

Racial Origins of Civic Nationalisms: Exploring Race Creation in Australia and Canada

Oren Howlett

Nationalism is an ideology. It claims to know when a nation exists, who belongs to it, and who does not, and why. It advocates the creation of an individual state as a nation's natural right, a precondition for realization of its fullest potential. Nationalism invents a group of people who recognize in each other a shared community of culture, history, and future expectation. (Senese, 2000)

Nationalism in any guise creates confusion, not clarity; anxiety, not tranquility. (Senese, 2000, 125)

The quotations above demonstrate the complexity of nationalism. In her essay entitled, "Weeds in the Garden of Civic Nationalism", Senese (2000) considers the major 'weed in the garden' of Canadian civic nationalism to be the ethnic nationalism of French Canadians (113). However, her discussion of civic nationalism is incomplete. In identifying who belongs to the nation, she fails to notice the exclusion of "the other" that inhabits the same territory as English and French Canadians and their civic or ethnic nationalisms: Aboriginal peoples and "race" minorities. As a result, this omission demands greater exploration. The history of Aboriginal oppression and colonization in settler societies and their future nation-states is relatively well known and documented (Broome, 1994; Dickason, 2002; McMillan *et al.*, 2004; Mulvaney, 1989). This essay, however, focuses on the experiences of national

exclusion through the creation of "race" suffered by visible "race" minorities in two such settler society nation-states: Australia and Canada.

In presenting an analysis of "race" creation in Canadian and Australian civic nationalisms, I hope to provide another layer to the existing work that explores the relationship between "race" and nationalism, incorporating the exclusion of "race" minorities from the benefits of civic nationalism into these discourses. In so doing, I wish to show the false nature of the dichotomy between the ideal civic nationalism and the "backwards" or "primitive" ethnic nationalisms. As a consequence, this paper argues that civic nationalisms, which have always existed in Australia and Canada, were, and continue to be, based on "race" and racist images of who belongs (White English-speaking Australians and Canadians) and who does not (Non-whites). Hence, I contend that race creation is and has been central to civic nationalism's exclusions, making nothing more than a variation of ethnic nationalism with ethnic roots.

To achieve the stated goals, I investigate the history of "race" creation in both Australia and Canada through a survey of scholarship on nationalism and "race" in Canada and Australia. First, I examine the creation of "race" in the nation. I then demonstrate the construction of the state in keeping with the imagined Canadian and Australian nations. This process, enabled through policies of nation-building, is based on whites-only nationalism in both countries. Following this, I present an overview of the recent attempts to deconstruct Canada and Australia's whites-only nationalism with replacement policies of multiculturalism. I suggest, however, that these policies which were meant to include all within the nation actually serve to further alienate, manage, and de-politicize non-white groups. Finally, I end this article with a discussion of the possibility of "de-rac(e)-ing" the nation and achieving a truly civic nationalism.

Before beginning this study, concepts must be defined and the limitations on the scope of the paper must be considered. Firstly, the study is limited to the settler societies of Australia and Canada. These societies provide an excellent opportunity for the exploration of "race" creation in the early development of settler nationalisms. Moreover, these two countries provide historical trajectories that are very similar and complementary for a comparative examination of nationalism and "race". Yet, at the same time, nuanced differences provide an interesting comparison

for analysis. In completing this comparative study, I follow in the steps of many scholars who have used similar comparative frameworks between settler societies and their resulting nation-states (Albinski, 1973; Alexander & Galligan, 1992; Berry *et al.*, 1985; Blee, 2001; Crabbe & Australian and New Zealand Association for Canadian Studies., 1983; MacDonagh *et al.*, 1988).

I have also limited my study to the exclusion of “race” minority Canadians and Australians. Therefore, French Canadians in the Canadian case will not be considered in this study. Moreover, I will not include Aboriginal peoples in my definition of “race” minority or non-white Canadian and Australian groups. While I acknowledge the racialization of Aboriginal peoples in both countries, there are reasons for this exclusion. First, the Aboriginal peoples of both countries have a different history of oppression – internal colonialism.¹ As the original inhabitants of this land, their oppression created the base upon which the exclusion of other visible minorities was built (Vickers, 2000, 145). Moreover, Aboriginal peoples have themselves long disputed and resisted their inclusion under the rubric of multicultural policies and discourses, claiming that they are not just another ethnic or “race” minority. From an Aboriginal point of view, they are instead the rightful inhabitants of lands appropriated by Canadians and Australians. In addition, “race” minorities also benefit from Aboriginal land losses through the colonial processes of internal colonization further differentiating their experiences of oppression (Vickers, 2000, 145).

