Keeping the Peace: Social Justice Unionism in a Canadian Context

Cindy Rottmann

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education – University of Toronto
crottmann@oise.utoronto.ca

Abstract

In this paper I argue that the liberal white fantasy of civility[i], held deeply by many Canadians is precisely the condition that works against the possibility of anti-racist activism within the context of our organizations. I do this in the spirit of supporting meaningful anti-racist activism on the part of Canadian teachers' unions—a goal that I believe cannot be achieved until we face up to our complicity in educational racism. My argument is based on an analysis—through a combined conceptual lens focusing on race, nationalism and knowledge production—of four keynote addresses given at an event I attended in the spring of 2007 sponsored by a Canadian teachers' organization.

Introduction

A Call for Social Justice Teacher Unionism

In the early 1990s, two teacher union activists put forth a call for teachers' organizations to embrace social justice unionism (Peterson & Charney, 1999) by "defending public education and the rights of teachers," retaining a "strong emphasis on professionalism" and demonstrating a "commitment to children and learning" (p. 5). Using their call as a loose conceptual framework, I argued that Canadian teachers' unions, as representatives of teachers with access to the conditions they face in their classrooms and provincial contexts are uniquely positioned to do work that blends industrial, professional and social justice concerns of teachers (Rottmann, 2008). I came to the above conclusion by analyzing social justice initiatives articulated on the websites of 20 Canadian teachers' unions. My geographically broad analysis revealed many examples of social justice activism, but missed the kind of data that is omitted from promotional materials—the ways in which teachers' organizations reify the hegemonic norms they aim to disrupt.

In this article, which begins where the last one (see Rottmann, 2008) left off, I conduct an in-depth analysis of one element of one event promoted by an organization in my initial sample. I did not initially approach this event with critique in mind but experienced a discomfort during the conference and decided to explore it theoretically. A graduate course I took on *Race and Knowledge Production* helped me make sense of this feeling. As a relative outsider to this conference, filled with teacher activists of primarily British Canadian Christian heritage belonging to a particular member organization, I was able to see and feel the ways in which conference organizers and delegates reinforced exclusionary racist practices in a uniquely Canadian way, by building on the notion of national civility. As a person who demographically reflects the white, middle class, female majority of Canadian teachers, however, I was also keenly aware of my own involvement in the reification of educational racism. Looking back now, I am aware that my attempts to engage in anti-racist teaching have often reinforced the very norms that I have set out to challenge. As such, my analysis of racism embedded in the conference doubles as an analysis of my own racist pedagogy.

Conceptual Framework

Canadian Aspirations for Civility as Racist Practice

The five texts framing my analysis— Daniel Coleman's (2006) *White Civility: The Literary Project of English Canada,* Renee Bergland's *(2000) The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects,* Sherene Razack's (2004) *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism*, Ghassan Hage's (2000) *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, and Robyn Wiegman's (1999) *Whiteness Studies and the Paradox of Particularity*—have in common a concern with national claims to racial tolerance. The five authors situate their work in different national contexts and espouse different theoretical perspectives, but they all attempt to make explicit the limits of civility and the dangers of hegemonic whiteness in its current, liberal form.

Coleman (2006) analyzes Canadian fiction, poetry, drama, journalism, and social and political history published between 1820 and 1950 to examine how the normative concept of English Canadianness came to be established. His analysis of popular and political Canadian literature from the nineteenth and early twentieth century exposes four recurrent allegorical figures that persist in Canadian culture today——the "Loyalist brother," the "enterprising Scottish orphan," the "muscular Christian," and the "maturing colonial son." (p. 5-6) He argues that "these regularly repeated literary personifications for the Canadian nation mediated and gradually reified the privileged, normative status of British whiteness in English Canada" (Coleman, 2006, p. 6). Notably absent among these allegorical figures is any reference to First Nations peoples.

