Beyond Intersectionalities of Identity or Interlocking Analyses of Difference: Confluence and the Problematic of "Anti"-oppression

Ameil J. Joseph
McMaster University

Abstract

Intersectional approaches are often called upon in social work education and practice to conceptualize identities (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability, etc.) and forms of oppression and privilege (racism, sexism, heteronormativity, patriarchy, mentalism, etc.) as separate yet mutually constitutive categories. An ongoing problematic within such approaches is the propensity to rely on predetermined analytical systems of oppression interlocking or aspects of identity intersecting. I suggest that it is possible to consider the material effects of oppression that are targeting delineated groups without requiring the technologies of difference (including analytical categories named upon difference, i.e., racism, patriarchy, ableism, sexism, etc.) to advance positions of social justice. These technologies of difference were forged through violent means for colonial and imperial projects. As formulated through a study of the practice of deportation for those identified with mental illness in Canada, an analysis of confluence is offered as a departure from an intersectional or interlocking analysis in that a confluence is never static, no part is completely distinct from another, and there are multiple perspectives from which one can examine or trace the same idea, system, or influence. An appreciation of confluence acknowledges that all categories and systems of difference are suspect and focuses our attention toward their common projects as well as their resulting fields of knowledge and practices. An analysis of confluence also acknowledges identity *qua* difference as complicit within and a product of historically perpetrated violence rendering positions of "anti-(racist, oppressive, etc.)" impossible.

Keywords: critical social work, confluence, anti-oppression, privilege, social justice

Complex issues relating to oppression are often approached through an intersectional analysis that understands that various forms of oppression are targeted at certain groups by virtue of their identification by race, class, age, ability, gender, sexual orientation, religion, language, etc. Intersectional approaches often describe one or more "types" of oppression (i.e., racism, heteronormativity, mentalism, ageism, etc.) working interrelatedly or together depending on the identity categories to which a person or group is understood as belonging. Criticisms of this approach have highlighted its lack of attention to hierarchy, to relations of power and the formation of subjectivities, and an overreliance on identities or subjectivities (Carbado, 2013; Heron, 2005; McCall, 2005; Nash, 2008). Some scholars have suggested a systemic analysis is required that focuses on interlocking systems of

oppression or a matrix of domination to reveal one historically related system and how these systems need and secure one another hierarchically (Collins, 1991; Heron, 2005; Nash, 2008; Razack, 1998).

An ongoing problematic within such approaches (here mentioned together only by their common reliance on and reproduction of categories of identity *qua* difference or systems of domination, oppression, privilege that are discursively delineated as separate in analyses that perceive them as mutually constituting, interlocking systemically or intersecting individually) is the propensity to rely on predetermined analytical systems of oppression interlocking or aspects of identity intersecting.

This reliance exposes an ongoing tendency to resist transformational analytic perspectives that permit an engagement with social issues without a reliance on systems or relations or identities of difference that were forged through violent means for colonial and imperial projects. In this paper, I will suggest that it is possible to consider the material effects of segregation, oppression, or violence that is targeting delineated groups without requiring the identification of technologies of difference (including analytical categories named upon difference, e.g., racism, patriarchy, ableism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ageism), or the (re)establishment of hierarchies to advance a position of social justice or any ethical claims for recognition, redistribution, or reconciliation.

Although analyses of interlocking systems of oppression are useful, in some instances, a directed analysis toward the processes and technologies of difference rather than a systemic analysis can help to reveal a project or purpose that has been overlooked in the analyses of the workings of power or oppression. For example, the project of eugenics, and the systems of sanism (referred to by Poole et al. [2012, p. 20] as the "systematic subjugation of people who have received 'mental health' diagnoses or treatment") and mentalism (as coined by Chamberlin [1978] as discrimination based on perceived mental disorder, trait, disability, difference or condition) are often overlooked for their involvement within systemic analyses of oppression (see also Poole & Ward, 2013). The project of eugenics can never be separated into race, ability, mental illness as they were all products of a project delineating conceptualizations of undesirability based on perceived blood or genetic ranking and classification. There is no system of racism or ableism or mentalism that is ever distinct or separated from this history in order for them to be analytically interlocked for analytical purposes capable of analyzing any neo-eugenic project within colonial enterprise. Mental health, criminal justice, and immigration systems have also been historically bound to each other and as exemplified in my recent study of the process of deportation for those identified with mental illness; an analysis of these interlocking systems is not the focus in an analysis of confluence. In my study, an attention to confluence focuses on the common practices and technologies within these systems across temporal periods to reveal relations and operations of power and their common project.

My use of the term "identified with mental illness" is a purposeful, directed use as systems (medical, juridical, colonial) and professions (lawyers, psychiatrists, social workers, etc.) often ignore how people self-identify and instead isolate problems and

rely on nomenclature or categorical terms that locate issues as biomedically situated inside bodies through the processes of individualizing socially and politically constituted judgments as behaviours or traits of defectiveness, lack, or disorder. This is achieved through the applied practice of "identification" by external figures of power and authority to or on people often without their agreement or consent. My intent with confluence is to acknowledge the chronicity and disciplinary purpose of terminology while noting how it is bound to specific structures, i.e., psychiatry and the Canadian legal and immigration systems. These systems, the professionals that practice within them, and the knowledge regimes that form their discursive fields identify people "with mental illness" by an adherence to and allegiance to the dehumanizing taxonometric and categorizing practices embedded within the dominant purview of psychiatric power among these institutions. This practice often diminishes or erases attention to social, political, or social influences to human experience. However, the people themselves may or may not identify as they have been identified by a system or structure—thus rendering the bodies and voices of particular people irrelevant within particular professional and disciplinary practices.

In this paper an analysis of confluence is offered as a departure from an intersectional or interlocking analysis in that a confluence is never static, no part is completely distinct from another, and there are multiple perspectives from which one can examine or trace the same idea, system, factor, or influence. To study a confluence is to trace how more than one idea, system, factor, or influence run or merge together at a similar point or junction, just as two or more bodies of water run together and affect the composition and trajectory via their contributing sources. Confluence demands a historical consideration, an appreciation of the temporal. Imagine that no cubes of a matrix, spheres of intersecting difference, or systems that interlock can remain static. Imagine that their relations are fluid and therefore time must always be an aspect for consideration. An appreciation of confluence acknowledges that all categories and systems of difference are suspect and focuses or redirects our attention to their common projects as well as their resulting fields of knowledge, practices, and technologies. An analysis of confluence also acknowledges identity *qua* difference as complicit within and a product of historically perpetrated violence. When our methodology is commenced with a respect for complexity, we also commence with an appreciation for representations that are historically produced, our own historically influenced interpretations, the functions and powers of discipline specific discourse, and the contours of a set of social relations (rather than the relations among different social groups themselves). These historically developed systems *and* the technologies that (re)create hierarchical structures, as well as the interdependent set of hegemonic knowledge bases and practices, and governing processes must also simultaneously be appreciated in an analysis of confluence.