Finally, the problematic term of “race” must also be discussed. To this point, “race” has been enclosed in quotations.² This is done to recognize the social construction of the term. As Simms notes, “[t]he scientific basis of such identification is largely suspect, but the concept of ‘race’ is socially accepted” (1993, 334). As this study illustrates, the concept of “race” is generally defined by the historically dominant group of society. Stasiulis and Williams (1992) illustrate that the dominant group has the political power to decide who is racialized and who is not. Thus, “race” has different meanings depending upon the national context and the dominant group(s) in society.

For simplicity and ease of language, I will use the term “non-whites” as synonymous with Canadians and Australians of visible “race” minority status, such as non-white landed immigrants and visible minorities.³

The narrow focus of this terminology reflects the construction and reconstruction of non-white citizens in political and social discourses and acknowledges the replacement of "race" by ethnic diversity in both nation-states. As a result, it is hard to find a single term that remains constant throughout the literature examined. With this framework, I hope to provide clarity and understanding to abstract and subjective terminology.

Imagining Nation and the Creation of Race

The origins of race creation in Canada and Australia can be found in the history of racialism (Betts, 1988; Castles *et al.*, 1992; Kane, 1997; London, 1970; Markus, 1994; Marx, 1998; Vickers, 2000). Vickers finds that political regimes in both countries were built on values of race hierarchy and ideals of racialism. Racialism consists of three ideas: 1) humans are divided into races; 2) human capabilities are determined by race; and 3) one race can rule over another race because of their superiority (2000, 2).

In his discussion of the United States, South Africa, and Brazil, Anthony Marx observes the following of racialism's condoned white superiority:

The colo[u]r line was seen as having been drawn by God or biology. Slavery, proscriptions against miscegenation, colonialism, imperialism, manifest destiny, racially exclusive forms of citizenship or nationalism, exploitation were all justified by whites as preordained in nature. Such racism became a mode of thought endemic in Western civilization, buttressed by eugenics, social Darwinism, and explicitly racist theories such as those of Count Gobineau. Primordialism serving the interests of whites made the domination of darker peoples seem inescapable. (1998, 3)

The idea of racial domination and superiority reflected upon by Anthony Marx has far reaching implications in both Australia and Canada.

Values of racialism were central to the creation of race and settlement in both Canada and Australia. These racialist values permitted the racialization and internal colonization of Aboriginal peoples of Canada

and Australia. Moreover, they provided the context for the creation of race regimes in both countries, which would shape future imaginings of the nation and its accompanying sovereign state. As Vickers shows, internal colonialism underwent an important shift from colonial power in a sovereign regime to ordinary state enforcement in a governmental system based on racialist values (Vickers, 2000, 42). This new governmental regime needed to be harnessed to a nation. To do this, the imaginations of the forefathers of both Australia and Canada were necessary to carry out the work of mediation in creating their nations.

Benedict Anderson (1991) in his seminal work, *Imagined Communities*, defines the nation as an imagined political community (6). This definition accurately describes both the Australian and Canadian situations. The British soldiers and governors of both countries had the important task of imagining and defining the future of their lands. In doing so, they created nations in which they would feel at home. Their nation model, therefore, was based upon their British experience, in keeping with Anderson's assertion that "[n]o nation imagines itself as coterminous with mankind" (Anderson, 1991, 7). Thus, the founders of Canada and Australia created an ideal Australian and Canadian according to their previous white British experiences.

The main marker of the racial ideals for both countries was race. For example, one need only examine the debates of early Canadian elites to see their imagining of the Canadian nation and community. Strong-Boag (1998) provides an example of the race-based sentiments which shaped the imagined Canadian identity. Based on racialist principles, Canada was to be "a Northern country inhabited by the descendants of Northern races" (Strong-Boag et al., 1998, 8). As a result, Canadians were clearly imagined to be Anglo-Saxon descendants of British origin, white in race and superior to the Aboriginals who were seen as savages with no history.