Bergland's (2000) concept of the "Indian ghost" provides us with an insight into this omission. Based on her analysis of literary representations of Native Americans, she argues that:

> The interior logic of the modern nation requires that citizens be haunted, and that American nationalism is sustained by writings that conjure forth spectral Native Americans…in the American imagination, Native American ghosts function both as representations of national guilt and triumphant agents of Americanization. (p. 4)

Despite our national tendency to distance ourselves from the United States (US), Bergland's analysis makes sense in the Canadian context, which like the US is a colonial settler society (Coleman, 2006; Razack, 2004). Our national construction of Canadian civility depends on forgetting our original sin against Native people and with it, their claim to *our* home and native land. British and to a less extent, French Canadians who successfully forget can conceal their immigrant status and naturalize their claim to the land in a way that no other group of immigrants who precede or follow them can do.

These two naturalized groups of Canadians can either welcome others to their land, as is the case with liberal multiculturalism, or aggress against them through more explicit versions of white supremacy. Wiegman's (1999) concept of "counter-whiteness" helps to problematize the former by making explicit liberal white subjects' unrelenting yet unsuccessful attempts to remain innocent of racial privilege by "actively… disaffiliating from white supremacist practices" (p. 119) Wiegman (1999) and Coleman (2006) analyze white supremacy and racism by making comparisons primarily across time—by not allowing Canadians or Americans forget the genealogy of whiteness. Hage (2000), in contrast, focuses primarily on space in his analysis of qualitative interviews and government reports on the tolerance of Australian citizens. His conceptual distinction between "passive belonging" (I belong to the nation) and "governmental belonging" (The nation belongs to me) reveals the distinctly territorial nature of violence inherent in hegemonic whiteness (p. 46). Hage (2000) encourages Australians not only to consider racism as a territorial phenomenon but also as a deeply emotional one. As such, he departs from the Marxian and critical theoretical focus on ideology and material inequity (See for example Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1979; Marx, 1906). According to Hage, citizens who believe the nation belongs to them—those with "governmental belonging"—recall an "idealised image of what this national spatial background ought to be like" (p. 38). Hage (2000) further states:

> We can see here how the *imaginary homely nation* does not only operate as the background against which the undesirable is classified, but it also operates as a general goal. The nation as 'back to what it was like' is

a *spatial-affective aspiration*. (p. 41-42) [*italics added*]

Like Hage's analysis of Australian multiculturalism, Razack's (2004) analysis of Canadian peacekeeping highlights the spatial-affective nature of national racism. Her book charts the ways Canadian national fantasies about superior civility normalize racist "peacekeeping" interventions in the global south and urges us as Canadians to recognize our complicity in each mission:

> When we hide our own implication and stand outside of history, preoccupied with our own pain, we stake out the colour line, producing ourselves as individuals and as a nation on the civilized side of things. In this we have not been alone, although the position of the 'trauma damaged idealist' has suited our middle-power aspirations to a T. (p. 27)

In contrast to many advocates of social justice, the five authors whose work I have reviewed deliberately use liberal hegemonic whiteness rather than extreme cases of white racism as a referent. By doing this, they make explicit the ways in which liberal white subjects advocating for social justice or multiculturalism are actually the current hegemonic iteration of white racism. Merging concepts introduced above, it might be said that Canadians with what Hage (2000) terms "governmental belonging" hold a "spatial-affective aspiration" for a return to the "imaginary homely nation" (p. 49). The current iteration of the "maturing colonial son" (Coleman, 2006, p. 6) personifies our Canadian national hero as a "trauma damaged idealist" (Razack, 2004, p. 27) who claims innocence by disaffiliating from the American institutions of slavery and segregation (Wiegman, 1999). By doing so, he reinforces a "counter-whiteness" (Wiegman, 1999, p. 119) that assures him of personhood and agency in a liberal, white, Canadian setting, an agency that is denied the "Indian ghosts" (Bergland, 2000, p. 1) whose land he has claimed.