Beyond Intersectionality

In this section, I review some of the most significant critiques of intersectionality. Intersectional approaches are often called upon in social work education and practice to conceptualize identities (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability, etc.) and forms of oppression, privilege (racism, sexism, heteronormativity, patriarchy, mentalism, etc.) as separate yet mutually constitutive categories (Fong, 2005; Hulko, 2009; Mattsson, 2014; Salimbeni, 2011; Samuels & Ross-Sheriff, 2008). Intersectionality in social work has been applied as a lens, a continuum, as time and context contingent yet always maintaining the idea of differences intersecting or systems of oppression interlocking (Brotman & Lee, 2011; Hulko, 2009; Mehrotra, 2010). While this practice of relying on ideas from an intersectional analysis and an interlocking systemic analysis is common, an interlocking systemic analysis differs from an intersectional analysis in that interlocking analyses are "a paradigmatic shift of thinking inclusively about other oppressions … in which all groups possess varying amount of penalty and privilege" (Collins, 1991, p. 225, cited in Martinez, 1999). Interlocking systems need one another and can offer analysis that women are produced into subject positions that exist "symbiotically but hierarchically" (Razack, 1998, p. 13). Interlocking systemic analysis, while more aligned with confluence in its historical and symbiotic appreciation, continues to wield pre-existing analytical perspectives and attention to subjectivities and relations of power based on these categories and analytical perspectives (i.e., racism, patriarchy, classism applied together).

This reliance on difference exposes our ongoing propensity to resist a transformational analytic perspective that permits an engagement with social issues without a reliance on a basis of identity categories and systems that were forged through violent means. From this point of analysis, we are often confined to weaving theoretical perspectives together.

One outcome of this is often an over-attention to difference and its products, which (re)deploys historically established systems and technologies to securely establish power relations and hierarchies. Another outcome of this over-attention to difference and its products is our imbalanced attention to historiography or the writing and rewriting of history through our contemporary horizons of interpretation. To track a contemporary category of difference into the past can often map a category of difference onto the past, thereby obscuring the project, system, technology, power relations, and interdependent practices that produced it while anachronistically placing a contemporary representation or understanding of violence or difference in the past. In this instance, the potentials for resistance and transformation become exponentially undermined.

Wallerstein (1991) used the example of the idea of "India" to propose that our present ways of thinking determine how we think of the past and that therefore our past is ever changing. As Wallerstein outlined, the current "India" is an invention of the modern-world system (i.e., capitalism, colonialism, imperialism); its pre-modern history is an invention of modern India, and our conception of this historical culture may change in the future from how we define it today. This change in interpretation

or conception thereby changes our conception of India in the past. Wallerstein emphasized that he was not denying the historical specificity of India but rather was asserting that what is included in this description is "an ever-changing, very fluid phenomenon" (p. 134). Intersectional analysis might inaccurately apply aspects of contemporary categories of difference (i.e., race and mental health or illness) and map them onto the past, thereby obscuring and erasing the historical conceptions of race as a blend of culture, ethnicity, and geographical origin, through an attention to its contemporary use as phenotypic distinctions, social constructions, perceived genetic variations, behaviourism, etc., or madness (things that conceptually did not exist past a certain point in history while earlier conceptualization of race existed). Confluence permits the past understandings of race within and alongside current understandings of race as they materialize in social relations, discourses, and technologies and practices of particular disciplines.

Scholars have attributed the origins of the term *intersectionality* to Crenshaw's (1989) *Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics* (Carbado, 2013, p. 811; Nash, 2008). However, hooks (1981) articulated a similar analytical necessity some time earlier in her book, *Ain't I a Woman.* In it, hooks noted that we are all socialized by sexism, racism, and classism to varying degrees and that the work to rid ourselves of this socialization must be a conscious one (hooks, 1981). Intersectionality has been described as a paradigm for understanding "the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations" (McCall, 2005, p. 1771).

McCall suggested "that different methodologies produce different kinds of substantive knowledge and that a wider range of methodologies is needed to fully engage with the set of issues and topics falling broadly under the rubric of intersectionality" (McCall, 2005, p. 1774). She posited (reluctantly so) that methodologies focused on intersectionality can broadly be looked at as anti-categorical or deconstructing, intercategorical (examining the relationship among existing categories), or intracategorical ("acknowledges the stable and even durable relationships that social categories represent at any given point in time, though it also maintains a critical stance toward categories"; p. 1774)

Although the contribution of intersectionality has led to a more widespread consideration of multiple forms of oppression, critiques have been abundant to say the least. While I cannot attend to all contributors here, I have chosen some key critiques that have summarized some of the central concerns.

Nash (2008) critiqued intersectionality for "the lack of a defined intersectional methodology; the use of black women as quintessential intersectional subjects; the vague definition of intersectionality; and the empirical validity of intersectionality" (p. 1). She went on to specify that "ultimately, my project does not seek to undermine intersectionality; instead, I encourage both feminist and anti-racist scholars to grapple with intersectionality's theoretical, political, and methodological murkiness to construct a more complex way of theorizing identity and oppression" (p. 1).

Heron (2005) has suggested that rather than identifying or reflecting on one's specific identity categories via an intersectional approach to delineate a "social location," the process of reflection can achieve a potential for resistance through an examination of power relations, of one's subjectivity or subject position. As Heron explained, "Implicit in this structural analysis is an intersectional model of oppression which does not assert a hierarchy of oppressions but rather seeks to explain that oppressions may act in concert, in opposition, or in other complex ways in specific contexts" (p. 343).

Carbado (2013, p. 812) has attempted to addresses the following critiques of intersectionality:

1. Intersectionality is only or largely about Black women, or only about race and gender.

2. Intersectionality is an identitarian framework.

3. Intersectionality is a static theory that does not capture the dynamic and contingent processes of identity formation.

4. Intersectionality is overly invested in subjects.

5. Intersectionality has traveled as far as it can go, or there is nothing more the theory can teach us.

6. Intersectionality should be replaced by or at least applied in conjunction with (fill in the blank).

In his address, Carbado (2013) fulsomely responded to item 1. In his response to items 2–4, Carbado briefly stated,

> Intersectionality reflects a commitment neither to subjects nor to identities per se but, rather, to marking and mapping the production and contingency of both. Nor is the theory an effort to identify, in the abstract, an exhaustive list of intersectional social categories and to add them up to determine—once and for all—the different intersectional configurations those categories can form. (p. 815)

Carbado here also references Crenshaw's (1989) original project of "how the law constructs (and describes preexisting) social categories" (p. 815).

Carbado's brief response insufficiently addressed criticisms 2–4. The dynamic and contingent processes of identity formation are not revealed by a commitment to doing so. Intersectionality, by way of practice, does have the tendency to generate multiple combinations of categories that are often perceived as an effort to form an exhaustive list. Merely stating that its efforts are focused elsewhere is highly dismissive of the regular application of intersectionality in practice (in social service settings, community organizations, within social work practice, etc.)

With regard to items 5 and 6, Carbado (2013) shelved alternatives to intersectionality due to a "discursive limitation" whereby "all these theories seem to imagine the synthesis or interaction of things that are otherwise apart" (p. 816). Carbado's efforts directed at salvaging intersectionality as a concept were deployed

in order to propose his own subcategories of analysis, namely (p. 817), "colorblind intersectionality" (that is inattentive to hierarchical relations across racialized groups) and "gender-blind intersectionality" (that is inattentive to hierarchical relations across gendered groups). These two categories just happen to be another combination of identities (the seemingly invisible operations of whiteness and gender in specific instances) that are also very worthy of consideration. Whereas his contribution has brought attention to other intersecting areas of identity/oppression (i.e., colorblind intersectionality and gender-blind intersectionality), it failed to respond to the critiques of intersectionality while exposing that the concept of intersectionality and alternatives to intersectionality maintain difference and separation as a starting point and reproduce ideas of difference in their analyses and theorizations.