These themes of race and Britishness are entrenched within Australian identity and its nation as well. At the time of federation, Kane observes that Australian identity consisted of 'whiteness', 'Britishness', and Australianness which served to protect its security and assert dominion over the land (1997, 121-122). With Australia amongst the Asiatic countries and in a black man's world, we see the creation of a colonial nationalism built to defend a vulnerable colony. Thus, Austra-

lia, in the middle of these two threats, created a colonial nationalism and Australian citizen to keep them at bay and arms length from the nation.

Clearly evident in both countries are patterns of race creation, based on racialist values, which created ideal images of white Australian and Canadian races, societies and countries. The process of race creation in the national imaginings of both Canada and Australia support Anthony Marx's assertion that race was purposely chosen as the defining feature of colonial nation (1998: 23). In Canada and Australia, the imagined nations, like the states they supported, were built upon race regimes that were imbued with these racist ideologies, widely held at the time and so deemed "rational and scientific". Through the joining of an imagined nation with a state supported by a governmental race regime, the pieces of the puzzle were set in place for the rise of Canadian and Australian nation-states.

Whites-Only Nationalism and Building the Nation-state

Before continuing our analysis of race creation in Australia and Canada, it is important to note that while the nation and state have been separated for discussion in this study, the state-run processes of national imagination and state reinforcement of that nation occur simultaneously. At this juncture, it is useful to turn to the work of Margaret Canovan (1996) who posits that "nationhood is a mediating phenomenon" (69). She continues that "nationhood is hard to define not because it is confused or nonsensical, but because it is extremely subtle, and moreover, because an element of myth is essential to it" (Canovan, 1996, 69). As a result, it is difficult to determine which one of the state-run national imagination or the state reinforcement of that nation is leading the other at a given point in a country's historical formation or reconstruction. Hence, the relationship between the nation and the state that is captured in the term "nation-state" is this meditation process between the constructed and imagined. This relationship is fluid, constantly evolving, and one of interdependence between these two entities.

Both Vickers and Anthony Marx use the concept of whites-only nationalism to characterize nationalisms driven by racialist values. While discussing different countries, the nationalisms of both Canada and Australia can be considered whites-only because of their imagined qualities, which exclude non-white "races" from the nation-state, as citizens but not as denizens, such as the case of indentured labourers and

race minority workers in both countries. As noted above, the work of mediation can sustain and perpetuate these inherent contradictions within the nation-state and in keeping with its nationalism.

In addition, nationalism is, in fact, both a political and cultural phenomenon, characterized by the articulation of the nation through political discourses and practices (Jenkins & Sofos, 1996, 12). This process, in short, elevates the nation to the status of political subject (Jenkins & Sofos, 1996, 12). Here it is useful to think of this political subject as a collective 'we.' Conovan elaborates on this usage below:

What nationhood does is to constitute a collective political subject – a 'we' – with the capacity to act collectively over long periods of time. In doing so, it acts as a reservoir of political power, providing a strikingly effective solution to the most fundamental of political problems. (1996, 72)

The process of nation building, however, driven by whites-only nationalism, is essential in this complex puzzle of relationships among nationalism, the nation, and the state. Through nation-building, governmental regimes are able to build nation-states that reinforce the race solidarity engendered by nationalism and harness its power and strength to maintain legitimacy and ruling power. As Anthony Marx argues:

Nationhood was institutionalized on the basis of race.... State-imposed exclusion of a specified internal group, used to reinforce the allegiance and unity of a core constituency, may be a more pervasive pattern. Indeed nation-states have often been based on such exclusion, not only according to race, but also ethnicity, class, and other cleavages. (1998, 25)

Thus, Anthony Marx helps us understand why racial solidarity was maintained in both nations through the nation building process of immigration, building upon the race regime of internal colonialism created for Aboriginal peoples in Canada and Australia.

In Canada and Australia, state-implemented policies developed around the imagined nation. Furthermore, state-elites sought to create the state in its image embedding the existing race regimes into the

administration of the nation-state. One of the clearest examples of such policies are immigration laws to both countries, which excluded non-whites as citizens or even completely. Not only did immigration affect the admission of labour to both nation-states, it also provided the opportunity for further government control and management of the population through the granting or denying of citizenship. As Anthony Marx observes, citizenship is key to the processes of exclusion and race creation (1998, 5).

