Interrogating Multiculturalism and Urban Revitalization: “The Diversity of Diversity” in Toronto’s Regent Park

Vanessa Rosa
Latina/o Studies, Mount Holyoke College

Abstract: This article examines the uses of the term “diversity” in Toronto’s oldest and largest public housing project, Regent Park. The revitalization plan emphasizes a diversity of use, diversity of income, and diversity of culture in the redevelopment of the neighbourhood. I argue the *diversity of diversity* serves as a legitimizing tool for the revitalization projects and draws from the cachet of Canadian multiculturalism. While both “diversity” and “mix” (mixed income or diversity of incomes, for example) are generally taken for granted terms in planning discourse, promoting more equitable planning practices requires analyzing them more closely in context. My analysis sheds light on tensions between various types of diversity, thereby challenging the potential for the framework to address structural inequality via revitalization.

Keywords: diversity, multiculturalism, Regent Park, Toronto, urban revitalization

Introduction

The main theme that links all of the elements of this plan together is the importance of striving for diversity as a key organizing feature of the revitalization process: diversity of building types, designs and heights; diversity of tenures; diversity and mix of incomes; diversity and mix of uses; diversity of builders; and diversity of activities. A successful Toronto neighbourhood reflects this type of diversity. It is also what will make Regent Park a successful and special place. (Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2002, p. 5)

This passage from the “Regent Park Revitalization Study” regarding a public housing project in Toronto, Canada seems almost comic in its employment of diversity talk. Official narratives of Toronto’s overarching identity claim that its multicultural and diverse population is the city’s defining feature (Doucet, 2008; Teelucksingh, 2006; Valverde, 2008; 2012). The Toronto coat of arms displays the city’s motto: “Diversity our Strength.” While the motto originally referred to the diversity among the seven municipalities that were amalgamated in the late 1990s, contemporary observers, as well as those who invoke the motto, use it to refer to Toronto’s “cultural diversity.”

This article examines the uses of the term “diversity” in the revitalization framework of Regent Park, a public housing project in Toronto managed by the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). Official descriptions of Canada’s multicultural population often use the term diversity as a signal of pride. Given the significance on both national and local levels, it is no surprise that the concept of diversity stands out as a central feature of the revitalization planning framework in Regent Park. What is striking, however, is the use of diversity to refer to multiple planning priorities in the revitalization project beyond cultural diversity. In this article, I examine the following key questions: How is the term “diversity” employed in the Regent Park revitalization project? What is obscured and what is highlighted in the use of the term diversity in the revitalization project?

The primary concern of the revitalization planning framework in Regent Park is to address the segregation of the housing project and integrate the Regent Park community into the broader social fabric of Toronto. To achieve integration, the revitalization planning documents emphasize a symbiosis between three types of diversity: diversity of use, diversity of income and tenure, and diversity of culture. For example, in the Regent Park Social Development Plan, planners suggest, “After decades of planning and organizing on the part of

tenants and stakeholders, Regent Park is being rebuilt as a diverse, mixed-income community in an open and integrated neighbourhood” (TCHC, 2007b, p. 1). I explore how the interchangeable and often confusing references to diversity attempt to align a diversity of income, use, and culture with Canadian multicultural ideals in order to legitimize the revitalization project, yet do little to address poverty or disparity. I argue that the *diversity of diversity* in the revitalization makes diversity a tool for the legitimation of the revitalization project; that is, the language of diversity makes the revitalization more easily acceptable as a planning framework because of diversity’s cachet under Canadian multiculturalism.

In the case of Regent Park, the multiple and often ambiguous uses of diversity allows diversity to align to a presupposed success and the promotion of social inclusion in Canada’s liberal democratic and multicultural society. I suggest that the use of diversity becomes a legitimizing tactic because diversity hinges upon the cachet of multiculturalism in Canadian society by tapping into the ideology and discourses of multiculturalism as a result of the assumed value of diversity in liberal democratic societies. While both diversity and mix are generally taken for granted terms in planning discourse (diversity of income or use and mixed-income or use), such terms should be analyzed more closely and in relation to the contexts in which they are employed. In Toronto, employing the term diversity to characterize the key features of the planning framework allows the revitalization to align with and draw on the cachet of Canadian multiculturalism. This alignment operates by normalizing a mirage of diversity (diversity of income, diversity of use, and diversity of culture) that characterizes the integrative features of the revitalization. Regent Park revitalization documents employ the standard planning terms of “mixed-use” and “mixed-income” interchangeably with “diversity of use” and “diversity of income.” Importantly, I show that the use of diversity to refer to use and income is a signaling process—as I argue, it positions the revitalization project such that it is aligned with a broader set of Canadian values about racial “difference,” inclusion, and an acceptance of cultural diversity. It aligns because there are expectations about difference, especially in a multicultural society. These uses of diversity and mix align because of expectations that we *should* accept cultural and racial difference in Canadian society.

Building on the work of scholars critical of the employment of the concept of diversity in employment policy, education, communities, and law (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002; Ahmed, 2012; Berrey, 2015; Valverde, 2012), I suggest that because of the ambiguous usage of the term, diversity can signal equity and the inclusion of diverse ethnoracial groups

and low-income residents under the auspices of goodwill and multiculturalism, but does not generally challenge the historical and structural causes of racial and class inequality. This article aims to not only examine often taken for granted planning frameworks (such as revitalization) to encourage more equitable and critical planning practices, but also to contribute to critiques of diversity and multiculturalism more broadly to center an analysis of the historical and structural causes of inequality in urban planning.

In order to gain a full understanding of the processes underway, I employ a multi-method approach including five semi-structured interviews with planners and representatives from TCHC, an interview with a former long-time Regent Park resident and current employee of a local service organization, an executive director of a primary service provider in Regent Park, and an extensive analysis of revitalization planning documents from Regent Park. I interviewed the key city planners and TCHC representatives who were most directly connected to the Regent Park revitalization.¹ My document analysis includes analysis of city and planning documents published after 2002. I analyzed site plans, social development plans, economic plans, zoning documents, city council minutes, community council minutes, and consultation documents from Regent Park. This combined methodological approach using both primary and secondary sources allowed me to trace the uses of the term diversity in the planning documents and investigate how planners imagined or envisioned diversity in the revitalization.

In the following section, I explore the literature on Canadian multiculturalism and diversity in cities as well as the pertinence of this research in urban planning and other contexts. I then draw from interview transcripts and planning documents to explore how diversity is mobilized in the Regent Park revitalization project.

Literature and Framework: The Cachet of Multiculturalism and Diversity Discourses

This interdisciplinary investigation is situated at the intersection of studies of multiculturalism across the social sciences, as well as urban studies and urban planning research on diversity. Multiculturalism maintains a powerful place in the Canadian imaginary as a defining characteristic of national identity that boasts acceptance, integration, and celebrations of cultural difference. As Stuart Hall (2000) explains, multiculturalism has a

¹ In this article, I use pseudonyms to protect the identity of informants.

variety of manifestations and is both contested and embraced in liberal democratic societies. For Hall (2000), multiculturalism refers to the strategies or policies used to “govern or manage the problems of diversity and multiplicity that multi-cultural societies throw up” (p. 209). Other scholars define multiculturalism generally as the social, legal, and political accommodation of ethnic diversity in liberal societies (Kymlica, 1996; Povenelli, 2002). Canada has federally recognized cultural difference and promotes the celebration of cultural diversity through policies such as the Multiculturalism Act, a law passed in 1988 that seeks to preserve and enhance multiculturalism.