Other scholars have suggested that the critiques of intersectional approaches can be very informative. In the concluding statements of Nash (2008), *Re-thinking Intersectionality,* she suggested that intersectional analyses would be enriched by

> examining how race and gender utilize differing technologies of categorization and control, disciplining bodies in distinctive ways, and coalescing (or colliding) in particular formations in certain historical, social, cultural, representational, legal, and technological moments. In analyzing race and gender both as co-constitutive processes and as distinctive and historically specific technologies of categorization, intersectionality scholars will be able to offer insights that far exceed imagining race and gender as inextricably bound up. (p. 13)

Interlocking Systems of Oppression

Other articulations or analyses of oppression, privilege and identity *qua* difference have included Collins's (1991) matrix of domination "along interlocking axes of race, class, and gender oppression" (p. 225), among other axes such as sexual orientation and religion. She wrote:

> The significance of seeing race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression is that such an approach fosters paradigmatic shift of thinking inclusively about other oppressions, such as age, sexual orientation, religion, and ethnicity … opens up possibilities for … a both/and conceptual stance, one in which all groups possess varying amounts of penalty and privilege in one historically created system. (p. 225, cited in Martinez, 1999)

As Razack (1998) described,

> Analytical tools that consist of looking at how systems of oppression interlock differ in emphasis from those that stress intersectionality. Interlocking systems need one another, and in tracing the complex ways in which they help to secure one another, we learn how women are produced into positions that exist symbiotically but hierarchically. (p. 13)

From Nash, Collins, Heron, and Razack we can appreciate the necessities of our attention to the specific historical conditions revealing "one historically created

system" (Collins, 1991, p. 225, cited in Martinez, 1999), "historically specific technologies" (Nash, 2008, p. 13), power relations and subject position (Heron, 2005), and the interdependency of these systems that "secure" them and order them "hierarchically" (Razack, 1998, p. 13). This attention to one historically created system and to historically specific technologies and power relations is common to an analysis of confluence as well. What is less emphasized in these contributions is the paradoxically maintained reliance and reproduction of categories of identity *qua* difference and systems of domination, oppression, privilege that are discursively and operationally delineated as separate in order to speak of them as "mutually constituting," interdependent, or "interlocking."

An ongoing problem is how can we consider the material effects of segregation, oppression, or violence that are targeting delineated groups without requiring the identification of technologies of difference, or the (re)establishment of hierarchies to advance a position of social justice or any ethical claims for recognition, redistribution, or reconciliation.

To begin with an aspect of difference to trace its production, dependency, (co)(re)produced power relations, and subject positions often disturbs the process of appreciating a common project that privileged "one historically created system" (Collins, 1991), used "historically specific technologies" (Nash, 2008), and established and reinforced power relations and subject position (Heron, 2005) all in support of these projects. We also lose focus on the importance of the interdependency of these systems and an attention to the practices and processes that "secure" them and order them "hierarchically" (Razack, 1998).

The Lack of an Acceptable Alternative

Currently the words "intersectional," "interlocking," or "matrix" are relied upon despite the surmounting critiques opposed to them. Dhamoon (2011) cited many of the contributions of intersectionality while advocating for mainstreaming of intersectionality as a research paradigm yet stated, "In my own work I have moved away from the language of intersectionality … the metaphor of intersecting roads has come to falsely suggest that there are separable, pure, containable ways to analyze subject formation and power" (p. 232). Dhamoon explained that

> while no concept is perfectly able to capture all the complexities of irreducible forms of difference, as an alternative to "intersections," I have tended to use the language of interactions as a way to describe, explain, and critique the ways in which processes of differentiation *dynamically* function through one another and enable each other; they do not exist apart from one another, although the character of these processes and their effects are varied and indeterminate. These processes are both generated by the forces of power and constitute relations of power … there does not need to be a single, universally agreed concept; such a presumption would itself leave unquestioned concepts that have emerged in specific geopolitical contexts (hence leading to American-centric conceptions of intersectionality). Rather, *it is necessary to be precise about the critical capacity of concepts chosen and be open to different terms as theories*

develop [emphasis added]. Put differently, as a tool that is premised on critiquing bounded conceptions of difference, the discourse of intersectionality must itself be subject to scrutiny. (p. 232)

Dhamoon settled on "intersectional-type" as an analytical framework instead of intersectionality but stressed the imperative of an attention to the processes of subject formation as systems of domination and power that result in or form penalty and privilege (p. 235). Dhamoon also noted:

On the whole, while some of these models illustrate how one set of interactions might occur and how differences can be unequal in importance, none of these indicate that there are contingently formed relationships and patterns *between* multiple and differing sets of interactive processes and systems, and none adequately capture how these relationships might vary at different levels of life and across time and space. In short, in describing identity and oppressions in fixed and simplified ways, these models limit critiques of power and collapse into a positivist tradition that assumes that there are stable preexisting patterns that are fully knowable, objective, temporally and spatially bound, and generalizable. (p. 237)

She went on to support a model of a "matrix of meaning making":

The idea of a matrix of meaning-making aims to foreground an expanded Foucauldian understanding of power so as to capture the ways in which processes of differentiation and systems of domination interrelate. The focus of analysis is thus not "just" domination but the very interactive processes and structures in which meanings of privilege and penalty are produced, reproduced, and resisted in contingent and relational ways. While it may not be possible to develop a diagram of a matrix of meaning-making on paper or in text form because it entails movement among multiple interactions and across time, dimensions, and levels, Figure 8 provides some sense of what this might look like. (p. 238)

The image that Dhamoon labelled Figure 8 has little resemblance to a matrix of any kind. However, it does appear to approach the ideas of dynamism and fluidity that an analytical model of confluence would accommodate. The nebulousness of Dharmoon's selected image is itself a useful conceptual contribution to understanding oppression, privilege, and power. In Foucault's lectures on power and knowledge (specifically Lecture 2: January 14, 1976), he used the word "capillary" when providing guidance on how one can attend to the methods of subjugation instigated by permanent agents of relations of domination, i.e., "the system of right, the domain of law" (Foucault, 1980, p. 96). The idea of a capillary network, branching connecting, permeable, fluid, dynamic, and ever flowing through time reveals the point that we attend to the entirety of the operations of power, including the extremes, that challenges what is historically acceptable and then pushes beyond/through those limits, rewriting history, law, and practice to then accommodate what has been made to be acceptable. It is not an understanding or competence of intersecting understandings of race, ability, and citizenship through the interlocking systemic analyses of racism, ableism, and nationalism that reveal the

"how" of a project of eugenics. It is an attention to the techniques, instruments, technologies, and practices used that reveals how violence becomes permitted and how it can be intervened upon methodologically. While I prefer the metaphor of confluence (a river system) to capillary (a more enclosed type), I suspect that Foucault's purposeful use of the word indicates that a matrix, interlocking systems, or interesting categories would do not suffice. As Foucault (1980) described,