In post-Confederation Canada, the early years of nation-building gave rise to an overtly and unapologetically racist immigration policy. Politicians of the day actively sought to create policies that restricted immigration from undesirable countries to maintain the homogeneity of the Canadian race. Stasiulis and Williams (1992) illuminate the mediation necessary in creating the racial hierarchy of suitable candidates for entry and citizenship in Canada. This ideological work contained all viewpoints, both explicitly racist and exclusive, and moderate and inclusive. Despite the efforts of a few liberal minded parliamentarians, however, early post-Confederation immigration overwhelmingly came from Britain to the almost complete exclusion of non-whites (Wayland, 1997, 36). Canada's hard labour was performed by the few immigrants from Central and Western Europe and China admitted to the country. This early pattern of immigration began to shift as pools of immigrants dried up (Fleras & Elliot, 1992; Mackey, 1999; Simms, 1993; Stasiulis & Jhappan, 1995; Vickers, 2000; Wayland, 1997). Canadian immigration policies, however, remained exclusionary, clinging to notions of racialism, and the image of a land of a "Northern race".

In contrast, Australia reinforced and justified racist immigration policies through a narrative of unity and cohesion of white Australians. Here, the entry of inferior non-whites was thought to threaten the development of the Australian nation-state and the equality needed for its success (Castles et al., 1992; Kane, 1997; London, 1970; Markus, 1994; Vickers, 2000). As a result, the need to create and maintain a homogeneous white Australian society was supported at any cost until the early 1970s (Vickers, 2000, 87). The prior experiences of using indentured Chinese workers to replace convict, and gold diggers helped support this belief and early leaders, whether motivated by fear, nationalism, humanitarianism, racial superiority, or all three, almost unanimously supported protection of the White Australia policy (London, 1970, 13).

In summary, to support whites-only nationalism, both the Canadian and Australian nation-states implemented racist immigration policies. These policies were justified in different ways. In Canada, arguments of environmental relativism and equal or suitable races were used to argue the superiority of the Canadian northern and European races and create a hierarchy of suitable races, immigrants, and citizens, to the exclusion of those with darker skin pigmentation, who were thought too morally and physically inferior. In contrast, Australians used unity, equality, and the quest for a democratic state to justify their overtly racist White Australia policy. Thus, through the maintenance of a white homogeneous society and complete exclusion of new non-white immigrants, they were able to avoid social cleavages while also protecting their nation-state from the threat of flooding by non-white immigrants such as the “yellow peril” of the nearby Asian countries, who would then undercut wages with their inexpensive labour and contribute to the degradation of Australian society.

Deconstruction of Whites-Only Nationalism: Building a Land for All

To this point, I have explored the creation of race in Canada and Australia. I have looked at the racialist principles that underlie the race regimes eventually set up in each country. I also introduced the concept of whites-only nationalism that was in use at the time of the founding of both nation-states. For simplicity, I broke down the nation-state by looking first at the imagining of the nation and then at the construction of the state according to the imagined whites-only nationalism via immigration and citizenship-granting policies. Hence, by the mid 1950s, both Canada and Australia were fully-fledged nation-states driven by visions which excluded and oppressed minorities because of their race.

Although race is no longer a justifiable reason for exclusion or discrimination, the concept continues to permeate our society and affect the lived experience of many within both countries. What has happened to the old race regimes, however, if race is no longer “politically correct”? As Jill Vickers notes, the state race regimes, on which whites-only nationalisms in Canada and Australia are built, currently are undergoing legislative deconstruction by policy makers (Vickers, 2000, 97). Consistent with Sylvia Walby’s (1997) rounds of restructuring⁴, the deconstruction of whites-only nationalism is hindered by two “sedimentary” factors. First, new pieces of legislation that attempt to deconstruct race

regimes are implemented alongside others which maintain internal colonialism, such as the *Indian Act* in Canada (Vickers, 2000, 98). Second, the democratic political system, which in practice has represented only the White citizens in both Canadian and Australia, creates an expectation for White citizens that this will continue (Vickers, 2000, 98). As a result, dismantling race regimes has proved very difficult.

