Toronto. (1992). *Competitive Tourism Development Strategy*. Toronto: City of Toronto.

- City of Toronto. (2000a). *Toronto Competes: An Assessment of Toronto's Global Competitiveness*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2000b). *Economic Development Strategy Report*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2001a). *The Creative City*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2001b). *A Social Development for the City of Toronto*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2001c). *Tourism Investment Report*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2002a). *Gay and Lesbian Toronto*. Toronto: City of Toronto.
- City of Toronto. (2002b). *Toronto—City of Festivals Fact Sheet*. [Online] Available at: www.city.toronto.on.ca/special_events.
- Clarke, Danae. (1991). Commodity Lesbianism. *Camera Obscura*, 25-26, 181-201.
- Clement, Wallace. (1997). Whither the New Canadian Political Economy? In Wallace Clement (Ed.), *Understanding Canada: Building on the New Canadian Political Economy* (3-18). McGill-Queens University Press.
- Cochrane, Allan. (1999). Redefining Urban Politics for the Twenty-First Century. In Andre Jonas and David Wilson (Eds.), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (110-135). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Committee To Stop Target Policing. (2000). An Evaluation of Community Action Policing. [Online] Available at: <http://interlog.com/-command/targetp.htm>.
- Cox, Kevin and Mair, Andrew. (1988). Locality and Community in the Politics of Economic Development. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 78,2, 307-325.
- Cox, Kevin. (1999). Ideology and the Growth Coalition. In Andre Jonas and David Wilson (Eds.), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (73-97). Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Crilley, David. (1993). Architecture as Advertising: Constructing the Image of Redevelopment. In Gary Kearns and Chris Philo (Eds.), *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present* (220-243). Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Croucher, Sheila. (1997). Constructing the Image of Ethnic Harmony in Toronto, Canada: The Politics of Problem Definition and Nondefinition. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32, 3, 319-347.
- D'Emilio, John. (1983). Capitalism and Gay Identity. In Ann Snitow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson (Eds.), *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality* (17-32). New York: Monthly Review.
- Eggleton, Art. (1989, November 8) Letter to the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee.
- Eisinger, Peter. (2000). The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35, 3, 316-333.
- Fainstein, Susan and Judd, Dennis. (1999). Global Forces, Local Strategies and Urban Tourism. In Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd (Eds.), *The Tourist City* (97-319). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Featherstone, Mike. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fox Gotham, Kevin. (2002). Marketing Mardi Gras: Commodification, Spectacle and the Political Economy of Tourism in New Orleans. *Urban Studies*, 39, 10, 1735-1756.
- Florida, Richard and Gates, Gary. (2001). *Technology and Tolerance: The Importance of Diversity to High Technology Growth*. Washington: The Centre on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
- Florida, Richard. (June 24, 2002). We Can Make It Happen Here. *Globe and Mail*, T8.
- Floyd, Kevin. (1998). Making History: Marxism, Queer Theory and the Future of American Studies. *Cultural Critique*, 40, 167-201.
- Foucault, Michel. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Fraser, Miriam. (1999). Classing Queer: Politics in Competition. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16, 2, 107-131.
- Fraser, Nancy. (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the Postsocialist Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Friskien, Frances. (1993). Planning and Servicing the Greater Toronto Area: The Interplay of Provincial and Municipal Interests. In Donald Rothblatt and Andrew Sancton (Eds.), *Metropolitan Governance: American/Canadian Intergovernmental Perspectives* (143-169). Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies Press.
- Gay Shame. (2002). [Online]. Available at:
<http://www.gayshamesf.org/home.htm>.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gillespie, Kerrie. (June 25, 2002). A City Battle for Equity. *Toronto Star*, A9.
- Glamorous Outcasts (2002). [Online]. Available at:
<http://books.dreambook.com/tblgay/takeaction.html>.
- Government of Canada. (1986, March 4). Minister of Justice Tables Progressive Measures for Equality and Social Justice, News Release.
- Grube, John. (1997). No More Shit: The Struggle for Democratic Gay Space. In Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthillette, and Yolanda Retter (Eds.), *Queers in Space: Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance* (227-249). Seattle: Bay Press.
- Hall, C. Michael. (1992). *Hallmark Tourist Events: Impacts, Management, and Planning*. London: Belhaven.
- Hall, Tim and Hubbard, Phillip (1998). *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons
- Hall, Tim and Hubbard, Phillip. (1996). The Entrepreneurial City: New Urban Politics, New Urban Geographies? *Progress in Human Geography*, 20, 2, 153-174.
- Hannigan, John. (1998). *Fantasy City: Pleasure and Profit in the Postmodern Metropolis*. London: Routledge.