> The analysis in question should not concern itself with the regulated and legitimate forms of power in their central locations, with the general mechanisms, through which they operate, and the continual effects of these. On the contrary, it should be concerned with power at its extremities, in its ultimate destinations, with those points where it becomes capillary, that is, in its more regional and local forms and institutions. Its paramount concern, in fact, should be with the point where power surmounts the rules of right which organize and delimit it and extends itself beyond them, invests itself in institutions, becomes embodied in techniques, and equips itself with instruments and eventually even violent means of material interventions. (p. 96)

Dhamoon and I would very much agree on the necessity of foregrounding an attention to the processes of differentiation and systems of domination as productive forces of power; however, the adherence to metaphorical models such as "intersectional-type" and "matrix of meaning making" only shores up notions and images of delimited things intersecting or interlocking within a matrix. The language, symbolism, and metaphor of "intersectional-type" and "matrix of meaning making" also do not fit epistemological or ontological premises that view relations of oppression privilege and power as continuous, permeable, and common to grand historical project goals. In the end, Dhamoon, while concerned with complexity and aware of the many limits of the language and models of intersectionality did not mention the word, metaphor, or model of confluence anywhere in the paper. The model of confluence resists essentialization or universal architecture in that it is dialogical, temporally transient, and permeable to its historical influences as understood in the contemporary and/or as rewritten anachronistically through the temporary (as historiography is understood). Confluence does away with any foreseeable idea of sovereignty and is more concerned with how we are all imbricated, implicated, and complicit within the hegemonies, hierarchies, and struggles of our human condition. There exists no stabilized and transfixed analytical position where one can view forms of difference or identity intersecting (race, gender, sexual orientation, class, ability) or systems of domination operating in a matrix or interlocking (racism, patriarchy, heteronormativity, etc.) as if one were not complicit within its formation and then its (re)production.

In the edited volume, *Health Inequities in Canada: Intersectional Frameworks and Practices*, Dhamoon and Hankivsky (2011) continued to support intersectionality, specifically in relation to health research and policy. However, they did note that there has been widespread "contestability regarding the very language of intersectionality" (p. 20). While Dhamoon and Hankivsky have noted the existence of suggested alternatives, i.e., "interlocking oppressions," "multiple

jeopardy,"   "multiplicity,"   "multiplex   epistemologies,"   "translocational positionality," and "complexifying," they concluded with a maintenance of the use of the word *intersectional* and a model image of a *matrix* (p. 20).

When people focus on the identity *qua* difference category intersecting (whether understood as mutually constituting/dependent or not) or the analytical perspective/systems interlocking (while understood as interdependent or not) we lose the focus of analysis on the temporal and the procedural, processes over time, space, when technologies and practices are institutionalized in policy and law, embedded in people's beliefs and then divorced from their original project. What do they become? How do they become institutionalized across policy and law and *across* identity categories and systems of domination to uphold the ongoing project of something like eugenics, the colonial rule of human likenesses, the international divisions of labour?

If we take the example of the project of eugenics, we have an example of a project that is a product of ideas of genetic and phenotypic variance, human hierarchy, race, ability, class, and gender, and has come to influence how these ideas co-exist and how they can and have also come to be known as separate in the contemporary. Eugenics conflated idea of race, genetics, biology, and social human hierarchy in ways that influenced fields of study, professions, and disciplines and embedded these ideas within policy and law. There is no version of the rewriting of this by fragmenting identity positions (intersecting) or separate (but seemingly interdependent) analytic perspectives (interlocking) that contributes to our understanding of its historical, political, and social coherence. In my study of the practice of deportation for those identified with mental illness, involved with the criminal justice system, and identified as different by the immigration system, intersectional and interlocking perspectives and analyses failed to name or recognize the observance of the processes and technologies of eugenics. An analysis of confluence permitted me to look back and forth across time while seeing myself and my study as complicity within the ideas and language formations that are imbedded within my own identity, profession, academic field, and methods of knowledge production. An analysis of confluence holds as complicit our practice of relying on an interlocking analysis that examines already determined analytical categories in relation to a phenomenon. This has historically left out how eugenic colonial processes have combined ideas of mental illness or wellness, genetic variation, foreignness, and sub-humanity as a conceptualization of Otherness that cannot be separated into race, racism, ableism, ability, citizenship, or geographic origin. An analysis of confluence also holds interlocking analyses that identify discreet categories of difference in relation to one another and obscure hierarchy as complicit within this eugenic colonial exclusion.

One cannot hold theorists and academics solely at fault for exploring the infinite combinations of aspects of identity through varying combinations of analytical perspectives. This procedure very much coincides with the embedded neoliberal agenda for academic research that appreciates quantity over quality. We all too often see problematic identity categories advanced despite recognition of their contribution to processes of difference making and essentialism.

The Necessity of Confluence

While the analysis of interlocking systems of oppression is important, theorists who utilize the interlocking metaphor have illustrated that more can be considered with an attention to the processes and technologies rather than by beginning with an analysis of systems interlocking such as patriarchy or racism. A study of confluence allows for a consideration of that which is not already established in an analytical category or interlocking set of analytical categories. Rather than focusing on the distinct systems of oppression or the identity categories of difference (whether recognized as mutually constitutive, present in every moment or not), focus *on the how and the why*, the practices and technologies and the social relations, thereby revealing a project. An example of a project that is revealed in this study through an analysis of confluence is that of eugenics. The project of eugenics was identified and explicated through the tracing of the processes of dehumanization that had particular benefits to colonization, nation building, and the establishment of professional and human hierarchies and authorities. It also (re)generated the products of racism, ableism, mentalism, sanism, and professionalism. Historically speaking, eugenics, mentalism, and sanism have been areas of neglect among those who rely on interlocking analyses alone. However, interlocking analyses can make key contributions when looking at how the systems of ableism and patriarchy and racism interlock during specific instances or in specific spaces, i.e., courtrooms, etc. (Razack, 1998).

To illustrate my insistence on what I will further elaborate on as confluence, I will use a short personal example. Through my example, I mean to render transparent my ethical position, one that refuses violence done to me or violence done to the cases I am examining in my research. This violence that I mention is the effect of intersectionality that conceptualized aspects of difference in relation to one another from already existing conceptual categories which are ordered often hierarchically. This can lead to a fragmentation of the self, an understanding of oneself through competing lenses of difference, privilege, or oppression. These analyses and understandings then become the method of how we come to understand one another, as separate, discontinuous, identities of difference. An analysis of confluence refuses to engage in this competition and fragmentation. It refuses to rely on knowledge of totalized ideas of difference in which someone else can possess expertise.

When I was an undergraduate and a graduate student, the practice of critical reflexivity and critical reflection was explored and taught through an intersectional analysis. Students were asked to identify aspects of privilege and oppression among categories of difference and to think about how they have experienced these privileges and oppressions or inherited or learned them. I often found myself generating a list that covered the most identity categories and threw in the words "power and intersecting …" to fill any holes (this was the best analysis of course).

> I am Ameil Joseph, a cis-gendered, heterosexual male, no identified mental diagnosis or developmental disabilities, no acquired injuries limiting my ability or variation of ability that marginalizes me by virtue of my mobility, eyesight, hearing, social interaction, level of verbal or non-

verbal communication, a Canadian born, Guyanese of South Asian descent, who was raised Catholic, is university educated, speaks English, a person of color, et cetera, et cetera.