Data Source

Peacekeeper, Educator, American Foil and Native Entertainer

In the spring of 2007, I attended a social justice conference sponsored and organized by a teachers' union in Canada. The aim of the three day conference open to the public but geared to teacher union activists from across the country was to "consider how to remake our schools and organizations in the image of social justice and as sites for social action" (p. 2[ii]). Delegates were presented with a schedule, a document containing a dozen background papers, and a summary of results from a national social justice teacher union survey. The conference alternated between whole group presentations such as keynote addresses, introductory and concluding remarks, and an international panel; small group breakout sessions involving simultaneous workshops between which delegates could select; and meals. This paper is not an evaluation of the conference as a whole but rather an analysis of one of the large group presentation elements, the keynote addresses. My intention is not to discredit the organizers, keynote speakers, or conference delegates, but rather to look beyond the "best practices" of teachers' unions in an effort to reveal how the nationalist practices deeply embedded in our organizations can act as a barrier to the anti-racist work teacher activists set out to do.

The first keynote speaker at the conference was a retired military officer who was billed as "a true hero and one of the greatest leaders of the 21st century, an authority on humanitarian leadership" (p. 2). In his address, he asked if we as Canadians wished to shape the future or merely survive it. After attributing dehumanization to military managerialism of the 1990s, he suggested that we exchange management for leadership and dehumanization for humanity. He reported evidence of the Canadian military's progress with respect to bilingualism and the treatment of women and proposed "new peacekeeping" to deal with a changing world. In response to an audience member's question about whether or not to pull out of Afghanistan, he argued that it would be irresponsible to leave since we, along with our international family—member nations of the UN—had a "responsibility to protect" the human rights of individuals in nations where people's human rights were being abused. Upon the completion of his address, a room filled with hundreds of previously silent teacher union delegates from around the country came to their feet in a rousing standing ovation.

Moving from male to female, peacekeeper to educator, the second keynote address was given by the founder of a not-for- profit school-based program. The program targets students deemed "at risk" and sets out to exchange middle and secondary school students' aggression and violence for empathy through the regular introduction of an

infant and parent from the community. She shared her belief that children have a natural tendency toward social justice and fairness and suggested that schools were ultimately responsible for building a democratic citizenry. After speaking about the importance of student voice she shared success stories and samples of student art. One of the stories involved a young man in an urban setting who had suffered abuse at the hands of his parents and wondered aloud after interacting with the community baby if he could become a good parent in spite of his upbringing. The program leaders' answer to him in the affirmative marked the end of her address and the beginning of an enthusiastic and tearful standing ovation.

The third address was given by a critical theorist who was the first to relate a story without good news, and perhaps as a result the first not to receive a standing ovation. The audience held their collective breath as he spoke at a macro-level about the current state of affairs—"an increasing gap between rich and poor, nationally sanctioned racism, treating youth as suspect, the senselessness of war, and an increasingly corporate and militarized higher education." The communal sigh of relief was palpable upon his admission that he was describing the context in the United States.

Finally, the fourth address, which doubled as a musical interlude, was given by an Aboriginal singer and activist who was introduced as an "accomplished musician and actor dedicated to helping the less fortunate" (p. 7). Of the four speakers, he was the only one whose birthplace was identified in his biography. Like other speakers, his awards, career, and humanitarian work were detailed. Unlike others, however, his biography included a rather intimate credential—"Born on the [name] reserve in [province] and raised in [city], [name] left school at the age of 15 and spent seven years living on the back streets of [city]. This experience built the foundation of his character— tenacity, leadership, determination to succeed and an altruistic capacity to care for others." (p. 7) The Aboriginal activist, in what I am assuming was a deliberately ironic performance, began by playing a country and western tune. His speech addressed the impact of systemic inequities on individuals. He used the metaphor of a backpack with stones, suggesting that each stressor in people's lives forces them to walk through the world with an increasingly heavy load. Other than poverty, he stopped short of identifying the stones. He underlined his belief in "the power of one" and argued that we must protect our children by "showering them with love." Upon completing his address he received an enthusiastic standing ovation.