Largely, the deconstruction of the old race regime has occurred in both nation-states at the level of legislative change, in the form of amended immigration laws. Yet, efforts to right past wrongs through legislative change have given rise to a new race regime: democratic racism. Democratic racism, like the older race regimes, is characterized by the continued disadvantaging of certain racial groups and the privileging of others. It differs because it brings together the values of democratic equality and racism (Vickers, 2000, 99). Thus, in terms of race, this new regime fits the pattern of the previous system of race creation by maintaining the status quo. While anti-racist and affirmative action legislation has been put in place, the implementation of multiculturalism in both countries will form the focus of my discussion.

Australian and Canadian governments have touted multiculturalism as a solution to the problem of diversity created by new immigration laws allowing non-white immigration. The Canadian government first introduced the policy of multiculturalism in the late 1960s. It later became entrenched in the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* in 1982. In Australia, the policy was adopted and adapted by politicians in the 1970s, based on the Canadian model. Thus, the race regimes in both countries shifted from different forms of non-white immigrant exclusion to the management of diversity through multiculturalism.

That multiculturalism manages cultural diversity in Canada has been noted by Canadian scholars (Bissoondath, 1993; Day, 2000; Mackey, 1999; Simms, 1993; Vickers, 2000). Diversity, lauded under multicultural policies, constructs white English Canadian identity as the norm around which other identities are grouped (Mackey, 1999, 5) and allows white Canadian to retain their individuality while homogenizing the "other" (Eisenberg, 1998, 39-40). Yet, discussions of Canadian identity never fully acknowledge this fact or that multiculturalism perpetuates English Canadian dominance and cultural superiority (Eisenberg, 1998, 49-50). This trend reinforces the majority's power to construct the iden-

tities of racial and ethnic communities within “their” Canadian nation-state.

A similar trend is evident in Australia. It is not, however, framed in exactly the same manner. Australian multiculturalism policy evolved from a guiding principle, implemented in an effort to break with an assimilationist past, to being tied directly to specific government policies and programs (Jupp, 1997, 134). This then redefined multiculturalism and moved it from an ideology which allowed the preservation of ethnic identities to a tolerance of ethnicity within an overarching Australian identity and allegiance (Jupp, 1997, 136).

This notion of tolerance enabled by multiculturalism is explored by Gassan Hage (1998) who argues that the “good” multicultural nationalism, as opposed to racist “white” Australian nationalism, is actually a manifestation of a white fantasy like that of the racist “white” Australian nationalists. Like Canadian scholars, he feels that multiculturalism does nothing to change white-centred conceptions or imaginings of the nation (Hage, 1998, 23). In fact, both multiculturalists and anti-racists, who vilify racists, are clinging to the same white fantasy, only in a more sophisticated form (Hage, 1998, 23). Thus, while tolerance gives the impression of freedom, it actually serves to control the tolerated and manage their identity (Hage, 1998, 89).

Thus, multiculturalism, as implemented in both Canada and Australia, provides an interesting study of policy makers’ attempts to deconstruct whites-only nationalism. These case studies highlight the key to a race regime based democratic racism: the power of the majority is assumed normal and legitimate. This is the basis, however, of democracy which further complicates the dilemma of deconstruction. Thus, through the management of cultural diversity, cohesion is sought and enforced by the state through construction of “the other” based on liberal and enlightened values of equality, which only includes the “others” if they are safe for assimilation. Meanwhile, both the dominance of the racially homogeneous majority and the oppression of others due to their ethnic diversity are ignored.

This new tolerant nationalism is based on the ideal of civic nationalism and is thus constructed as open and equal to all without racial or ethnic foundations. This is clearly not the case, however. In both Australia and Canada, the state legislated a civic nation through legislative reform, but the nation remained locked in past imaginings of great white races.

The uneven reconstruction of the nation-state perpetuates the exclusion experienced by some non-white citizens and contributes to the democratic racist regime of both countries. In short, the deconstruction of both Australia and Canada's race regimes is incomplete. Conceptions of race disappear from the lexicons of legislators and are replaced by words, such as diversity and ethnicity; however race continues to play a major role in the nation-state and contributes energy to the newly constructed race regime even if it is unspoken.