I often chose to write about an aspect of intersectionality, i.e., how my male, English, Canadian born, educated privilege was affected by racism. What I could never really capture was the story my father helped me to appreciate over time. That although we speak English, our English was and is never considered as the same as that of a white person who speaks English, especially if one speaks with an accent. It is their language, not ours. Ours may have been Hindi (we think, as my great-grandmother spoke Hindi), but that was taken from us, beaten and erased over decades. We were punished for speaking it, and rewarded for speaking "the King's English." We were indentured laborers from India, brought to work their sugar plantations, to make them rich, while leaving us poor.

If English is a privilege, it is yours that I speak it, not mine that I can. For me, it is a reminder that my language was held as inferior, as savage and uncivilized. It is a reminder for me that your English is superior, universal, and owned by you. If it affords me opportunities above others in the present, it is only within a context of great suffering and loss where that "privilege," when accepted as such by me, reinforces a reminder that my language is inferior, savage, and uncivilized and yours is superior; therefore, I am privileged to speak it. I always felt so sad handing in that assignment. Sad, that I couldn't tell my story because it could not be depicted on the petals of a flower. I grew up listening to Hindi music and watching Hindi movies. My parents, family, and I still enjoy them with immense satisfaction, even though we cannot speak a word of the language.

My father helped me to understand our missing languages in relation to a system of dominance, a project of colonization, of global imperialism, the establishments of hierarchies of language, and how difference was perpetuated between *us* and *them*, *theirs* and *ours*. This was always much more informative to me than an intersectional analysis that looked at English and Hindi as privilege and oppression, or an interlocking analysis directed at the power relations operating at an institutional level revealing a disparity of access at one given instance. In my father's version, historiography must be appreciated for the historical positioning of English as dominant, universal, and privileged. The project of colonization and technologies of subjugation are crucial to an understanding of this equation of English with privilege and what that does to Hindi in my situation.

In those reflections, I also often felt pressured to accept the privilege of my affiliation with Catholicism. Living in a Judeo-Christian nation, I am attached to those who represent the most abundant religious group, the dominant group, and the laws that privilege this affiliation. What I have difficulty sharing is that my mother was Hindu; my ancestors on my father's side were likely Sikh. If my grandfather had not aligned with a Christian faith in Guyana (then a British colony), he would not have been able to get work outside of the sugar fields or send his children to school; the British system did not allow this. Also, marriages in the colonies were sanctified

by the colonizers. If both parties did not assimilate to the accepted ritual of marriage, the marriage was not recognized.

Hinduism was depicted as an ancient primitive, exotic, paranormal, fairy tale. Christianity was a religion. While there are those who maintained their Hindu or Islamic affiliation, my family did not. To describe my affiliation with Catholicism as representing privileges afforded to me in the present or to my family's past is at the very least, an incomplete representation. In my case, some would want me to accept that "I'm better off" because I am affiliated with Christianity both now (although I would resist this affiliation), and for my family in Guyana. This is a zero-sum game I do not enjoy playing or accepting. My reality is one where my affiliation with Christianity was a product of colonial dominance, the systemic coercion to assimilate, a denial and erasure of Indigenous traditions and beliefs, the development of contempt for what was depicted as mystical, exotic, and primitive.

The alternative to Christian imposition was often no family (a denial of marriage), no education (refusal of access to education), malnutrition, poverty (resulting from lack of employment), shorter lives or death. For me to accept this as a privilege is to accept that the benefits come with the affiliation, rather than acknowledging that these "benefits" arise from the violence that set Christianity as the privilege and Hinduism as the oppressed. It is the project of colonization that is important here, the technologies of assimilation and erasure, the interconnectedness of systems and establishment of the institutions of education, employment, marriage (based on this violence) that provide us a contextual understanding of this as it was then and as it is now. What is also important is how the rivers of language and religion run together with the project of colonization; they develop and merge with race, and never can be separated and then analytically interlocked to achieve an analysis of indentureship realized through the practices and technologies of coolie[1] labour. My examples themselves are only a bucket drawn from this ever-flowing, dynamic, and changing confluence, telling only my portion, represented partially, contingently, and through my horizons of interpretation (affected by a father who was directly involved in Guyana's revolution for independence, educated in the Soviet Union by a socialist regime encouraging liberation from capitalism and colonial imperialism, a father who fought for separation of Church and state, etc.). Without an appreciation of confluence, the project of colonization and indentureship can never be rendered through an analysis that views the contexts of development of language, religion, race, as fusing and melding with the project (of colonization) as it proceeds to the project's own advantage. Without an analysis of confluence, the contexts and histories are lost. Once the project is embedded in the culture, its

---

[1] The term *coolie* includes a combination of representations of practices, prejudices, and use of language for non-western workers. The term was originally reserved for those from India and China to perform menial labour under contract (by a colonial authority, i.e., the British, Dutch, French, Spanish) for no or low wages and often attached to a loss of freedoms and compared to slavery. The term itself has several originating sources in South Asia and Asia often referring to indentured labourers, low wages, and menial work (Balachandran, 2011). It has been used as a derogatory word, and as a reclaimed self-identifier for people and their descendants who belonged to this class of indentured labourers originating from South Asia or China.

technologies and practices are divorced from their benefactor and it is difficult to trace the effects within contemporary institutional practices and their contributing disciplines.

Confluence: The Case of Deportation for People Identified with Mental Illness

In my study of the practice of deportation for people identified with mental illness at the confluence of criminal justice, immigration, and mental health, complexity was the primary focus. Whereas the realities of the experiences of difference are noted in the contemporary, difference was not the starting point of analysis. Rather, my focus was on the processes, discursive technologies, practices, historiographies that produce ordered difference, relational and professional hierarchies, and relations of power and dominance. I substitute confluence for an interlocking or intersectional approach for these political ends.

 As mentioned earlier, to study a confluence is to trace how more than one idea, system, factor, or influence run or merge together at a similar point or junction, just as two or more bodies of water run together and affect the composition and trajectory via their contributing sources. The study of confluence differs from an intersectional or interlocking analysis in that a confluence is never static, no part is completely distinct from another, and there are multiple perspectives from which one can examine or trace the same idea, system, factor, or influence. Confluence demands a historical consideration, an appreciation of the temporal. It must also attend to complexity by engaging with the terrain as it is, with its many contributors of differing composition. Imagine that no cubes of a matrix, spheres of intersecting difference, or systems that interlock can remain static. Imagine that their relations are fluid and therefore time must always be an aspect for consideration.

Confluence has been used as a guiding concept to analyze the phenomenon of youth homicide through an analysis of social and economic factors in neighborhoods in Chicago across historical periods (Joe, 2000). Confluence has also been studied to trace the historical, social, scientific, and political developments that have affected legislation regarding trauma and child sexual abuse (Rix, 2000). Other examples include: the study of confluence with respect to "jail inmates with co-occurring mental health and substance use problems" (Sung, Mellow, & Mahoney, 2010, p.126); the study of how the disciplines of sociology, statistics, and public policy are relevant to family assistance programs (i.e., food stamps, Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Medicaid; Press & Tanur, 1991); how residential segregation results in racial inequality in future occupational outcomes (Dickerson, 2008); and how criminal justice and child welfare systems effect the outcomes for the children of probationers (Phillips, Leathers, & Erkanli, 2009).