Analysis

Mapping Keynote Addresses onto 19th Century Canadian Allegorical Figures

Coleman's (2006) analysis of popular and political Canadian literature from the nineteenth and early twentieth century exposes four allegorical figures that persist in Canadian culture today—the "Loyalist brother," the "enterprising Scottish orphan," the "muscular Christian," and the "maturing colonial son." (p. 5-6) His argument that the repetition of these literary personifications for the Canadian nation reifies the normative status of British whiteness in Canada provides evidence for my argument that the reappearance of these figures at a 2007 social justice teacher union conference reveals the organization's complicity in national racism.

"Maturing Colonial Son" (Coleman, 2006) as a "Trauma Damaged Idealist" (Razack, 2004)

The image of the "maturing colonial son…allegorizes Canada as a youth that has recently emerged from its colonial dependency and is now stepping forth independently onto the international stage." (Coleman, 2006, p. 6) This figure is quite closely approximated by the first keynote speaker, the retired military officer who,

> despite the lack of support and the limitations of his force…exerted untiring personal and professional efforts to protect and save as many people as possible…The [war] introduced a whole new level of horror to the international community. Never before had the United Nations faced a humanitarian tragedy of such magnitude (p. 2).

The preceding passage presents an innocent, homogenized 'international community' –and by extension the retired military officer, Canadians, and the UN—as victims of the war in question. It simultaneously speaks about the heroism, choice, leadership, courage and moral conviction of a particular, white, Canadian humanitarian leader. The military officer's biography, as assembled by conference organizers for the consumption of teacher union activists

across the country, depends on our acceptance and celebration of the liberal, colour-blind notion that free choice, individual courage, and agency are equally accessible to all human beings at the same time as it requires us to contradict our belief in universal agency by erasing the subjectivity and humanity of the non-white citizens we presume to protect.

By imagining ourselves—through the body of our national representative—as personally experiencing this horror, we, like him, become "trauma damaged idealists" —moral and compassionate people who feel the pain of those whose human rights we presume to defend (Razack, 2004, p. 27). By applauding his efforts, we actively took part in protecting our distinctiveness as a civilized nation—a distinctiveness that depends, by definition, on a series of uncivilized nations who need our help.

The "Muscular Christian" (Coleman, 2006) brings those with "Governmental Belonging" (Hage, 2000) Home

The second keynote speaker, who has been recognized nationally and internationally for successfully teaching young "at risk" Canadians nationally approved social skills, embodies Coleman's (2006) allegorical figure of the Muscular Christian:

> Muscular Christian ideals simultaneously advocated charitable welcome to 'foreigners' and other less fortunate people and, in the very act, represented these others as beneficiaries, rather than full members, of the civil collective.(Coleman, 2006, p. 6)

Her address involved a claim that "there is no better place than the classroom to build citizenship in a participatory democracy," a claim that suggests a charitable but exclusionary notion of citizenship. Rather than being conditional upon residence in a particular state, citizenship must be taught to children, particularly those deemed by their schools and teachers to be "at risk."

More than any other keynote address, this one brought conference attendees "home" in a deeply emotional way. Many participants shed tears in response to the educational entrepreneur's success. I did not shed tears but felt personally angry with her examples of "naturally empathic children"—white children who included children of colour in their playground games—and ambiguously raced children who were constructed as coming from homes where parents neglected them. It is clear that normative whiteness has set the standard for empathy, citizenship, and parenthood in this nationally celebrated program. When I raised the possibility at my table that many non-abusive parents fail to measure up to the second keynote speaker's standard, I expected to find some level of agreement or at least debate. Instead, 11 out of 12 delegates presented me with stiffened backs and one challenged me verbally. Her words, rapidly blushing cheeks, and curt manner communicated anger and anxiety at my daring to critique a speaker who could bring a room of Canadian justice-minded teachers to their feet in a teary and appreciative ovation. This experience taught me about the deeply affective and uneven nature of the contest for national space and the role of those with "governmental belonging" (Hage, 2000) in staking out that space in their nation and organizations.