The Canadian federal government’s need to manage the two dominant “founding cultures” and languages, English and French, as well as the rising voices of other “ethnocultural” groups (Mackey, 2002, p. 63-64) prompted the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission to address the questions of bilingualism and biculturalism in 1963.² The resulting policy, *Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework*, prescribed explicit acknowledgement of the variety of cultures in Canada, as well as the government’s protection of rights for diverse cultural groups (Mackey, 2002, p. 64).

The *Multiculturalism Act* of 1988 expanded multiculturalism far beyond French/English relations, including explicitly addressing the contributions and inclusion of immigrant communities. Further, it explicitly outlined the importance of eliminating racism and discrimination (Mackey, 2002, p. 67). The Act legally mandated *multiculturalism* to reinforce the idea that Canada welcomed and supported diversity and ethnic pluralism.

While dominant liberal discourses define multiculturalism and diversity as inherent characteristics and strengths of Canadian national identity, critical analyses of multiculturalism provide a more cynical view. Critics point to the description of multiculturalism as characteristic of Canadian society in order to neutralize power relations, deepen divisions between groups, and promote superficial integration while neglecting power imbalances (Bannerji, 2000; Goonewardena & Kipfer, 2005; Mackey, 2002; Thobani, 2007). From this perspective, multiculturalism produces diversity as a defining feature of Canadianness—by making diversity a central tool of inclusion, users render diversity as a political and power-laden discourse.

Notwithstanding the extreme backlash against multiculturalism of the conservative Stephen Harper administration of 2005–2015, most liberal Canadians would agree

² In the Commission Report, Native peoples were not considered one of the two “founding races” or an immigrant or ethnic group, reflecting the settler colonial power relations that are tied to Canadian multiculturalism (Mackey, 2002, p. 62).

multiculturalism is central to “Canadianness” and Canadian national identity. But liberal and critical perspectives yield much debate over the merit, purpose, and implementation of multiculturalism. The *liberal* perspectives of the 1990s (Kymlicka, 1996; Taylor, 1994) emphasized the role of the policy of multiculturalism and its integrative features, while *critical* perspectives take into account the history of settler colonialism and racism (Bannerji, 2000; Mackey, 2002; McCready, 2009; Modood, 2007; Povenelli, 2002; Teelucksingh, 2006; Thobani, 2007). Liberal positions on multiculturalism are frequently used to positively distinguish Canada from the United States (Kymlicka, 1996; Mackey 2002). As Kymlicka (1988) argues, “Canada does better than virtually any other country in the world in the integration of immigrants” (p. 21-22). Canadian “acceptance” and “tolerance” of different cultural groups and their traditions, embedded in Canadian law, positions Canada as a model of liberal multiculturalism.

It is not particularly novel to assert that diversity is a contested concept; indeed, diversity is a constantly shifting concept and difficult to tie to a particular meaning (Berrey, 2015; Valverde, 2012). While diversity is increasingly used to refer to multiple signifiers of identity (e.g., age, gender, sexuality, ability), this article will use its more traditional meaning—related to race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class (Bell & Hartmann, 2007; Berrey, 2015; Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Michaels, 2006; Smelser & Alexander, 1999).

Scholars have challenged the stability and inferred definition of the term diversity by examining its material use in everyday contexts as well in politics, institutions, and organizations (Ahmed, 2012; Berrey, 2005; 2015; Valverde, 2008). For example, Ellen Berrey (2015) explores the links between equity and the different usages of diversity in the context of different interest groups (not urban planning) in a Chicago neighbourhood, Rogers Park, while Mariana Valverde (2008) examines the use of the term diversity in a socio-legal framework in Toronto. Both highlight the contested nature of diversity and its malleability and provide insight into how the materials they study use diversity in contradictory ways in different contexts. Berrey’s (2005) conclusion reveals that varying “interest groups draw upon the thinly shared prism of diversity to construct different interpretations of race, class, and social difference as they pursue their polarized political goals” (p. 146). Berrey’s contributions are central because they help to highlight the complex “verbal maneuvering” of a term that has such political and social cachet (2015, p. 3; 2005, p. 146). She tracks its everyday use to challenge taken for granted assumptions about the equal uses,

manifestations, or outcomes associated with diversity. Thus she reveals that diversity can be employed in competing efforts that serve to both reproduce *and* eradicate inequality.

Valverde (2012), on the other hand, sheds light on the relationship between diversity and neoliberalism, providing insight into how the two become intertwined in urban governance and legal frameworks in Toronto. Valverde (2012, p. 210) instructively concludes that, “cities rarely use their legal and regulatory tools to promote inclusion.”

Diversity has long been a central theme and area of concern for urban planners. While 19th and early/mid-20th century planning and urban studies—including the Atlanta School of Sociology and the Chicago School of Sociology—explored the integration, assimilation, and inequality of heterogeneous groups in cities, diversity has also been used to describe the built environment and desirable urban spaces. Critical planning scholars have used theoretical and practical approaches to explore how diversity can remedy or address urban inequality (Burayidi, 2015; Fainstein, 2005; 2010; Fincher & Iveson, 2008). In the contemporary moment, critical planning approaches challenge neoliberal urban policies that further entrench segregation and urban poverty in the name of privatization and the free market.

In relation to critical texts on the flexibility of the term diversity, planning critiques are crucial for analyzing the ways in which diversity does not necessarily initiate social inclusion or the promotion of equity and access for “diverse” groups. Fainstein, for example, questions the assumption that there is a connection between “physical and social diversity.” In my investigation, I explore the assumption that social diversity (culture and income) is assumed to be aligned with physical diversity (use and building types) in Regent Park.

In *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Sara Ahmed investigates the institutionalization of diversity in higher education and explores “what diversity does by focusing on what diversity obscures, that is by focusing on the relationship between diversity and racism as a way of making explicit a tendency that is reproduced by staying implicit” (2012, p. 14). I draw from Ahmed’s insights to shed light on what is obscured and reproduced in the implementation of diversity in revitalization. The following section investigates how a *diversity of diversity* operates in the planning logic as a key legitimizing tool for the revitalization of Regent Park.

Background and Context

Regent Park is located approximately one mile east of Toronto's downtown core and financial district. Regent Park, Toronto's oldest and largest public housing community, was built between 1947-1958. Until redevelopment began, Regent Park was home to 2,083 rent-geared-to-income, or subsidized, units with approximately 7,500 residents. It was made up of a combination of mid-rise buildings, high-rise buildings, and townhouses. According to the 2006 census, 80% of the population of Regent Park identified as visible minorities—the city average in 2006 was 50%—with a large population of South Asian, Black, and Chinese residents. Sixty percent of residents identified as immigrants. The median income was approximately \$14,696, which was well below the low-income cut-off of \$27,745 for a family of four. Initially heralded as a success and model for other low-income communities when first built, by the mid-1950s newspapers described Regent Park as a planning failure, with high levels of crime and violence and segregated from other Toronto neighbourhoods (Globe and Mail, 1956). As Kipfer and Petrunia (2009) note, the formation of public housing cannot be detached from processes of racialization and racism:

Racialization and racism are intrinsic to the formation, crisis, and delegitimation of public housing. In fact, the postwar model of functionally separating and hierarchically ordering urban space was most acute in the planning of public housing projects. This was particularly the case where public housing was always strongly residual and housed non-European residents from the beginning (in the United States and, more selectively, Canada). (Kipfer and Petrunia, 2009, p. 114)

I argue that the design of Regent Park is no exception and emulates the functional separation and ordering of urban space that Kipfer and Petrunia critique. In fact, the deterioration of the housing stock that resulted from post-war planning practices easily became tied to the pathology of non-white residents. According to Sean Purdy “The powerful demonization of Regent Park as a site of social depravity and behavioural deficiency became a central feature of tenants’ lives in the country’s largest housing project” (2003, p. 107).