Hamilton (2010) has illustrated the importance of an attention to historical contributing social, political, and specifically colonial contexts through his analysis of the targeting of queer sexualities. As Hamilton has suggested, "The legacy of colonization has always historically meant the targeting of queer sexualities and spiritualities, the crushing of fluid sexual behavior to establish a heteronorm" (p. 122). As Hamilton describes, the current injustice of the anti-homosexuality bill in

Uganda (passed October 13, 2009) owes its ancestry to the criminalization of "sodomy and homosexual acts" (p. 128) that began in 1886 in a history that Christian Europe has authored as the "Passion of the Uganda Martyrs" (p. 125).

Hamilton articulated clear examples of how the formation of the heteronorm in Uganda owes an inheritance to the legacy and violence of colonization. For a theory of violence and confluence that is able to consider contemporary Ugandan homophobic violence, or anti-homosexuality bills, and their resulting experiences of humiliation and disrespect, we must acknowledge that it is crucial to recognize the complex, specific, historical, political, and social conditions for any person because in the absence of this greater understanding, violence prevails, i.e., condemning Uganda and Ugandans as homophobic people, thereby erasing global complicity in this contemporary situation.

Whereas the term confluence is not original, my use of it for this new political and conceptual purpose is a departure from other approaches to complexity. In all of the above examples of the study of confluence, an appreciation of complexity directs the methodology, examining for continuities rather than differences. The outcome, rather than being examined for what it has left out, can be appreciated for its representations, and our interpretations, through the functions of discourse, that reveal the contours of a set of power relations, systems, and technologies that (re)create a hierarchical structure, an interdependent set of hegemonic knowledge structures and practices, and governing processes. This understanding exposes a project, a project that can no longer be understood as "post" or "neo" but as colonization, as imperialism, as liberalism.

Researching Confluence

My research explores historical and contemporary manifestations of colonial and eugenic systems of violence within the practice of deportation for people identified with mental illness, involved with the criminal justice system, and identified as Other by the immigration system; consequently, a conceptualization of confluence is a necessity for analysis.

Foucauldian genealogy provided me with some unique methodological insights that support an analysis of confluence. Genealogy reveals the history of how things become truths, problems, valued or dismissed. Genealogy examines particular historical moments (often ones that contradict contemporary representations of history) through "non-linear, layered, critical historical enquiry and reflection (Rabinow, 1984)—to create a history of the present" (Schmid, 2010, p. 2104). The goal is to present how truth is maintained in the present while problematizing it in relation to the past through an analysis of the operations of discourse to reveal the relations of power (Schmid, 2010).

The historical consideration in my study explored for contingencies (rather than causes or origins) as genealogy does, while it also followed the strands of common projects. The common projects of colonization and imperialism and the use of identification, segregation, dehumanization, confinement, and deportation based on

perceived differences and processes that discursively frame people to construct, legitimize, and authorize violence are necessary points for attention in this study.

I reviewed historical materials through archival research at the Archives of Ontario, examining past Immigration and Refugee Protection Acts, the Criminal Code of Canada, and the Mental Health Act as well as their pre-existing forms. I also reviewed relevant correspondence for changes to these acts. Through this work, I have been drawn to the common use of criminal justice and mental health systems for "immigrants." The process involved requesting and reviewing dozens of boxes of policy, laws, and correspondence documents relevant to this confluence in Canada from 1906 to the present. The 1906 revision of the immigration act expanded the scope of its exclusionary measures to the "feeble-minded, idiot, epileptic, insane deaf, dumb, blind or infirm." It was also the earliest period in which psychiatrists collaborated with immigration and government officials to include provisions in law to systematically deport people from asylums in Canada. I chose to use cases from the Appeals Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board specifically to acknowledge and respect the resiliency, resistance, and agency of those who found themselves at the convergence of this confluence. I queried the appeals database from January 1, 2001–December 31, 2011 resulting in matches corresponding to 75 people. This period also allows for an analysis of the most recent complete years of the "contemporary effects" of discourses that have historically advanced racial, eugenic, and colonial ideas to constitute subjectivities, identities of difference, and human limitation to justify and authorize violence. I selected a representative sample of ten cases for in-depth analysis. The representation of gender in these cases raised many questions with regard to the pathways for women and other genders found at this confluence, as well as the spectrum of constructions of identity, authorities, and authorizations of violence and the representational discourse used to legitimize violence directed in gendered ways. These areas require further investigation.

Of the 75 appeals cases for deportation for people identified with mental illness, 86 % of people ordered to be deported were from countries of the global South: South Asia, East Asia, Africa, South East Asia, West Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The average amount of time people identified for deportation had lived in Canada was approximately 20 years.

My in-depth analysis of these ten contemporary deportation appeals cases and my contemporary and historical policy analysis were further enhanced by my analysis of three historical cases (Dunlap, 1919; Robbins, 1927; Scott, 1915) of the interdependent workings of the mental health, criminal justice, and immigration systems (relying on eugenic and racial thinking). Three interdependent identity constitutions were achieved through the tracing of the interdependent confluence of policies, laws, and practices within immigration, mental health, and criminal justice systems in order to achieve the outcome of deportation for people identified with mental illness in Canada.

The Untreatable, Biomedical or Genetic Anomaly:

→A focus on the individual in biomedical terms that redirects responsibility solely toward the individual.

> On the basis of the evidence the panel finds that the appellant is mentally ill and that when he is not medicated he poses a threat to people. The appellant's criminality is a direct consequence of his mental illness. (Hassan v. Canada, 2007)

> The notion of a person who is an untreatable biological anomaly deserving of deportation and undeserving of care in Canada invokes an idea of an individual savage, erased from their social and political context, who cannot be controlled. When targeting people of colour specifically, the histories of drapetomania (the "insanity" of black slaves running away from white masters—coined by Samuel A. Cartwright), dysaesthesia aethiopis (a form of madness manifested by "rascality" and "disrespect for the master's property" that was believed to be "cured" by extensive "whipping, hard labour, and, in extreme cases, amputation of the toes,"), and the conceptions of a person as biologically unfit for freedom cannot be denied for their implication of these colonial tropes that carry with them a deep historical disrespect and dehumanizing violence (Metzl, 2009, p. 30).

The Unrehabilitatable Criminal:

→A notion of inherent criminality, dehumanized, and deserving of punishment.

> This writer has provided extraordinary supervision two time per week to no avail as Mr. Jama has been arrested repeatedly and this writer holds little hope of him being rehabilitated … Mr. Jama does not take his medication as prescribed as recently it has come to my attention that he has been consuming alcohol, it is for these reasons that supervision has been withdrawn. (Mental Health Coordinator; Jama v. Canada, 2008)

> The notion of an unrehabilitatable criminal person of colour or immigrant who is a danger or a threat to the Canadian public invokes the idea of an uncivilized primitive person. As exemplified in Odum's (1910) *Social and Mental Traits of the Negro,* this specific, directed characterization is historically bound to the colonial trope of a dehumanized person with tendencies toward criminality, addiction, and mental defects of idiocy and imbecility. The trajectory of this trope offers a painful rendering of an image of one who is deserving of subjugation or slavery historically and surveillance or confinement in the present.

The Undeserving, Foreign Alien:

→A reproduction of the Other represented in terms of lack, who is not "one of us" or deserving of our support or care.

