

**From:** [Andreas Kalogiannides](#)  
**To:** [Executive Committee](#)  
**Subject:** [External Sender] My comments for 2025.EX21.14 on March 19, 2025 Executive Committee  
**Date:** March 17, 2025 9:56:11 PM

---

To the City Clerk:

Please add my comments to the agenda for the March 19, 2025 Executive Committee meeting on item 2025.EX21.14, Committee Discussion on Indigenous Council Members

I understand that my comments and the personal information in this email will form part of the public record and that my name will be listed as a correspondent on agendas and minutes of City Council or its committees. Also, I understand that agendas and minutes are posted online and my name may be indexed by search engines like Google.

**ensure my comments are readable/visible on the website**

Comments:

I am shocked and dismayed that the Exec Committee is considering creating an Indigenous Member of City Council. **I strongly and vehemently oppose this motion/proposal.** Frankly, were this motion to succeed, it invites a myriad of legal challenges, for example, under the Charter section 2(b) Freedom of Expression (participation in political decision making and political speech is protected); Section 3 Democratic Rights; Section 15 - Equality Rights (there's no positive right for the government to counteract inequalities in society, but if it does act, it must not discriminate). Among others.

I cannot believe that this is a realistic proposal in a democratic, fair and free society. This idea is deeply illiberal: the idea that someone, solely by virtue of their membership in an identity class, can hold a public office, on an elected body, without being elected themselves, is terrifying. It should scare anybody who knows of it. This is a hijacking of a bedrock principle of liberal democracy in the name of equity, diversity and inclusion. I literally cannot believe this is being proposed and debated for more than 30 seconds. You - whoever put this forward and advocates for it - should be **deeply ashamed**, and you need to reflect on the principles you're espousing and question whether you indeed believe in the ideals of democracy. This is progressive identity politics run amok, and illustrates the Trotsky-Marxist-communist ideal of "the ends justify the means" as long as you win, and the "rest of us" will forget about it/get over it (look it up, read history). Make no mistake - this is a step towards authoritarianism.

Members of council are elected. Not appointed. Neither are they elected on the basis of their membership in some type of immutable identity group, e.g. being Greek or bald.

By its very definition, this proposed council seat is discriminatory: if there is a native seat, then why not a black seat? A white seat? A gay seat? Are there more white seats than Muslim seats? Or women than men? Or +65 v <40? What about glasses-wearers v. contact-lens users? By proposing an unelected native member of council, the City is prioritizing a random identity characteristic over those of others, and doing so on an arbitrary basis. The moment you introduce some sort of explicit bias based on some immutable identity characteristic, you open the door for other silly, pernicious ideas that may find footing, e.g. Perhaps we should have only black councillors deal with the issues of black citizens? Once you start pushing progressive identity politics within the context of the most important City body, you create the opportunity for these ideas to be further entrenched and taken to potentially ridiculous and illiberal conclusions.

Or, is it the other way? That every native person (note: not the *elected* native, but the one *named* to this seat) thinks the same as every other native person, and they are therefore interchangeable? The appointment of one is just as good as the appointment of another, as long as they're all native? What about allowing for diversity of thinking and experience amongst members of the native community? Or, do they all think the same and hold the same views and the same skills? (Is this not a bigoted idea - that all members of the same group are the same?) Or, yet still, is it because a given native person - again, *any* person as long as they're native - "knows" more or has more or better skill or experience than a white person? A black person? A disabled person? An older white woman? etc. etc. Is this not prima facie discrimination? What is it about natives that their perspective - again, not even the perspective of a *given* person, but the perspective of *any* native by virtue of their "nativeness" - is so much more valuable than the perspective of anyone else? Is it so valuable to the extent that we can subvert a basic democratic principle of elected representation to have it on Council?

Further, what problem is this intending to solve? Can a native not run for council like anyone else? What is the barrier here? Do they not have the same rights as we all do? Will this person run a given ward? If so, what ward? My ward? What if the constituents don't like this person? Can there be accountability to the electorate even though this person was not elected by the community? What type of moral authority and mandate would this person have to lead and make decisions and represent the city?

At the end of the day, having an unelected native seat on council is yet another example of the progressive left's soft bigotry of low expectations; the low expectations they seem to have of whatever 'group' is supposedly due "representation". In this case, the native community. It is effectively sending the message that the group could never have the opportunity to be considered for a Council position or never win in a democratic race because - and solely or mostly because - of their membership in an identity group, i.e.

being native. And this messaging is 100% wrong. Why couldn't a native person, say, have the skills, ideas and character to be elected by the community in a given ward, aside and separate from their membership in the group of "native"? That doesn't make sense - there's no reason a native person cannot run in an election and be elected! Run! test your ideas and marketing and charisma against everyone else running - and let the voters decide! This is how democracy works after all.

The soft bigotry of low expectations is also corrosive to the self-actualization and core identity of the person in that group because it encourages the person to think of themselves as a victim and creates a narrative of internalized victimhood, i.e. because I'm native I could never have been reasonably be elected to Council, therefore I need special accommodation and need to be appointed. Of course, this isn't true - there is nothing about being native that inherently disqualifies a person from applying to and being selected for Council - or whatever opportunity. Further, and relatedly, this narrative has another side: it invites society to view this person as being a "diversity hire", i.e. in a given position solely or mostly because of their membership in an identity group, and that this person has little substance to offer beyond their "identity". This, over time, breeds resentment as we see someone being appointed not because of their ideas, skills, experience, temperament or interest, but only or mostly because of X identifiable characteristic; it sets up a scenario whereby there is a shadow cast over this person and, by extension, others in their same "group". There will be a large, public and sustained backlash against this person, and likely against natives as a group. It will set back decades whatever cause "you" are trying to move forward. This is the soft bigotry of low expectations: because you're a member of this identity group, you couldn't possibly achieve X on your own, and so we don't expect much from you because of X identity, so the state/this group/we need to help you achieve X. This idea is fundamentally illiberal and bigoted, and irredeemably so.

Again, I am shocked - outraged! - that this is A. a real proposal and B. I have to remind the committee of basic principles of a liberal democracy. This is beyond insane, even for a Council composed of its current membership as it has been for the past 6 years or so.

It is an unfortunate hallmark of recent times that politics is marred by an overly-zealous emphasis on identity and other immutable characteristics as the basis for competency, opportunity or representation. Council should strongly resist this motion, and indeed any idea to name an unelected person to Council based on ANY characteristic whatever.

Merit > everything. Democracy > everything. This simple idea is the basis for, literally, modern Western civilization. It's given us everything we have to this point in human

existence, and what we have now is pretty great. Don't chip away at it and ruin it.

Andreas