TCHC's 2004 Annual Review announced that “[a]fter decades of need and many unsuccessful attempts, renewal is finally coming to Regent Park” (2004a, p. 10), referencing a long-standing desire on behalf of residents and planners to address the deteriorating housing stock. The “Toronto Community Housing Report on the Regent Park Revitalization Study” promised that revitalization would create a “more typical Toronto neighborhood” (TCHC,

2003, p. 30). Additionally, The Regent Park Revitalization Study (Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2002) critiqued the brick and mortar approach that characterized the original construction plan for the neighbourhood and did not provide broader social supports. TCHC described Regent Park as in “need of massive capital investment in buildings, improved neighbourhood design and integration with surrounding communities” (TCHC, 2002, p. 10). The Regent Park revitalization began in 2005 and will be completed by 2020. After redevelopment, there will be 1,817 rent-geared-to-income units in Regent Park with 266 replaced in new buildings nearby. The revitalization will also introduce 5,417 market rate units and increase the overall population to approximately 12,500 residents.

Regent Park is being revitalized to become a mixed-use and mixed-income neighbourhood. A mixed-use framework addresses the lack of commercial, recreational, and community spaces in the neighbourhoods, while a mix of incomes and tenures is meant to address the concentration of low-income people in public housing. Mixed-income and tenure refers to the combination of private-market units and subsidized rent-geared-to-income public housing units. Rent-geared-to-income housing units regulate the rent in relation for resident’s income, where generally each household pays approximately 30% of their income towards their rent (TCHC 2019). A mix of tenures, tied to the mix of incomes, refers to private market (owned) and both affordable and subsidized rental units.

Scholars have explored the social implications of mixed-income communities as well as how the term “mixed-income” is defined in different ways (August, 2016; August & Walks, 2011; DeFilippis & Fraser, 2010; Joseph et. al, 2007; Vale & Shamsuddin, 2017). For example, Joseph et al. (2007) argue that proposals for mixed-income housing are a policy response to urban poverty. They find that the logic of mixed-income housing is based on four propositions: the establishment of social networks that encompass the social capital of middle-class people; higher income residents will raise the level of social control; the dispersal of middle-class values to lower-class neighbours; and the superior ability to attract business development and other resources. Many scholars argue, however, that mixed-income developments rarely live up to their promise of inclusion (August, 2016, 2008; Chaskin & Joseph, 2011; Lees, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007). Chaskin & Joseph (2011) assert that one of the expectations of mixed-income housing is the expansion of social networks and opportunities for low-income communities. Yet, they argue that this expectation does not necessarily match TCHC residents’ experiences or lead to the desired outcome.

Contemporary revitalization schemes in Toronto that employ a mixed-income approach must be further contextualized in relation to changes in social housing policy in Canada the 1990s (Hackworth & Moriah, 2006). Following federal shifts in policy in the 1980s and early 1990s, in 1995 the conservative Mike Harris government in Ontario cut funds for social housing and the province downloaded \$905 million in social housing costs to local governments, making municipalities responsible for all housing complexes the province had previously managed (Hackworth 2008). In 1993, the federal government made it clear that no new funding would be made available for social housing, with exception of housing on reservations (Chisholm, 2003). Changes to social housing policy were entrenched via The Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA) in 2000 (Hackworth & Moriah, 2006, p. 515). Through the Act, the Ontario government facilitated the deregulation of housing and also encouraged housing providers to both partner with and function like developers and landlords in the private housing market (Hackworth, 2008, p. 18). Urban neoliberalism began in Ontario as early as 1995, but by 2000 its influence on policy and everyday life was glaring (Hackworth & Moriah, 2006; Keil, 2002).³ Because of these neoliberal changes to housing policy, new local public housing providers were forced to seek solutions to address affordable housing shortages and maintenance repair backlog in Toronto. As such, revitalization was one of the first major initiatives brought forth by TCHC.

A “Diversity of Diversity”⁴

Diversity of Income

In a report by Derek Ballantyne, the CEO of the TCHC to the Board of Directors, he noted, “The proposed housing mix was driven by the aim to effectively end the isolation of Regent Park residents from the surrounding communities, and to meet the principles of a mixed community developed with residents through the planning process” (TCHC, 2004b, p. 5). Such mixed-income frameworks are certainly not unique to Toronto. TCHC examined models from the United States, Europe, and the St. Lawrence redevelopment in Toronto to inform the mixed-income model for Regent Park (TCHC, 2004b, p. 6). In Regent Park, TCHC

³ For a more in depth discussion of these changes, see Hackworth and Moriah 2006 and Rosa 2018.

⁴ Dose and Klimoski, 1999. Steven Vertovec (2007) references the “diversification of diversity” in relation to his work on superdiversity, where he explores how rates of diversity in particular contexts is increasing due to migration and immigration, in combination with other factors.

entered a joint venture with Daniels Corporation, a large real estate developer in Toronto. The funding for the \$1 billion-plus project in Regent Park was provided by sales of market housing, TCHC savings from maintenance, city funding for public infrastructure, as well as provincial and federal funding (Moore & Wright, 2017; TCHC, 2004a). While the selling of market rate units by private developers will fund the new TCHC housing stock, funding from the city, province, and federal government is primarily responsible for the public infrastructure improvements (e.g., roads, sewers, parks, etc.) (Regent Park Collaborative Team 2002, p. 47-48). Leroy, a TCHC representative in Regent Park, described the mixed-income approach as the solution to making the neighborhood “a far more functional part of the city” (Personal interview with Leroy, August 9, 2010).

Under the revitalization framework, a diversity of incomes (mixed-income) and tenures provides both the financial backing for the projects, but also aims to address the social isolation of segregated housing projects (Moore & Wright, 2017; TCHC, 2004a, p. 5). In this section, I suggest diversity of income and tenure is framed to address urban inequality and social isolation of the communities, but because of the diverse uses of diversity, it does not have to address the structural causes of such inequality and isolation. Instead, in the case of income, *disparity* of incomes is positioned as a *diversity* of incomes and a diversity of incomes is positioned as something to value, not as something to eliminate. Additionally, a diversity of incomes obscures the removal of a percentage of public housing units to other neighbourhoods and the overall decrease in public housing units in Regent Park because of a perception of “too much social housing” (Ballentyne in Kipfer & Petrunia, 2009, p. 123). So, for example, 266 rent-geared-to-income units were moved off the footprint of Regent Park, leaving 1,817 on site. And 5,417 units will be market units, making the percentage of market units approximately one-quarter of the total units (Moore and Wright, 2017, p. 70), with a total of 7,234 units overall. The maximum percentage of social housing to compose an adequate social mix was set at 25% (with 75% market units) (TCHC, 2018, p. 8).