De-rac(e)ing the Nation: Building a Truly Civic Nationalism

When I began this race analysis of Canadian and Australian nationalism I set out to: 1) explore how nation-states create race, 2) show that civic nationalism can have racial and settler foundations upon which nation-states are built and reconstructed through national mediation and rounds of restructuring, and 3) show the implications of these race regimes and nationalisms on non-white citizens in both countries.

I have argued that nation-states, like Canada and Australia, created race through a dual process of imagining the nation and creating the state through nation building. These processes occur simultaneously, through mediation between the elite parliamentarians of each society, and may occur at different rates and trajectories. This is seen in both Canada and Australia where state deconstruction of racist race regimes has given rise to new race regimes. Here, we can see that Day's assertion – that current policy is a reproduction of the history of diversity through proliferation and adaptation – is true for both Canada and Australia (Day, 2000, 207). While his framework focuses solely on Canada, multiculturalism can more generally be seen as a reproduction of past failed attempts at achieving unity among ethnic groups and solving the "problem" of diversity.

Multiculturalism, however, reveals a more insidious truth surrounding civic nationalism. In the present rhetoric espoused by liberal theorists, civic nationalism is the "good" nationalism, devoid of ties to ethnicity, yet based on values of liberal equality and democracy. In contrast, this race analysis has shown that present constructions of civic nationalism in both countries were indeed based upon racial foundations of Whiteness and the ethnic exclusions of "others" in both Canada and Australia. These foundations allowed for the internal colonization and racialization of Aboriginal peoples in Canada and Blacks in Australia

and gave rise to secondary race regimes of exclusion based upon race. Even in the reconstruction of both Canadian and Australian nation-states, their civic nationalisms remained tied to ideals of a white citizenry and proceeded to manage, dominate, de-politicize, and silence the voice of non-white citizens. This process manifests itself in policy such as multiculturalism and second-class citizenship for non-whites (Abu-Laban, 1998; Bissoondath, 1993, 1994; Jupp, 1997; Senese, 2000; Vickers, 2000). The implications of these findings might also reveal interestingly similar in trends in other countries with morally upstanding civic nationalisms. What is distinct in the case of white settler societies, like Canada and Australia, is the work of mediation, which was based upon European racial orders (Stasiulis & Williams, 1992, 5).

Within Canadian and Australian contexts, non-whites are currently caught in a complex situation. While their chosen home welcomes them, they are continuously held at an arm's length by the elites in the same countries that celebrate the diversity to which they contribute as the key to their upstanding and civilized society. This contradiction, in the end, results in second-class treatment, citizenship, and feelings of exclusion which are not rectified by any nationalism currently in place. What can be done to correct this paradoxical situation?

In posing this question, I assume that there is a possibility of a truly civic nationalism. It might be more realistic, however, to adopt a spectrum from which to gauge the process of progression. Hence, it might be helpful to borrow Tim Nieguth's (1997) conception of civic and ethnic nationalism as ideal type models.⁵ As such, attaining either a fully civic or a fully ethnic nationalism would be difficult. As a result, Canada and Australia, from the evidence presented here, fall between these two models, as do many other countries. Thus, the challenge becomes one of attempting to attain a nationalism that approximates civic nationalism as much as possible.

Yet, in order to achieve this goal, I believe that we must return to the state of national imagining. For as the Canadian experience illustrates, elite driven re-imaginings of nation result in a nation-state that does not shift the foundations of the whiteness that remains at the centre of nation. Instead, power must be radically shifted and new discourses and groups given room to share in the benefits of this new nation, state, and nationalism. It is just not enough to implement new legislation and enact new politicise of tolerance or even acceptance. In this renewed space of

imagining, negotiations, similar to those carried out by the founders of both countries, will be necessary. This round of imagining, however, would be inclusive and based upon the groundwork provided by a multicultural liberal politics that exists in both countries and creates room for the formerly identified "other" to tell their truth and contribute their reality to the imagining of a new nation.

This is probably the hardest route to travel as it requires an acknowledgment of the past and the rejection of delusional structures and legislative solutions that mediate and support conflicting realities and mythologies. The process was begun in Australia as the country sought to resituate an Australian identity linked to Asia within a globalizing world (Hudson & Stokes, 1997). Even within this failed endeavour, however, the concept of race was absent. Its inclusion could have allowed for a full re-imagining or restructuring of the nation with inclusion of all Australians regardless of race. This is especially true when one considers the break with Britishness advocated by government and repositioning of Australian identity within an Asian context. This transition could then have been supported by the state through new nation-building policies to reinforce this new global positioning and Australian identity.