- Halperin, David. (1995). *Saint Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. (1989). From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation of Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler* 71, 3-17.
- Harvey, David. (1990). *The Condition of Post-Modernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell Press.
- Hasselriis, Kaj. (July 3, 1997). Straight Looking, Straight Acting. *Xtra!*, no. 331, 20.
- Heath, Jamey. (2001, Feb 22). EGALE is Dead, Long Live EGALE. *Xtra!*, no. 426 [Online]. Available at: <http://www.xtra.ca/site/toronto2/arch/body768.shtm>
- Hennessey, Rosemary. (1995). Queer Visibility in Commodity Culture. *Cultural Critique*, 29, 31-76.
- Hill, Karen. (1998, August 2). Activists Suggests Banning Bad Guys. *Xtra!*, no. 360, 19.
- Hood, Duncon. (1998a, June 18). They're Starkers! *Xtra!*, no. 356, 11.
- Hood, Duncan. (1998b, August 27). Two Activists try to Control Meeting. *Xtra!*, no. 361, 16.
- Hubbard, Phillip. (1996). Urban Design and Urban Regeneration: Social Representation of Entrepreneurial Landscapes. *Urban Studies*, 33, 8, 1441-1461.
- Hunt, Christopher. (2001). *Constructing the Entrepreneurial City: Silicon Valley North and Ottawa's Local Mode of Governance 1988-2000 Phd Dissertation*. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Ingebretsen, Edward. (1999). Gone Shopping: The Commercialization of Same-Sex Desire. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Identity*, 4, 132-152.
- InterPride. (2002). Who We Are and What We Do. [Online]. Available at: www.interPride.org.
- Immen, Wallace. (2002, July 29). Parade More About Acceptance than Shock. *The Globe and Mail*, A1.

- Isin, Engin. (1998). Governing Toronto Without Government: Liberalism and Neoliberalism. *Studies in Political Economy*, 56, 169-191.
- Isin, Engin and Wolfson, Joanne. (1999). *The Making of the Megacity: An Introduction*, Vol. 21, *Urban Studies Programme Working Paper*. Toronto: York University.
- Isin, Engin. (1990). Citizenship, Class and the Global City. *Citizenship Studies* 3,2, 267-283.
- Jacobs, Jane M. (1999). Staging difference: Aestheticization and the Politics of Difference. In Ruth Fincher and Jane M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Cities of Difference* (253-278). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jessop, Bob. (1997). The Entrepreneurial City: Re-Imaging Localities, Redesigning Economic Governance, and Restructuring capital? In Nick Jewson and Susanne MacGregor (Eds.), *Transforming Cities: Contested Governance and new Spatial Divisions* (28-41). London: Routledge.
- Jessop, Bob. (1998). The Enterprise of Narrative and the Narrative of Enterprise: Place Marketing and the Entrepreneurial City. In Phillip Hubbard and Tim Hall (Eds.), *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation* (77-99), New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Jessop, Bob, Peck, Jamie and Tickell, Allan. (1999). Retooling the Machine: Economic Crisis, State Restructuring and Urban Politics. In Andre Jonas and David Wilson (Eds.), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (141-159). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Judd, Dennis. (1999). Creating the Tourist Bubble. In Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd (Eds.), *The Tourist City* (35-54). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- June 13th Committee. (2000, September). Press Release.
- Kaur Puar, Jasbir. (2002). Circuits of Queer Mobility: Tourism, Travel, and Globalization. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 8, 1&2, 101-137.
- Keat, Russell and Abercrombie, Nicholas (1991). *Enterprise Culture*. London: Routledge.