TCHC’s *Social Development Plan* (2007b) emphasizes the importance of diversity of income and tenure:

In July 2003, Toronto City Council approved the plan for revitalization of Regent Park. This approval opened the way to a period of significant transition and change. Council gave direction...[for] a Social Development Plan for Regent Park to help address issues of transition and social inclusion. The redevelopment of Regent Park will replace existing housing but will also bring in new market housing. This will add to the

existing population of Regent Park. It will also add to the *diversity of the population* [emphasis added], introducing a *broader mix of income and tenure* [emphasis added]. This can provide significant advantages to the people now living in Regent Park. The resources of their community grow with the *growing diversity of their neighbourhood* [emphasis added], creating the potential for new relationships and new opportunities. (TCHC, 2007b, p. 1)

Here, diversity is not specifically attached to income, use, or culture, but in general as a “diversity of population” and “the growing diversity of their neighbourhood.” However, in both uses of diversity, it is meant to signal the diversity of income that the plans introduce. Thus, a diversity of diversity converges through a celebration of the various types of diversity and the opportunities the revitalization makes available. The first use of the term diversity is in relation to a mix of income and tenure and is framed as adding to the diversity of the population by aligning it with “a broader mix of income and tenure.” While the Social Development Plan describes Regent Park as culturally diverse by referencing the linguistic and cultural diversity of the neighbourhood, it describes it as lacking diversity of income. For example, in section 3.2, the plan provides a “snapshot” of the current neighbourhood and provides the statistics on new immigrants and linguistic diversity. It references Regent Park as the “lowest-income census tract in Ontario” (2007b, p. 22). It also suggests, “when the redevelopment proposal is realized, people with a variety of incomes and housing needs will be living in Regent Park,” in contrast to the current lack of income diversity (2007b, p. 23).

In these examples from the Social Development Plan (2007b), diversity is used to signal income. The claim that diversity will bring “new opportunities” (p. 22) refers to the general logic that legitimizes mixed-income frameworks and suggests that the social capital of the middle-class will provide opportunities, as well as businesses that are attracted by their purchasing power. This framing of diversity thus can hinge on diversity’s cachet in Canada—linking diversity to income and the introduction of market rate housing, with no indication of what new relationships and new opportunities it will present to the already culturally diverse neighbourhood. This is one example of how a *disparity* of incomes is framed as a *diversity* of incomes in the revitalization.

When asked about the mixed-income framework, Amanda, a city planner, suggested: Well I think that’s [pause] part of the problem. And you know it applies anywhere really: *too much of one thing is not good* [emphasis added]... so it is providing that

variety in a community. I think that is important. You used to come into Regent Park and you know that you were someplace different. It didn't integrate with the rest of the fabric [of the city]... *I just think that you can't have too much of a good thing or then having too much is a bad thing* [emphasis added]...and then, it is looking for creating a mixture that I think that will help. (Personal interview with Amanda, July 27, 2010)

“[T]oo much” of “one thing” refers to a concentration of people at one income level. However, her reflection implies that the concentration is only *bad* if it is a concentration of low-income people. In this context, planners are not proposing to diversify or add income mixture to middle-income neighbourhoods. Amanda suggests that introducing a diversity of income will make it possible to integrate the neighbourhood into the fabric of the city.⁵ But her rhetoric gets confused when she says “I just think that you can't have too much of a good thing or then having too much is a bad thing.” Her reflection that “You used to come into Regent Park and you know that you were someplace different” in relation to “too much of one thing is not good,” suggests the ways that Regent Park was stigmatized for both its racial and low-income segregation from the rest of the city. The racial and class segregation was central to the formation and stigmatization of mid-20th century public housing projects (Kipfer & Petrunia 2009). The garden city model of planning, with inward facing buildings and no-thru streets was a mechanism of spatial and racial separation that has long-standing effects on public housing residents. Under urban revitalization, a diversity of income is one tool to address this segregation. Amanda signals diversity when she argues that “creating a mixture will help” address “too much” concentration.

Race and racial segregation are obscured in Amanda's response; her references to “knowing you were somewhere different” and the lack of integration with the rest of the city, however, must take into account the history of racial segregation in public housing in order to understand the specific dynamics at play. Because of a concentration of low-income people of colour, racial and cultural diversity are a problem to be solved, in contrast to the Canadian ideals promoted by multiculturalism that suggest diversity is something to celebrate and honor. The language of “knowing you were someplace different” and “didn't integrate with the rest of the city” position the racial and cultural diversity of Regent Park that existed before revitalization in contrast to the revitalization's insistence on diversity. Importantly, the vague

⁵ However, what Amanda also highlights is that the transformation will increase property values. Here, there is no analysis of what increased property values means (and has meant) for low-income residents.

reference to creating a “mixture” allows for the history of racism and classism that produced the segregation to be obscured by the general promotion of diversity in Canada’s liberal democracy.

The financial plan that supports the revitalization depends on the public-private partnership and the selling of market value units to generate revenue to fund the revitalization; a testimony to the result of 1990s neoliberal restructuring (Kipfer & Petrunia, 2009; Moore & Wright, 2017; Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2002). The rhetoric of the plans describes the mixed-income framework as not only funding the project, but also adding to the diversity of the population by bringing in middle-class homebuyers and those from higher economic status to formerly low-income neighbourhoods *in order to* influence the behaviour of low-income residents (Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2002). In the Regent Park Revitalization Study, authors list the perceived benefits of mixed-income housing:

Mixed income housing is seen as an antidote to the conditions of social and economic isolation brought about by traditional public housing development. Behavioural patterns of lower-income tenants will be altered by interaction with higher-income neighbours. For example, social norms about workforce participation will be passed on to the low-income residents. The crime rate will fall as high-income residents enforce stricter ground rule for the community. (Laven quoted in Regent Park Revitalization Study 2002, p. 77-78)

Thus, a diversity of incomes not only provides financial backing for the rejuvenation of the deteriorated social housing stock, but also an perceived opportunity to change the social demographics of the community by bringing in middle-income families. One of the perceived benefits to this demographic shift is influencing the behaviour of low-income residents. Instead of focusing on the structural causes of poverty and eliminating income disparity, I argue that this paternalistic framing undermines the long-standing social networks and sustainable community practices (e.g., child care, community events, local markets) in public housing and focuses on individual behaviours. Further, according to Rowe and Dunn’s (2016) 2011-2012 research on tenure and income mix in Regent Park,

There was evidence only of modest interaction between tenures, and even relatively little interaction among residents of the same tenure (i.e. among condominium residents or among social housing residents). For most of the residents, the “mixed” nature of the community was a positive, if peripheral, aspect of the redevelopment,

with condominium residents espousing more vocal support for the strategy of tenure mix than subsidized renters. For most of the subsidized tenants, more proximal concerns about building management and aspects of the physical condition of their units took precedence over tenure mix, although none directly expressed antipathy towards this strategy or towards the condominium owners in the community. (Rowe & Dunn, 2016, p. 1265)

While a diversity of incomes proposes to increase interactions between residents of different incomes and tenures to influence behaviour and create opportunities, there is little evidence to support that such interactions occur in the first place. Notably, Rowe and Dunn (2016) report that owners and middle-income residents were “more vocal” about supporting a diversity of incomes than renters, and that residents living in subsidized housing were more concerned with the “building management” and the condition of their units (they complained about the condition) (p. 1268-1269).