In Canada, the same opportunity is currently available to legislators. The current shifts in government and political thought, regarding democratic deficits, accountability, political institutions, and political participation, provides an opportune time for Canadians to address inequality and injustices entrenched in the Canadian system brought about by the new race regime. Yet again, the focus is solely on the state and rights-based initiatives rather than inclusive national imaginings or a reconstruction of the complete nation-state, leaving issues of race completely invisible.

These changes clearly require brave leadership that is truly committed to these the ideals of civic nationalism and to de-race-ing exclusionist visions of the nation from our collective memories. The changes also require full participation by all citizens in the process of imagining the nation, in keeping with notions of extensive or inclusive democracy. This, however, is not a task that can be carried out alone by one portion of the population, as has happened in the past. A first important step is for all levels of governance to acknowledge the current shortcomings of the state in granting equal rights to all citizens and truly acknowledge the

causes for these inequalities. From this point, we might be able to build Canadian and Australian nation-states and nationalisms that are truly civic.

Endnotes

1. The process of dispossession or the forcible removal of Aboriginal peoples from their lands and their confinement on small reserves of missions controlled by the state.

2. From this point forward, I will not enclose the term "race" in quotations. While I acknowledge that race is a social construct, I feel race is also a lived experience that negates the social imaginings or construction of race. Thus, the quotation marks used by many authors in the field to denote the social construction of race and problematize the term will not be used in this paper. In moving away from this trend, I hope not to reify race, but to give credence and legitimization to the lived experiences of those who confront race and racialization daily.

3. This category includes refugees, landed immigrants, and their children. The terminology is also inclusive of Canadians and Australians who have skin pigmentation other than white. As a result, this definition excludes white racialized minorities and long term residents of both countries, who again are subject to different effects from the above mentioned policies of cultural management and "race" creation. In excluding white racialized minorities, I, in no way, contend that all landed immigrants are non-white. For the purposes of this analysis, however, I believe it is important to make this distinction to witness how the creation of race differentially affects these visible "race" minorities in both Canada and Australia and the promise their inclusion holds.

4. Walby describes rounds of restructuring as a useful way of "carrying the notion of change built upon foundations which remain, and that layer upon layer of change can take place, each of which leaves its sediment which significantly affects future practices" in the process of nation-formation (1997, 190).

5. Nieguth (1997) provides categories of ethnic and civic nationalism. Ethnic nationalism is defined as "having a common character and a common culture...possessing a shared genetic connection, such that most members take themselves to be genetically similar and/or related to most other members of the group" (cited: 24). Civic nationalism "emphasizes the constructed nature of society in general and nations in particular; any cohesion and sense of belonging is rooted not in quasi-natural kinship ties, but in political arrangements which accommodate different cultural and ethnic groups" (Nieguth 1997: 24).

References

- Abu-Laban, Y. (1998). Keeping 'em Out: Gender, Race, and Class Bias in Canadian Immigration Policy. In V. Strong-Boag, A. Eisenberg, S. Grace & J. Anderson (Eds.), *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender and the Construction of Canada* (pp. 69-84). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Albinski, H. S. (1973). *Canadian and Australian politics in comparative perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alexander, M., & Galligan, B. (1992). *Comparative Political Studies: Australia and Canada*. Melbourne: Pitman.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Berry, R. J., Acheson, J., & Association for Canadian Studies in Australia and New Zealand. Conference. (1985). *Regionalism and National Identity: Multi-disciplinary Essays on Canada, Australia and New Zealand*. Christchurch, N.Z.: Association for Canadian Studies in Australia and New Zealand.
- Betts, K. (1988). *Ideology and Immigration: Australia 1967 to 1987*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Bissoondath, N. (1993). A Question of Belonging: Multiculturalism and Citizenship. In W. Kaplan (Ed.), *Belonging: The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship* (pp. 368-387). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bissoondath, N. (1994). *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Blee, K. M. (2001). *Feminism and Antiracism: International Struggles for Justice*. New York: New York University Press.
- Broome, R. (1994). *Aboriginal Australians: Black Responses to White Dominance, 1788-1994* (2nd ed.). St Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Canovan, M. (1996). *Nationhood and Political Theory*. Vermont: Edward Elgar Publishing Company.