- Keil, Roger (1998). Toronto in the 1990s: Dissociated Governance. *Studies in Political Economy*, 56 (Summer), 151-168.
- Kennedy, John. (1999, Dec 9). Julian Fantino: Homophobic or Misunderstood? *Fab Magazine*, 127, 24.
- Kinsman, Gary. (1996). *The Regulation of Desire: Homo and Hetero Sexualities Second Revised Edition*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Kinsman, Gary. (2002, December 15). Personal Interview.
- Kipfer, Stephan and Keil, Roger. (2000). Still Planning to be Different? Toronto at the Turn of the Millennium. [Online] Available at: http://www.orl.arch.ethz.ch/disp/pdf/140_5.pdf
- Kipfer, Stephan and Keil, Roger. (2002). Toronto Inc. Planning The Competitive City in the New City of Toronto. *Antipode*, 34, 2, 227-264.
- Knoeck, Kyle. (2002, December 18). Personal Interview.
- Knopp, Lawrence. (1998). Sexuality and Urban Space: Gay Male Identities, Communities and Cultures in the U.S., U.K. and Australia. In Ruth Fincher and Jane M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Cities of Difference* (149-176). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lah Di Dah. (2001). Something For Everyone. [Online] Available at: <http://www.queeruption.com/pressreports.htm>.
- Lash, Scott and Urry, John. (1994). *Economies of Signs and Space*. London: Sage.
- Leitner, Helga and Sheppard, Eric. (1998). Economic Uncertainty, Inter-Urban Competition and the Efficacy of Entrepreneurialism. In Hall, Tim and Hubbard, Phillip (Eds.), *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation* (285-307), New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lesbian and Gay Pride Day Committee. (1990, June). Pride Program.
- Leslie, Colin. (1996). New Sex Chill Hits Gay Bars *Xtra!*, no. 312, 11.
- Ley, David. (1996). The New Middle Class in Canadian Central Cities. In Jon Caulfield and Linda Peake (Eds.), *City Lives and City Forms: Critical Research and Canadian Urbanism* (15-32). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lindstrom, Jeff. (1997, Jan 30). Tax-Funded Study's a Secret. *Xtra!* no. 320, 14.

- Lloyd, Richard and Clark, Terry Nichols. (2001). The City as An Entertainment Machine. *Critical Perspectives on Urban Redevelopment*, 6, 357-378.
- Logan, John. and Molotch, Harvey (1987). *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lovering, John. (1995). Creating Discourses Rather Than Jobs: The Crisis in the Cities and the Transition Fantasies of Intellectuals and Policy Makers. In Pat Healy (ed.), *Managing Cities: The New Urban Context* (109-126). Sussex: John Wiley and Sons Limited.
- Lowes, Mark. (2002). *Indy Dreams and Urban Nightmares: Speed Merchants, Spectacle and the Struggle over Public Space in the World-Class City*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Markwell, Kevin. (2002). Mardi Gras Tourism and the Construction of Sydney as an International Gay and Lesbian City. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 8, 1&2, 81-99.
- Mayer, Margit. (1991). Politics in the Post-Fordist City. In *Socialist Review*, 21, 1, 105-124.
- Mayer, Margit. (1994). Post-Fordist City Politics. In Ash Amin (Ed.), *Post-Fordism* (316-337). Oxford: Blackwell.
- McCaskell, Tim. (1988). The Bath Raids and Gay Politics. In Sue Findlay, Marlene Kadar, and Al Lennon (Eds.), *Social Movements/ Social Change* (140-154), Toronto: Society for Socialist Studies.
- Meiksins Wood, Ellen. (1997). What is the Postmodern Agenda? In Ellen Meiksins Wood and John Bellamy Foster (Eds.), *In Defence of History* (1-16). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ministry of the Attorney General. (1999). Safe Streets Act Press Release. [Online] Available at:
<http://www.newswire.ca/government/ontario/english/releases/November1999/02/c0352.html>.
- Molotch, Harvey (1976). The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 309-30.
- Money, Janet. (1997a, August 28th). London Mayor Explains. *Xtra* no.335, 22.