As Ashley Spalding (2008) highlights, neoliberal ideologies about the culture of poverty⁶ legitimize deconcentration and ignore structural causes of poverty and instead focus on individual merit as the cause of and solution to poverty (p. 17-18). As such, mixed-income frameworks are promoted as a solution to address urban poverty by both diluting the population of low-income residents and asserting that the social capital of middle-income people will help “elevate” low-income people and increase their social networks, opportunities for employment, and the spread of middle-class values. However, as August (2016) suggests, Regent Park residents reported they missed their old, more spacious homes and that the new mixed-income development had a negative impact on their social networks and community bonds. Further, there is evidence that a diversity of incomes has a negative impact on social and political networks in Regent Park, whereby public housing residents become politically marginalized as a result of the revitalization, despite decades of intricate and powerful tenant activism (August & Walks, 2011). Additionally, I argue that the use of diversity legitimizes an argument that income mixing in and of itself is “good.” In other words, *disparity* of incomes is positioned as a *diversity* of incomes and thus a diversity of

⁶ The culture of poverty thesis was popularized by Oscar Lewis (1959 and 1966). Lewis argued that Puerto Ricans and Mexicans, in particular, adapted to poverty that led to a culture of poverty. Traits such as laziness, lack of ambition, dependency, no knowledge of history, disorganization, lack of structure, etc. would be passed down to younger generations producing a culture of poverty. He argued that a culture of poverty was a way of life. His theory became popular with policy makers and politicians who used the concept to inform social policy and reports, including the infamous Moynihan report (1966).

incomes is positioned as something to value, not as something to eliminate. A diversity of incomes positions income inequality as an achievement to be celebrated without calling into question the structures that produce income inequality or structural solutions to racial and class inequality.

Diversity of Use

The Pam McConnell Aquatic Center (formerly the Regent Park Aquatic Center), named after late local city councillor Pam McConnell, received media attention because of its swim hours for women and trans people. A *New York Times* article (Levin, 2016) boasts,

On Saturday evenings, mechanized screens shroud the center's expansive glass walls to create a session that allows only women and girls to relax in the hot tub, swim laps or careen down the water slide, a rare bit of "me" time treasured by many of the neighborhood's Muslim residents.

And,

The aquatic center reflects that ethos of inclusion. After the weekly women's swim ends, the blinds stay down for a private session popular with transgender people who want to swim without feeling they are being stared at. Out of the pool, everyone uses gender-neutral locker rooms that provide private cubicles for changing. (Levin, 2016)

The aquatic center, a facility that provides services at no cost to the public, is just one example of how recreational and other uses are being introduced into the neighbourhood. While the revitalization plans posit a diversity of incomes as central to the financial framework of the revitalization, they posit a diversity of use as the means to bring and support businesses, services, recreational spaces, and employment opportunities that serve people across different cultural groups. For example, in the Regent Park Revitalization Study (2002), it suggests that revitalization will "provide opportunities for the community to celebrate and share its diverse cultures. It would provide spaces for economic regeneration, educational programs, community gardens, recreational activities and arts and cultural programs" (p. 5). In this section, I examine how the use of the term diversity is employed to describe a mix of uses and what makes a diversity of use *diverse*.

A neighbourhood with a diversity of use incorporates residential dwellings, commercial spaces, parks, and community spaces as opposed to the concentration of only

residential dwellings that has been a central critique to the design of public housing in the 20th century. The planning documents lament that Regent Park lacked commercial establishments for residents to shop, eat, interact, and find local employment opportunities prior to revitalization (Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2002). For example in the Regent Park Revitalization Study, it notes that “Regent Park is an almost completely residential neighbourhood, targeted to lower income households, unlike a typical downtown neighbourhood, which has a wide range of uses, building types and mix of tenures” (2002, p. 34). I explore how the employment of a diversity of use insists on particular uses managed under the revitalization (particularly large commercial retailers) and reinforces a critique that a diversity of uses makes the neighbourhood desirable for those who own market units.

In Regent Park, the revitalization introduced the new aquatic center, athletic fields, Daniels Spectrum (an arts and culture hub), a new community center, and commercial and retail storefronts. Four years into the Regent Park revitalization, new businesses began to open on Parliament Street, which borders the neighbourhood to the west. By 2010, Rogers Communications, the Royal Bank of Canada, Sobeys Fresh Co. (the more affordable Sobeys’ grocery store), and Tim Horton’s were all serving residents. These commercial spaces are on the first level of One Cole Condominiums (a market rate building), which were built in Phase One of the revitalization (TCHC, 2007c). While the contracts for the real estate included a commitment to local hiring (and reports document that over 500 residents have found employment as a result of revitalization) (TCHC, 2018, p. 19), some residents were concerned that these large corporations would not improve the neighbourhood and were a sign of gentrification.⁷ Chandra, a former resident who works at the local health center and now lives on the border of Regent Park, discussed how gentrification was becoming increasingly visible:

You are starting to see it around you know. Restaurants that used to serve the folks that are here are gone or closed [or] have been moved and replaced by places that have

⁷ First defined by Ruth Glass (1964) to describe the rehabilitation of inner-city residential neighbourhoods, contemporary definitions of gentrification vary. Neil Smith (1995) examined gentrification in relation to the movement of capital in relation to global economic restructuring. According to Shaw (2008), gentrification is the “generalised middle-class restructuring of place, encompassing the entire transformation from low-status neighbourhoods to upper-middle-class playgrounds. Gentrifiers’ residences are no longer just renovated houses but newly built townhouses and highrise apartments... Gentrification extends to retail and commercial precincts, and can be seen in rural and coastal townships as well as cities ... Designer shops, art galleries, bars and restaurants form the background to a landscape of people in semi-public space (tables on the footpath they must pay to occupy) watching the passing parade and sipping chardonnay from a boutique winery, beer from a microbrewery, coffee from organic beans grown in the developing country du jour” (Shaw 2008, p. 2)

menus that are inaccessible to low-income people or won't let them sit there. You know. So you are seeing it around you. You know, I saw it in my backyard before, when they took down the button factory that was behind me and they put a Mercedes showroom in. (Personal interview with Chandra, September 23, 2010)

Chandra was not specific about which venues were not accessible or did not permit residents to "sit there" and there is a lack of data on the number of businesses that closed or were displaced in the revitalization. In the case of the newly opened Tim Horton's, for example, it is well known that Tim Horton's is affordable, but it is unclear if residents were discouraged from sitting in the coffee shop. Given her knowledge of social history in Regent Park and her participation in the revitalization process, Chandra's perception carries weight because of her lived experience. Chandra's reference to the Mercedes showroom that opened in close proximity to Regent Park (across the Don Valley Parkway) was seen to be representative of the threat of gentrification that was closing in on Regent Park. Thus, Chandra's reflections on a diversity of use should not be understood apart from the history of Regent Park as a stigmatized and racially segregated neighbourhood or apart from the gentrification of the neighbourhoods to the north, east, and south of Regent Park. In the context of revitalization, diversifying the use of a neighbourhood might push out a restaurant or business that might have formerly anchored a community. While, in theory, a diversity of use should not necessarily facilitate the closing of local businesses, and in the case of Regent Park a diversity of use should be positioned as a tool to integrate the neighbourhood into the surrounding social fabric. However, given the role of the commercial partnerships between the Daniels Corporation, TCHC, and Sobey's, Rogers, and Royal Bank of Canada (TCHC, 2007c), a diversity of use seems to insist on *particular* uses or *particular* partnerships.