Castles, S., Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & Morrissey, M. (1992). *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*. Sydney: Pluto Press.

Crabbe, P., & Australian and New Zealand Association for Canadian Studies. (1983). *Theory and Practice in Comparative Studies: Canada, Australia and New Zealand: papers from the First Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Canadian Studies held at Macquarie University, Sydney, August 1982*. North Ryde, New South Wales: Australian and New Zealand Association for Canadian Studies.

Day, R. J. F. (2000). *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dickason, O. P. (2002). *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples From Earliest Times* (3rd ed.). Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.

Eisenberg, A. (1998). Domination and Political Representation in Canada. In V. Strong-Boag, S. Grace, A. Eisenberg & J. Anderson (Eds.), *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender and the Construction of Canada* (pp. 37-52). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Fleras, A., & Elliot, J. L. (1992). *Multiculturalism in Canada: The Challenge of Diversity*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada.

Hage, G. (1998). *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Sydney: Pluto Press.

Hudson, W., & Stokes, G. (1997). Australia and Asia: Place, Determinism and National Identities. In G. Stokes (Ed.), *The Politics of Identity in Australia* (pp. 145-157). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, B., & Sofos, S. A. (Eds.). (1996). *National Identity in Contemporary Europe*. London: Routledge.

Jupp, J. (1997). Immigration and National Identity: Multiculturalism. In G. Stokes (Ed.), *The Politics of National Identity in Australia* (pp. 132-144). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Alternate Routes

- Kane, J. (1997). Racialism and Democracy: The Legacy of White Australia. In G. Stokes (Ed.), *The Politics of Identity in Australia* (pp. 117-131). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- London, H. I. (1970). *Non-White Immigration and the White Australia Policy*. New York: New York University Press.
- MacDonagh, O., Eddy, J. A., & Schreuder, D. M. (1988). *The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa First Assert their Nationalities, 1880-1914*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Mackey, E. (1999). *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. New York: Routledge.
- Markus, A. (1994). *Australian Race Relations*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.
- Marx, A. (1998). *Making of Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McMillan, A. D., Yellowhorn, E., & McMillan, A. D. (2004). *First Peoples in Canada* (3rd updated and rev. ed.). Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.
- Mulvaney, D. J. (1989). *Encounters in Place: Outsiders and Aboriginal Australians, 1606-1985*. St. Lucia, Qld., Aust.: University of Queensland Press.
- Nieguth, T. (1997). *Ethnic, Civic, Conformistic? English Canadian Concepts of the Nation in Perspective*. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Magisterarbeit der Universität Augsburg, Augsburg.
- Senese, P. M. (2000). Weeds in the garden of Civic Nationalism. In M. D. Behiels & M. Martel (Eds.), *Nation, Ideas, Identities: Essays in Honour of Ramsay Cook* (pp. 113-129). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Simms, G. P. (1993). Racism as a Barrier to Canadian Citizenship. In W. Kaplan (Ed.), *Belonging: The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship* (pp. 332-348). Montreal: Queen's-McGill University Press.
- Stasiulis, D., & Jhappan, R. (1995). The Fractious Politics of a Settler Society. In N. Yuva-Davis & D. Stasiulis (Eds.), *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class* (pp. 95-131). London: Sage.

Stasiulis, D., & Williams, G. (April 1992). *Mapping Racial/Ethnic Hierarchy in the Canadian Social Formation, 1860-1914: An Examination of Selected Federal Policy Debates*. Paper presented at the Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities - Canadian Association of Political Science, Ottawa.

Strong-Boag, V., Grace, S., Eisenberg, A., & Anderson, J. (1998). Introduction. In V. Strong-Boag, S. Grace, A. Eisenberg & J. Anderson (Eds.), *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender and the Construction of Canada* (pp. 1-24). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Vickers, J. (2000). *The Politics of "Race": Canada, Australia and the United States*. Ottawa: The Golden Dog Press.

Walby, S. (1997). *Gender Transformations*. New York: Routledge.

Wayland, S. (1997). Immigration, Multiculturalism and National Identity in Canada. *International Journal on Group Rights*, 5, 33-58