> Once the government creates a right available to everyone, in that case free health care, access to that right must be provided equally. However, in this case, the government has not created such a right. Section 6 of the Charter and Chiarelli, above, authoritatively establish that foreign nationals have no right to remain in Canada, no matter their state of

mental or physical health. The Applicant's argument fails. (Gardner v. Canada, 2011)

The construction of an identity of a foreign alien who does not belong and who is undeserving of the protections of society or access to its public supports invokes the idea of an invasive intruder, a burdensome cost to society, and someone who is not our problem. This specific colonial trope in Canada for immigrants and people of colour is bound to the marring history of head taxes, internment, and turned-away ships (including the Komagata Maru, the ship with close to 400 passengers from India—British subjects who were forced to return in 1914, based on racist immigration laws in excluding or limiting those of Asian origin. Only 20 people from the ship were permitted to stay (Johnston, 1989).

The constitution of these identities, the positions of legal and medical authority, and the moral legitimization of deportation, confinement, or lack of care in general were rationalized relying on eugenic and racial ideas, embedded in policy and law through the establishment and enforcement of prohibited classes in an interdependent, fluid, and dynamic fashion (An Act Respecting Immigration, 1910). The project of colonial nation building, relying on colonial technologies and practices, has become imbricated into the fabric of the criminal justice, mental health, and immigration systems as they were established to control for people deemed undesirable. The categories of difference, the hierarchies of professional authority, and the policies and governance practices that are wielded to enforce them were achieved by relying on one another in order to reference the idea of a Canadian citizen subject who was able, white, just, superior in genetics and behaviour, and therefore deserving of care and belonging. We need to examine the implications of deeply hurtful and intergenerational forms of racialized and eugenic violence within professional practice, disciplines, policies, law, and within the operations and technologies of contemporary institutions. The use of figurative language to represent contemporarily accepted forms of biological inferiority, inherent unrehabilitatable criminality, or to identify someone as an undeserving alien, is no less violent than literal deployments of these meanings, as their (re)produced outcomes are the same: a denial of care, responsibility, and humanity. In the analysis of cases, I witnessed the use of very particular colonial tropes for the constructing of identities of dehumanized difference and the reliance on racial and eugenic rationale to provide the authority for and legitimization of violence. These deeply historical interdependent processes constituting the confluence of mental health, criminal justice, and immigration systems may have us question our conceptions of progress or advancement, of anti-oppressive or anti-racist proposals for their complicity in the continuation of the production of ordered subjects, a reliance on old colonial machinery, and the (re)positioning of authority and legitimacy through violence and difference.

The Problematic of "Anti" Language

Difference is currently relied upon in responses that aim to know difference by developing competencies or to take positions as "anti" in response to racism or oppression. When confluence and violence are appreciated for their fluidity and

complexity, the position of "anti" is impossible, as we are all in a position of complicity. The notion of competence is also impossible, as we are infinite in our uniqueness and have all been transgressed through our encapsulation in totalized systems of discourse, power, knowledge.

As I have described previously,

It has been noted that cultural competence promotes a colour-blind mentality that ''eclipses the significance of institutionalized racism'' (Abrams & Moio 2009, p. 245). Gordon Pon has described the notion of cultural competence as ''the new racism'' and ''argues that cultural competency promotes an obsolete view of culture and is a form of new racism. Cultural competence resembles new racism both by otherizing non-whites and by deploying modernist and absolutist views of culture while not using racialist language'' (Pon 2009, p. 59). (Joseph, 2014, p. 282–283)

Responses that impose Western models of justice, immigration regulation, and mental health internationally often carry with them the North–South and racial divisions that they have been fashioned upon within their technologies and practices. Western biomedical models of mental illness, the eugenic policing of borders, and the profiling and finalizing system of criminal justice denies people the opportunity to be seen as a whole person, capable of being well when given the chance to be supported and to belong. When systems of knowledge and law have historically fabricated and reinforced the idea or fantasy of a savage, uncivilized criminal through targeted colonial processes like Orientalism and dividing practices, the possibility of not being encapsulated as such is foreclosed upon for those who have historically been targeted. According to Said's Orientalism, a number of productive outcomes have forged themselves into the practices of academic disciplines and claimed objectivity during colonial projects. Individuals in "the Orient" were subordinated into a general type through orientalist discourse and posed through consistent binaries that set Europe apart from "the orient" geographically, racially, and religiously (Said, 1978). This orientalist discursive regime also produced an ontological and epistemological difference between the European "us" and the Oriental "them" (Said, 1978). The "Orient" becomes static and unchanging, and authors on the subject draw clear distinctions between themselves (white, male, European, etc.) and the oriental (Said, 1978). The orientalist also produces an overarching sense of contempt for the Other, and becomes the expert who knows the oriental better than the oriental can know her/his self (Said, 1978). Orientalism structures and guides academic fields and allows for a tendency to define the Other in broad sweeping terms (either Orient or Occident), eliminating the need to sub-define or for heterogeneity within groups (Said, 1978).

To target people for surveillance, compliance, confinement, or deportation within the discursive crosshairs of biomedical psychiatry, with the discourse of legislation and juridical structures of the criminal justice system, and within the status-regulating procedures of the immigration system is to figuratively speak of them as a biomedical anomaly deserving of segregation and a restricted set of freedoms under the law. It is to figuratively speak of them as a threat to Canadian society and a lesser kind of person who does not belong among those included in

historically established notions of desirability. By historically and contemporarily examining the processes and technologies used to achieve these outcomes and with an attention to who is targeted, the obscurity of professional and juridical hierarchies of complex systems of knowledge can be interrogated for their basic accountabilities to humanity and the human condition.

If the law, entire fields of knowledge, institutions, and professions at the confluence of mental health, criminal justice, and mental health systems are guided by eugenic and racial rationale, we are all at some level vulnerable to the violence that is possible within it. The Mental Health Act holds a power over anyone identified with a psychiatric diagnosis, and these numbers are increasing exponentially. The Criminal Code of Canada has evolved to deliver harsher penalties and more permanent records to those who find themselves within its grasp, and the Canadian immigration system is also shifting toward greater exclusion. These are seemingly new products made with the old machinery of racialized colonial violence. The mental health, criminal justice, and immigration systems participate in the continuation of colonial and imperial projects through these institutional expressions of social disrespect as seen in their reliance on processes and technologies of dehumanization and through racial and eugenic colonial violence.

These deeply historical interdependent processes revealed at the confluence of mental health, criminal justice, and immigration systems may have us question our conceptions of progress or advancement, of anti-oppressive or anti-racist proposals for their complicity in the continuation of the production of ordered subjects, a reliance on old colonial machinery, and the (re)positioning of authority and legitimacy through violence and difference. Without a historical, social, and political analysis in context, ideas such as anti-racism or anti-oppression and biomedical psychiatry can appear to be commensurate and possible. An analysis of confluence allows for a refusal to accept solutions such as those that propose that "anti-racist" and "psychotherapy" can be commensurate. In a confluence analysis technologies and disciplines such as psychotherapy are held as complicit in the formations and advancement of a normative subject (often centered as a white, Christian, able-bodied, -minded, heterosexual, cis-gendered, male, speaking the King's English, compliant with the law, etc.). The formations of this normative subject were and are, of course, dependent on identifying himself in relation to the Other, often at work to delineate himself by what he is not, generating an image of the savage, the uncivilized, the mad, and those deserving of violence.