One community agency Executive Director, Andrea, who was recruited by TCHC to help support the consultation efforts in Regent Park, described tensions around the planning process and a diversity of use:

It is this idea that, this stuff that is being brought in, you know there's an arts and cultural center, there's a learning center, there is going to be an aquatics center with a covered pool; there's a big park which has a number of things. There are a lot of new public facilities. There is a new community center. These are all being brought in because there is going to be mixed income. But why didn't you do that for us before?

We have been here a lot longer. (Personal interview with Andrea, September 30, 2010)

Andrea's critique calls into question the place of diversity of use in the revitalization efforts and why resources and amenities were not provided to public housing residents before revitalization. She went on to say "You are only doing this for them (the market units). You are not doing it for us. So that is an underlying, a current theme that is always there and it is difficult" (Personal interview with Andrea, September 30, 2010). While she acknowledges the need for services and amenities, her comments shed light on the long-standing precarity of Regent Park residents and the notion that investment is being made into the neighbourhood to serve and make the neighbourhood desirable for middle-income residents.

Andrea also described a situation about the planning of a new learning center in Regent Park:

So for instance, the whole thing around the learning center that is in the first building on Dundas, that came out to us by a presentation that one of the senior TCHC people did, who is responsible for buildings, and he just talked about well there's going to be a University of Toronto learning center here. And there were six of us around the table who provide literacy and adult ed courses and nobody had been consulted or anything. We didn't know anything about it. (Personal interview with Andrea, September 30, 2010)

Andrea is referring to the Regent Park Center of Learning that opened in 2010. The learning center provides college preparation courses, learning circles for women, computer literacy, and civic engagement opportunities for residents. Andrea's frustration was a result of not being consulted on the new center, particularly because many service providers in the area provide the same type of programming with limited resources. This includes the similarly named Regent Park Learning Center that was formerly housed in one of the low-rise buildings at 217 Gerrard Street and run by one of the community's most central service providers, Dixon Hall. The development of the Regent Park Center of Learning is one example of how the mixed use framework ignored existing programming, missed opportunities to develop key local partnerships, and is tied to Chandra's claims that the revitalization forced small businesses to close because of an insistence on particular types of uses that were specifically sponsored or initiated by the revitalization.

While certainly the Aquatic Centre and Daniels Spectrum are important additions to the community and provide space for culturally diverse residents in Regent Park (diversity of use and mix of use that takes cultural diversity into account), they obscure both the role of corporate retail/commercial space (as opposed to local small businesses or storefronts and the existing previously existing Regent Park Learning Centre) and the neoliberal revitalization framework. As Kipfer and Petrunia (2009) suggest, the revitalization of Regent Park

is not only a product of state rescaling (in this case, the downloading of public housing to the local state) and a new phase of state-managed gentrification. The project is promoted primarily by exponents of downtown progressivism and circumscribed by the ambiguous political horizon of the metropolitan mainstream. In this context, we suggest that the redevelopment project of Regent Park is a multipronged, racialized strategy to recolonize a segregated and long-pathologized, but potentially valuable central city space in the name of diversity and social mixity. (Kipfer and Petrunia, 2009, p. 111)

A diversity of use in relation to diversity of income and culture can become a mask for gentrification, whereby the entire fabric of the neighbourhood is altered to favor private investment and the dismantling of public provisions. Andrea's reflection that "You are only doing this for them (the market units). You are not doing it for us" is a critique to the mixed-use facilities that attract new middle-income residents and private investment.⁸ While women and trans only swim hours are an important step and much needed in Regent Park, the overall diversity of use framework does not indicate that the uses are in fact significantly diverse at all, or done in a way that builds on existing community infrastructure.

Diversity of Culture

In the planning process, a diversity of income and use is closely tied to a diversity of culture. The Regent Park Social Development Plan notes that "The cultural diversity of Regent Park requires a range of considerations to ensure that the space available to the community reflects the needs of the cultural and faith groups" (TCHC, 2007a, p. 8). It also notes that "Ethno-specific shopping opportunities can also serve this function if the facilities

⁸ To be clear, I am not suggesting that a bank and an affordable grocery store were not positive additions to Parliament Street as the community did not previously have a local bank or large grocery store.

offer a ‘boutique’ setting that appeals to a wide variety of potential shoppers, who may be initially unfamiliar with the products but attracted to new cultural opportunities” (TCHC, 2007a, p. 23). A diversity of culture in the planning process most explicitly signals a commitment to Canadian multiculturalism. However, reference to a diversity of culture in the planning documents and by planners in interviews was inconsistent. In some cases, planners and the plans described culture as something to be preserved and celebrated in Regent Park. In other cases, a celebration of culture (something that multiculturalism signals, but ideally would go beyond) was described as something that would be ushered in via revitalization and a diversity of income and use. I argue that these discrepancies index the ways in which diversity is ambiguously employed, and in fact, undermines any efforts to address discrimination and inequality along the lines of race and class. Further, I suggest that a promotion of cultural diversity in the revitalization process commodifies “culture” in relation to a diversity of income and use. A diversity of culture becomes something to be consumed, particularly because of new middle-income owners and via promotions of markets or bazaars (both of which have long standing histories in Regent Park and are certainly not new because of revitalization). For example, in the Regent Park Revitalization Study, it suggests that “the vibrant cultural mix and the young entrepreneurial demographic of Regent Park offer an opportunity to create a unique market or ‘bazaar’” (Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2002, p. 35). The phrasing “offer an opportunity to create” both positions culture as something to commodify under revitalization, but also ignores the organic and sustainable local economies that pre-exist the revitalization.

As City of Toronto employee, Corinne, reported:

You know the research will say that *mixed-income communities* [emphasis added] are a good approach, because the concentration of low-income people is no longer seen as the best way to plan it. But you have to do it with the appropriate facilities and services and that sort of thing... and we are in a diverse city, so you obviously want to do that. But it is building on the wealth of opportunity. I think *we will see lots of things culturally, cultural celebrations, the sharing of cultural traditions. You probably will see markets and things like that developing over time* [emphasis added]. So I think that is sort of inherent within the plan. That is something that everyone desires to see. And the arts and cultural components are very clear, and we will have the Arts and Cultural Center. *There’ll be a cultural component* [emphasis added]. How do you honour the history of a very rich diverse cultural community as it changes and you’re bringing in

new people? So that is an element that we definitely want to kind of monitor and ensure is understood through consultation processes and that actually comes through in the delivery of services. (Personal interview with Corinne, September 10, 2010)

Corinne's reflection that "I think we will see lots of things culturally, cultural celebrations, the sharing of cultural traditions. You probably will see markets and things like that developing over time," is just one example of how a planner imagined the ways in which revitalization would promote cultural diversity. These insights suggest that a diversity of culture is something that can be promoted via revitalization and as something *new*, erasing a long history of markets and cultural celebrations in Regent Park.