"Loyalist Brother" (Coleman, 2006)

In contrast to the "maturing colonial son" and "muscular Christian" who are born and bred in Canada, Coleman's allegorical figure of the "Loyalist brother" represents an immigration choice made by American citizens. According to Coleman, the loyalist brother is "one of the most commonly cited narratives for explaining why Canada exists as a separate entity from the United States" (p. 5). The third keynote speaker at the conference brought this allegorical figure to the fore. While the content of his address was inconsistent with the imperialist ventures of the United Empire Loyalists, he personified this figure through his choice, as an American critical of American domestic policy, to omit Canada from his critique. His critique presented Canadians with an opportunity to claim innocence and civility in relation to our racist southern neighbours—a problematic claim given that racial innocence cannot coexist with one's identification as a white, European-Canadian subject living on First Nations' soil.

Unlike the first two keynote speakers, the third speaker did not applaud Canada for our social justice efforts, and perhaps as a result did not get an enthusiastic standing ovation. However, he also failed to critique liberal multiculturalism or raise our national involvement in global injustice—consequently allowing audience members who believe deeply in Canadian civility to comfortably retain their identities as social justice activists.

Indian Ghost (Bergland, 2000)

The presence of First Nations peoples in Canada makes it impossible for Canadian nationalists to completely forget our colonial project. As a result, we are haunted by evidence of our lack of innocence and civility—the very traits we lay national claim to. The best way to temper our national anxiety is to witness the performance of a happy, successful and non-threatening Native Canadian recognised by the Order of Canada. The final keynote address was given by a Native Canadian activist and actor who met these criteria. Unlike the other keynote speakers, he did not map onto any of Coleman's allegorical figures personifying the Canadian nation, but like them, he did help reinforce our claims to national civility.

First, his presence helped conference organizers meet minimal diversity requirements. Without at least one non-white keynote speaker, they could not lay claim to multicultural inclusion. Second, his experiences were reconstructed to coincide with liberal scripts of beating the odds—the individual accomplishments of a man who emerged from a history of homelessness to become successful on our terms, a member of the Order of Canada. Through this process, his homelessness was transformed from an ongoing genocidal project in which all Canadians are implicated to an unfortunate ahistorical circumstance faced by an individual who nevertheless "beat the odds."

His address was set apart from the others not only by time and race, but also by function. His presentation, unlike the others, doubled as entertainment. Interestingly, he was the only speaker whose presentation included an element of irony. He made a joke about "cowboys and Indians" early in his address then began the entertainment portion by singing a country western song. In contrast to the sombre audience response generated by the second speakers' story about a non-white student "at risk" searching for confirmation of his parenting potential from a white program leader, most delegates laughed at the fourth speakers' joke and clapped along with his song. We could not do this without being secure, on some level, in our collective presumption of national innocence.

Counter-Arguments

Many theorists would contradict my claim that social justice cannot coexist with civility. In this section, I highlight four conceptions of social justice—liberal, libertarian, critical, and educational—and reveal what I perceive to be the limitations of each approach.