An analysis of confluence tracing the individualizing, dehumanizing difference making, colonial, eugenic, racial technologies and practices within a field of practice, i.e., biomedical psychiatry and its contributing disciplines, including social work, and laws, implicates all who operate within its ruling jurisdiction, rendering the individualizing, dehumanizing violence of biomedical psychiatry transparent and the position of "anti" as impossible.

References

Abrams, L. S., & Moio, J. A. (2009). Critical race theory and the cultural competence dilemma in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(2), 245–261.

An Act Respecting Immigration. (1910). Ottawa. Retrieved December 23, 2013, from http://eco.canadiana.ca/view/oocihm.9_07184/2?r=0&s=1

Balachandran, G. (2011). Making coolies, (un)making workers: "Globalizing" labour in the late-19th and early-20th centuries. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *2*, 266–296.

Brotman, S., & Lee, E. O. J. (2011). Exploring gender and sexuality through the lens of intersectionality: Sexual minority refugees in Canada. *Canadian Social Work Review/Revue Canadienne De Service Social, 28*(1), 151–156.

Carbado, D. W. (2013). Colorblind intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 38(4),* 811–845.

Chamberlin, J. (1978). *On our own: Patient controlled alternatives to the mental health system*. New York, NY: Haworth Press.

Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge: Consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *1*, 39–67.

Dhamoon, R. K. (2011). Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(1), 230–243.

Dhamoon, R. K. & Hankivsky, O. (2011). Why the theory and practice of intersectionality matter to health research and policy. In Hankivsky, O. (Ed.), *Health inequities in Canada : Intersectional frameworks and practices* (pp. 16–50). Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Dickerson, N. (2008). Occupational and residential segregation: The confluence of two systems of inequality. *Labor Studies Journal*, *33*(4), 393–411.

Dunlap, W. W. (Inspector of Prisons). 1919. *Query re: authority of Department of Immigration to use gaols for detention of undesirable immigrants*. Also concerns the specific case of Elsie Saborowiski, who associated with known revolutionaries. Archives of Ontario (Central registry criminal and civil files, series RG 4-32, 1871–2001). Toronto, ON.

Fong, R. (2005). The future of multicultural social work. *Advances in Social Work, 6*(1), 43–50. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/advancesin socialwork/article/view/75

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings (1972–77)*. C. Gordon (Ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Press.

Gardner v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration), 2011 FC 895 (CanLII), http://canlii.ca/t/fmf79, retrieved on December 23, 2013.

Hamilton, K. (2010). Colonial legacies, decolonized spirits: Balboa, Ugandan martyrs and AIDS solidarity today. *Journal of Bisexuality, 10*(1/2), 121–136.

Hankivsky, O. (Ed.). (2011). *Health inequities in Canada: Intersectional frameworks and practices*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Hassan v. Canada (Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness), 2007 CanLII 70790 (CA IRB), http://canlii.ca/t/21z42, retrieved on December 22, 2013.

Heron, B. (2005). Self-reflection in critical social work practice: Subjectivity and the possibilities of resistance. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *6*(3), 341–351. doi:10.1080/14623940500220095

Hulko, W. (2009). The time- and context-contingent nature of intersectionality and interlocking oppressions. *Affilia, 24*(1), 44–55.

hooks, b. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Jama v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration), 2008 FC 374 (CanLII), http://canlii.ca/t/1wgpw, retrieved on December 23, 2013.

Johnston, H. (1989). *The voyage of the Komagata Maru: The Sikh challenge to Canada's colour bar*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Joe, S. (2000). A study of the influence of selected neighborhood characteristics on Chicago youth homicide: 1970, 1980, 1990. (Abstract). *Dissertation abstracts international, A: The humanities and social sciences,* 3528-A.

Joseph, A. J. (2014). A prescription for violence: The legacy of colonization in contemporary forensic mental health and the production of difference. *Critical Criminology*, *22*(2), 273–293.

Martinez, T. A. (1999). Storytelling as oppositional culture: Race, class, and gender in the borderlands. *Race, Gender & Class, 6*(3), 33–51.

Mattsson, T. (2014). Intersectionality as a useful tool: Anti-oppressive social work and critical reflection. *Affilia, 29*(1), 8–17. doi:10.1177/0886109913510659

Mehrotra, G. (2010). Toward a continuum of intersectionality theorizing for feminist social work scholarship. *Affilia, 25*(4), 417–430.

Metzl, J. (2009). *The protest psychosis: How schizophrenia became a black disease*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30(3),* 1771–1800.

Nash, J. C. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, *89,* 1–15

Odum, H. W. (1910). *Social and mental traits of the Negro: Research into the conditions of the Negro race in southern towns, a study in race traits, tendencies, and prospects*. New York, NY: Columbia University.

Phillips, S. D., Leathers, S. J., & Erkanli, A. (2009). Children of probationers in the child welfare system and their families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *18*, 183–191.

Poole, J., Jivraj, T., Arslanian, A., Bellows, K., Chiasson, S., Hakimy, H., Pasini, J., & Reid, J. (2012). Sanism, 'mental health', and social work/education: A review and call to action. *Intersectionalities* 1, 20–36.

Poole, J. M., & Ward, J. (2013). "Breaking open the bone": Storying, sanism, and Mad grief. In LeFrançois, B., Menzies, R., & Reaume, G. (Eds.), *Mad matters: A critical reader in Canadian Mad studies* (pp. 281–297). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press.

Pon, G. (2009). Cultural competency as new racism: An ontology of forgetting. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, *20*, 59–71.

Press, S. J., & Tanur, J. M. (1991). The confluence of sociology, statistics, and public policy in the quality control of the food stamps, AFDC, and Medicaid family assistance programs. *Evaluation Review*, *15*(3), 315–332.

Rabinow, P. (Ed.). (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race, and culture in courtrooms and classrooms.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Rix, R. (2000). Trauma, science, and the law: A brief history of trauma research and the social response. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *3*(2), 1–47.

Robbins, H. M. (Dept. Prov. Sec.). 1927. *Request for opinion re power of Immigration Dept. to designate Ontario Hospitals for the insane as immigrant stations.* Archives of Ontario (Central registry criminal and civil files, series RG 4-32, 1871–2001). Toronto, ON.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Salimbeni, M. C. (2011). Domestic violence: Intersectionality and culturally competent practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 31*(1), 112–114.

Samuels, G. M., & Ross-Sheriff, F. (2008). Identity, oppression, and power: Feminisms and intersectionality theory. *Affilia, 23*(1), 5–9. doi:10.1177/0886109907310475

Schmid, J. (2010). A history of the present: Uncovering discourses in (South African) child welfare. *The British Journal of Social Work, 40*(7), 2102–2118. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcp124

Scott, W. D. (Department of Immigration, Ottawa). 1915. *Request for information on the deportation of Hobos from Ontario*. Archives of Ontario (Central registry criminal and civil files, series RG 4-32, 1871–2001). Toronto, ON.

Sung, H., Mellow, J., & Mahoney, A. M. (2010). Jail inmates with co-occurring mental health and substance use problems: Correlates and service needs. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *49*, 126–145.

Wallerstein, I. (1991). *Unthinking social science: The limits of nineteenth century paradigms*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ameil J. Joseph, School of Social Work, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street, West Hamilton, ON, L8S 4M4, Canada. Email: ameilj@mcmaster.ca