On the other hand, Corinne goes on to question "How do you honour the history of a very rich diverse cultural community as it changes and you're bringing in new people?" (Personal interview with Corinne, September 10, 2010). Her question acknowledges the challenges that come with a mixing of incomes. But her language of "honouring" the cultural diversity does not necessarily mean preserving cultural diversity. Further, in this case, the cultural diversity of the community is framed as something in the past ("how do you honour *the history*"), unlike her previous comments about seeing markets develop in the future.

Corinne's reference to culture in relation to the new residents echoes the ways that cultural diversity can be commodified through revitalization efforts. Although Corinne does specifically reference a diverse cultural community, she does not refer to the racial diversity of Regent Park. Instead, culture can signal race without having to use the terms race or racism. As Cheryl Teelucksingh (2006) argues,

[C]elebrated Canadian markers of racial diversity and racial harmony that are spatially managed through systems of domination are in fact commodified versions of multiculturalism in the forms of "ethnic culture," ethnic neighborhoods, and "ethnic restaurants." Easily consumed and packaged versions of race in Canadian cities have been used to market and strengthen Canada's position in the global economy. (Teelucksingh, 2006, p. 1)

Here, Teelucksingh unpacks how racial diversity is tied to "systems of domination" and cannot be separated from racial inequality. In fact, these "easily consumed and packaged versions of race," are not only marketing tools that rely on the cachet of multiculturalism, but reify racial difference and do not necessarily have to address racism and racial inequality. By

focusing on culture and diversity, the plans avoid addressing the racial and class segregation that the revitalization aims to fix by integrating Regent Park into the surrounding fabric. In Corinne's reflections above, she states "*I think we will see lots of things culturally, cultural celebrations, the sharing of cultural traditions. You probably will see markets and things like that developing over time,*" not only erases the history of cultural celebrations in Regent Park, but also marks the commodification of multiculturalism that Teelucksingh flags as being tied to power, domination, and settler colonialism.

City planner Amanda described the relationship between the types of diversity: "So I think the mixing of the other elements [of use and income] will just sort of naturally play out so that we're going to see that cultural mixing" (Personal interview with Amanda, July 27, 2010). In this example, a diversity of incomes and diversity of uses will enable further cultural mixing, but obscures the history of cultural diversity (and "mixing" in Regent Park). Unlike diversity of culture, which has a long history in Regent Park, the diversity of use and income were both key to the revitalization financial framework and introduced via the planning framework. In this instance, I suggest that the *diversity of diversity* allows the implementation of use and income "diversity" to be framed as natural and are tools to legitimize the revitalization, hinging on diversity's social cachet in Canada. However, a careful reading of the multiple usages of diversity shows how diversity does not require the revitalization to address inequality in the way it suggests. Instead, by relying on diversity's social cachet in relation to multiculturalism, diversity can signal inclusion but actually maintain disparity.

Conclusion

[D]iversity, and particularly the notion of social mixing, now operate as code words to incorporate and submerge racialized public housing tenants under a cohesive form of normalcy defined by private property and the (middle-class and typically white) sensibilities of the "new normal": gentrified Victorian neighbourhoods and neomodernist condominium districts in central Toronto. (Kipfer & Petrunia, 2009, p. 121)

What surfaces in this investigation are the ways a *diversity of diversity* operates as a legitimizing tactic to support the merits of the revitalization. So, for example, diversity of incomes is framed under a logic that it adds to the economic health of a community and is a

solution to the concentration of poverty. A proposed benefit of a diversity of income is that it will expand the social networks of low-income residents and create economic opportunities; the mixing of incomes will allow for low-income people to climb the economic ladder.

However, as many scholars have shown, the evidence challenges the outcome that social networks expand or that mixed-income frameworks actually address poverty (Chaskin & Joseph, 2011; DeFilippis and Fraser, 2010; Joseph & Chaskin, 2012;). As I suggest, because of the value placed on the term diversity *in relation to* Canadian multiculturalism, diversity of incomes actually accepts income disparity as something to value as opposed to eliminate and also obscures the dilution of social housing in the name of a diversity of incomes or social mixing. Importantly, there is also an underlying assumption that a concentration of *wealth* is unproblematic, as compared to a concentration of poverty. A mixed-income redevelopment framework targets and stigmatizes low-income neighbourhoods—middle and upper income neighbourhoods are not seen as in need of income mixing or diversification.

Like a diversity of income, diversity of use is also proposed to address the segregation of the neighbourhoods and integrate the neighbourhoods into the surrounding social fabric. Diversity of use promotes retail, commercial, and recreational spaces alongside residential use. The proposed benefits include bringing more amenities to the neighbourhood and contributing to the financial framework of the plan. Corinne, who worked on revitalization for the City of Toronto, alluded to the significance of mixed-use and mixed-income revitalization frameworks: “So those are the types of the communities [mixed use and mixed-income] that we are trying to build and just essentially to knit into the fabric of the surrounding city and make it a healthy, successful, prosperous environment” (Personal interview with Corinne, September 10, 2010). Corinne’s omission of cultural diversity positions racial and ethnic diversity as separate from income and use. Further, as I have outlined, a diversity of use has promoted large corporate retailers, with little space for local/small businesses, and limited efforts to partner with existing businesses and service providers. Chandra argued that in fact, the diversity of use via revitalization has forced businesses to close and was a sign of gentrification.

Lastly, references to a diversity of culture were inconsistent throughout the planning documents and interviews with planners. On the one hand, some planners argued that revitalization could create space for markets and cultural celebrations, without reference to the already rich vibrant cultural life in Regent Park, while on the other hand they suggested that

existing cultural diversity adds value to the revitalization. In both cases, diversity is something to be managed by the plan, ignoring residents' experiences of culture that have historically shaped the neighbourhood. The management of a diversity of culture in the plans also does not acknowledge the ways that cultural and racial difference in the housing projects are tied to structural inequality and stigma that have produced segregated communities. A diversity of culture easily aligns with a promotion of Canadian multiculturalism and legitimizes the revitalization efforts, without specifically mentioning racism and histories of racial segregation. By relying on "diversity talk" and the cachet of Canadian multiculturalism, culture can signal race and ethnicity, but does not have to address the interlocking systems of domination that produced the segregation of the neighbourhoods in the first place. In the case of Regent Park, according to Kipfer and Petrunia (2009),

The Plan redeploys a conventional version of multiculturalism to manage the very racialized class disparities created by a project that is willing to sacrifice one type of diversity (the existing wealth of ethnolinguistic multiplicity) for the benefit of forms of diversity (measured in terms of income and housing tenure) that are compatible with gentrification. (Kipfer and Petrunia, 2009, p. 128-129)

The diversity of diversity as well as the interchangeability of mix and diversity are central to the revitalization projects and their perceived integrative features. Diversity is employed as a tool that can signal the promise of inclusion by relying on the powerful cachet of multiculturalism in Canada. By shifting back and forth between use/income/culture and mix/diversity, a celebration of diversity is implied, but because of the various ways diversity is employed, it can be used to obscure the structural problems the revitalization cannot solve.