- Money, Janet. (1997b, October 23). Mayor Would Not Turn Her Back On God. *Xtra!* no. 339, 17.
- Mullins, Patrick. (1999). International tourism and the Cities of Southeast Asia. In Susan Fainstein and Dennis Judd (Eds.) *The Tourist City* (245-276). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Murdie, Robert (1996). Economic Restructuring and Social Polarisation in Toronto. In John O'Loughlin and Jeff Freidricks (Eds.), *Social Polarisation in Post-Industrial Metropolises* (207-233). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Noorani, Arif. (1998, June 18). Taming The Corporate Beast. *Xtra!*, no. 356, 43.
- Organization To Hold the Pride Committee Accountable. (1994, August 7). Feedback From Community Consultations. Toronto.
- Pavelich, G. (2002, December 18). Personal Interview.
- Petrunic, Josipa. (2002, July 01). Gays Celebrate Freedom. *Toronto Star*, A1.
- Phillips, Liz. (1997, October 9). Al Leach Steps Into Gaytown. *Xtra!*, no. 338, 22.
- Pride Toronto. (2002). Backgrounder. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.Pridetoronto.com/history/index.htm>.
- Pride Toronto. (1996). *Economic Impact Study*. Toronto.
- Pride Toronto (2001). Corporate Sponsorship Programme. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.Pridetoronto.com/sponsors/index.htm>.
- Pride Toronto. (2003). Inside Pride: A Newsletter for our Fabulous Pride Volunteers, 1, 1.
- Pritchard, Annette, Morgan, Nigel and Sedgely, Diane. (1998). Reaching Out to the Gay Tourist: Opportunities and Threats in an Emerging Market Segment. *Tourism Management*, 19, 273-82.
- Quilley, Stephen. (1997). Constructing Manchester's New Urban Village: Gay Space in the Entrepreneurial City. In Gordon Ingram, Anne-Marie Bouthilette and Yolanda Retter (Eds.), *Queers in Space: Communities, Public Places, Sites of Resistance* (275-292). Seattle: Bay Press.
- Rae, Kyle. (2002, December 11). Personal Interview.

- Rau, Krishna. (1997, August 17). Look Into My Eyes and Trust Me. *Xtra!* no. 334. 15.
- Renzetti, Elizabeth. (1994, July 4). Gay Parade Mixes Rage With Pride. *The Globe and Mail*, A1.
- Rites Editorial. (1987, June). *Rites Magazine*, 4,3, 3.
- Rose, Nikolas. (1996). The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government. *Economy and Society*, 25, 3, 327-356.
- Rose, Nikolas. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, Becki. (1995). *The House That Jill Built: A Lesbian Nation In Formation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ross, Heather. (1998, December 3). Uncle Uncle. *Xtra!* no. 368, 19.
- Rushbook, Dereka. (2002). Cities, Queer Space and the Cosmopolitan Tourist. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 8.1&2, 183-206.
- Sanchez, George. (2002, June 28). Question of Pride. *Mother Jones*. [Online]. Available at:
http://www.motherjones.com/web_exclusives/features/news/gay_shame.html
- Sassen, Saskia. (1991). *The Global City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. (2000). New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Millennium. *British Journal of Sociology*, 1,51, 143-159.
- Shields, Rob. (1992). *Lifestyle Shopping: The Subject of Consumption*. London: Routledge.
- Short, John Rennie. (1999). Urban Imagineers: Boosterism and the Representation of Cities. In Andre Jonas and David Wilson (Eds.), *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later* (43-68). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Siemiatycki, Meyer and Isin, Engin. (1997). Immigration, Diversity and Urban Citizenship in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, 1, 2, 73-102.