References

- August, M. (2016). Revitalisation gone wrong: Mixed-income public housing redevelopment in Toronto's Don Mount Court. *Urban Studies*, 53(16), 3405-3422
- August, M., & Walks, A. (2011). From social mix to political marginalization? The redevelopment of Toronto's public housing and the dilution of tenant organizational power. In G. Bridge, T. Butler, & L. Lees (Eds.), *Mixed communities: Gentrification by stealth*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

- Abu-Laban, Y., & Gabriel, C. (2002). *Selling diversity: Immigration, multiculturalism, employment equity, and globalization*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). *The dark side of the nation*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Bell, J., & Hartmann, D. (2007). Diversity in everyday discourse: The cultural ambiguities and consequences of happy talk. *American Sociological Review*, 72 (December), 895-914.
- Berrey, E. C. (2005). Divided over diversity. *City & Community*, 4, 143-170.
- Berrey, E. C. (2015). *The enigma of diversity: The language of race and the limits of racial justice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). *Debating diversity: Analyzing the discourse of tolerance*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Burayidi, M. A. (Ed). (2015). *Cities and the politics of difference: Multiculturalism and diversity in urban planning*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Chaskin, R. J., & Joseph, M. J. (2011). Social interaction in mixed-income developments: Relational expectations and emerging reality. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 33(2), 209-237.
- Chisholm, S. (2003). *Affordable housing in Canada's urban communities: A literature review*. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- DeFilippis, J., & Fraser, J. (2010). Why do we want mixed-income housing and neighborhoods? In J. Davies & D. Imbroscio (Eds.), *Critical Urban Studies: New Directions* (pp. 135-148). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Dose, J., & Klimoski, R. (1999). The diversity of diversity: Work values effects on formative team processes. *Human Resources Management*, 9(1), 83-108.
- Doucet, M. J. (2001). *The anatomy of an urban legend: Toronto's multicultural reputation*. Joint Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement (Ceris). Retrieved from http://shora.tabriz.ir/Uploads/83/cms/user/File/657/E_Book/Urban%20Studies/Anatomy%20Of%20Urban%20Legend%20Torontos%20Multicultural%20Reputation.pdf
- Fainstein, S. (2005). Cities and diversity: Should we want it? Can we plan for it? *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(1), 3-19.

- Fainstein, S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fincher, R., & Iveson, K. (2008). *Planning and diversity in the city: Redistribution, recognition, and encounter*. New York City, NY: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Glass, R. (1964). *London: Aspects of change*. Centre for Urban Studies Report No. 3, Edited by the Centre for Urban Studies, University College London. MacGibbon & Kee: London.
- The Globe and Mail. (1956). Former metro planner says public housing a 'ridiculous giveaway.' The Globe and Mail.
- Goonewardena, K., & Kipfer, S. (2005). Spaces of difference: Reflections from Toronto on multiculturalism, bourgeois urbanism and the possibility of radical urban politics. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3), 670-678.
- Hall, S. (2000). Conclusion: The multicultural question. In B. Hesse (Ed.), *Un/Settled multiculturalisms*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Hackworth, J. (2008). The durability of roll-out neoliberalism under center-left government. The case of Ontario's social housing sector. *Studies in Political Economy*, 81, 7-26.
- Hackworth, J., & Moriah, A. (2006). Neoliberalism, contingency, and urban policy: The case of social housing in Ontario. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(3): 510-27.
- Joseph, M. L., & Chaskin, R. J. (2012). Mixed-income developments and low rates of return: Insights from relocated public housing residents in Chicago. *Housing Policy Debate*, 22(3), 377-406.
- Joseph, M. L., Chaskin, R. J., & Webber, H. S. (2007). The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(3), 369-409.
- Keil, R. (2002). 'Common-sense' neoliberalism: Progressive conservative urbanism in Toronto, Canada. *Antipode*, 34(3): 578-601.
- Kipfer, S., & Petrunia, J. (2009). "Recolonization' and public housing: A Toronto case study. *Studies in Political Economy*, 83, 111-139.
- Kymlicka, W. (1988.) *The Theory and Practice of Canadian Multiculturalism*. Lectures hosted by the Humanities and Social Science Federation of Canada, Ottawa, ON.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lees, L. (2008). Gentrification and social mixing: Towards an inclusive urban renaissance? *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2449-2470.

- Levin, D. (2016). In Toronto, a neighborhood in despair transforms into a model of inclusion. *New York Times*.
- Lewis, O. (1959). *Five families: Mexican case studies in the culture of poverty*. New York: New York Basic Books.
- Lewis, O. (1966). *La Vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty—San Juan and New York, NY*: Vintage.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- McCready, A. L. (2009). Redressing redress: The neoliberal appropriation of redress in the anti-Native backlash at Caledonia. *English Studies in Canada*, 35(1), 162-190.
- Michaels, W. B. (2006). *The trouble with diversity: How we learned to love identity and ignore inequality*. New York: New York Metropolitan Books.
- Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Moore, A., & Wright, J. (2017). Toronto's market-oriented subsidised housing PPPs: A risk worth the reward? *Cities*, 69, 64-72.
- Povenelli, E. (2002). *The cunning of recognition: Indigenous alterities and the making of Australian multiculturalism*. Durham, NC and London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Purdy, S. (2003). 'Ripped off' by the system: Housing policy, poverty, and territorial stigmatization in Regent Park Housing Project, 1951-1991. *Labour/Le Travail*, 52, 45-108.
- Regent Park Collaborative Team. (2002). *The Regent Park revitalization study*.
- Rosa, V. (2018). Social citizenship and urban revitalization in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 27(2), 25-36.
- Rowe, D. J., & Dunn, J. R. (2016). Tenure and mix in Toronto: Resident attitudes and experience in the Regent Park community. *Housing Studies*, 30(8), 1257-1280.
- Shaw, K. (2008). Gentrification: What is it, why it is, and what can be done about it. *Geography Compass*, 2(5), 1-32.
- Smith, N. (1996). *The new urban frontier: Gentrification and the revanchist city*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Spalding, A. E. (2008). *Race, class, and real estate: Neoliberal policies in a mixed-income neighborhood*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida, Florida.
- Smelser, N. J., & Alexander, J. (1999). *Diversity and its discontents: Cultural conflict and*

- common ground in contemporary American society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Teelucksingh, C. (Ed.). (2006). *Claiming space: Racialization in Canadian cities*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (n.d.). "Rent: Subsidized housing." Retrieved from <https://www.torontohousing.ca/rent>
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2002). *TCHC Annual Review, 2002*.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2003). *Report on the Regent Park Revitalization Study*. Toronto Community Housing Corporation, no. 200330. April 28, 2003.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2004a). *Partners in Communities: Annual Review 2004*.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2004b). *Regent Park Revitalization Initiative (2004-150)*.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2007a). *Regent Park Social Development Plan: Executive Summary*.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2007b). *Regent Park Social Development Plan. Part 1: A History of Social and Cultural Change in Regent Park*.
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2007c, October 30). *Regent Park Revitalization Phase One Groundbreaking*. Retrieved from <https://www.torontohousing.ca/news/whatsnew/Pages/RegentParkRevitalizationPhaseOneCondominiumGroundbreaking.aspx>
- Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC). (2018). *Regent Park Community Update Meeting*. April 19, 2018.
- Vale, L. J., & Shamsuddin, S. (2017). All mixed up: Making sense of mixed-income housing developments. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 83(1): 56-67.
- Valverde, M. (2008). The ethic of diversity: Local law and the negotiation of urban norms. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 33(4): 895-923.

Valverde, M. (2012). *Everyday law on the street: Governance in an age of diversity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.