- Simich, Laura. (2000). Towards A Greater Toronto Charter: Implications for Immigration Settlement. [Online] Available at: http://www.maytree.com/pdf_files/tgtcReport.pdf
- Smith, Neil. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Miriam. (1999). *Lesbian And Gay Rights in Canada: Social Movements and Equity Seeking, 1971- 1995*. University of Toronto Press.
- Stoker, Gerry and Mossberger, Karen. (1994). Urban Regime Theory in Comparative Perspective. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 12, 195-212.
- Stone, Sharon Dale. (2001). Lesbians, Gays and the Press: Covering Lesbian and Gay Pride Day in Kelowna, 1996. *Studies in Political Economy*, 64. Spring, 2001, 59-81.
- Swainson, Gail. (1995, March 29). Policing or The Needy? Metro Juggles Budgets Cuts. *Toronto Star*, A4.
- Todd, Graham. (1993). Restructuring the Local State: Economic Development and Local Public Enterprise in Toronto. In Jon Caufield and Linda Peake (Eds.), *City Lives and City Forms: Critical Research and Canadian Urbanism* (173-194). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Todd, Graham. (1998). Megacity: Globalization and Governance in Toronto. *Studies in Political Economy*, 56, 193-216.
- Tourism Toronto. (2001). The Gay Village. [Online] Available: Toronto.com/Toronto/Tourism_Toronto/Media_Gallery/News_Releases/Gay.
- United Way of Greater Toronto. (2002). *A Decade of Decline: Poverty and Income Inequality in the City of Toronto in the Nineties*. [Online] Available at: http://www.unitedwaytoronto.com/who_we_help/social_issues.html
- Urry, John. (2002). *The Tourist Gaze 2nd Edition*. London: Sage.
- Valverde, Marianna. (1996). Despotism and Ethical Liberal Governance. *Economy and Society* 25, 3, 357-392.
- Valverde, Marianna and Cirak, Miromir. (2000). Governing Bodies, Creating Gay Spaces: Policing and Security Issues in Gay Downtown Toronto. *British Journal of Criminology*, Forthcoming.

- Vespry, Anne. (1990, January). Pride Day: The Saga Continues. *Rites*, 5, 3, 7.
- Walks, R. Alan. (2001). The Social Ecology of the Post-Fording/Global City? Economic Restructuring and Socio-spatial Polarisation in the Toronto Urban Region. *Urban Studies*, 38, 3, 407-447.
- Wallace, Robert. (2002). Exceeding Boundaries: Toronto's Pride Parade and the Struggle for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Canada. Paper presented at the North American Studies Conference, August 2002, Mexico City.
- Wallace, Marcia and Frisken, Frances. (1998). City-Suburban Differences in Government Responses to Immigration in the Greater Toronto Area. *Research Paper 197*. Toronto: Centre for Community and Urban Research.
- Warner, Tom. (2002). *Never Going Back: A History of Queer Activism in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Warner, Michael & Berland, Lauren. (1993). Sex in Public. In Simon During (Ed.), *Cultural Studies Reader 2nd Ed* (354-369). New York: Routledge.
- World Tourism Organization. (2002). Facts and Figures. [Online]. Available at: http://www.world-tourism.org/market_research/facts&figures/menu.htm.
- Workers Organizing Rainbow Coalition. (1998). Corporate Code of Ethics. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.car.ca/whatwedo/Pride/corporateconduct.asp>.
- Zukin, Sharon. (1998). Urban lifestyles: Diversity and Standardisation in Spaces of Consumption. *Urban Studies* 35, 5-6, 825-39.
- Zukin, Sharon. (1991). *Landscapes of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zukin, Sharon. (1995). *The Culture of Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.