The liberal view of justice builds on the Kantian philosophical assumption that human beings are free, equal, and rational individuals (Kant, 1959) who can generate fair governance guidelines if they have no information about their social status and make all decisions to benefit the least advantaged (Rawls, 1971). Current iterations of this approach in Canada include national policies on multiculturalism and inclusion such as the *Act for the Preservation and Enhancement of Multiculturalism in Canada* passed in 1985, based in part on the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism's 1971 report, and amended in 1991 by Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. The major limitation of this approach where anti-racism is concerned is that it does nothing to disrupt the colour line—the notion that white Anglo- or Franco- Canadians are distinguished from those whose culture is to be tolerated or accepted. It separates decision-makers with "governmental belonging" (Hage, 2000, p. 46) (primarily white, middle class politicians) from those who are presumed to benefit from the decisions (non-British/French immigrants and First Nations peoples).

Building on liberal theory are libertarian theorists who expose social justice, freedom, choice, and democracy to market forces (Friedman, 1962; Nozick, 1974). As a starting point, they critique capitalist economics and argue that an inequitable distribution of goods is socially just so long as it is brought about by free exchange between consenting adults. Departing from classical liberal thought (1971), libertarians do not expect all decisions to benefit the least advantaged. A current educational example is the charter school system in which parents are given the freedom to choose their children's public schools. The major critique of this perspective is that free exchange depends on equal access to the currency used in the exchange, whether that currency is legal tender or social capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Since neither type of currency is equally distributed, any attempt to bring social justice to market will only reify injustice. A libertarian approach to anti-racist activism would be to ensure people of all races access to free exchange.

Critical theorists (Freire, 1970; Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1979; Marx, 1906) depart from liberal and libertarian theorists in their construction of conflict as providing a productive tension and their acknowledgement that governing decision-makers represent the interests of privileged classes of individuals. For critical theorists, capitalist society is, by its very nature, unjust because different classes of individuals are inequitably positioned and rewarded in relation to an inequitable decision-making structure. Limitations of critical theory include adherents' faulty assumptions that humanity is made up of two homogenous classes of individuals; their reliance on a small group of white male theorists to conscientize the rest of us; and their dependence on a rational approach to deal with deeply psychic and emotional issues (Nussbaum, 1986). A critical approach to anti-racist activism would be to identify the high correlation between whiteness, wealth and socio-political status.

Finally, the approach to social justice most popular in educational and teacher union circles builds on the assumption that racism and other forms of oppression are products of ignorance (Froese-Germain & O'Haire, 2007; Shamsher & Decker, 2004). Like the model for teaching children, the professional development model assumes that oppressive actions on the part of well-meaning educators can be countered with additional experience and workshops. Adherents of this model would argue that exposing well-meaning teachers to personal or collective critique of their national civility would make them unnecessarily and unproductively defensive. While I agree that an increase in defensiveness on the part of teachers is unlikely to bring about social justice, I do not believe that this defensiveness is any more problematic than the reification of unconsciously racist teaching. An educational approach to anti-racist activism would be to organize a conference on social justice in the education system.

The unintentional mapping of keynote addresses at a 2007 social justice teacher union conference onto two hundred year-old Canadian allegorical figures (followed by brief emotional bursts of audience support) provides evidence of a strong, pervasive, and largely unconscious national identity. The unconscious nature of this identity means that any activist gesture based on liberal inclusion, libertarian freedom, critical rationality, or education has its limits.

Conclusions

In this article, I have argued that the fantasy of civility, held deeply by many Canadian teachers is not only inconsistent with social justice but is precisely the condition that works against the possibility of anti-racist activism within the context of our organizations. The central problem with using civility as a template for social justice is that it implicitly reinforces the colour line separating "civilized" Canadians and the "not yet civilized" nations or individuals we presume to help[iii]. Our involvement in this charitable work builds rather than dismantles the borders and hierarchies which feed national racism but our strong and irrational "spatial-affective aspiration" to know ourselves as civilized reduces the likelihood that we will begin to challenge the inherent good in our civilizing projects.

Meaningful activism, as I see it, follows from our recognition of deeply rooted individual and organizational complicity in educational racism and loosening the grip of Canadian civility as a template for social justice teacher unionism. I will not construct an alternative template for challenging racism, colonialism or social injustice in an educational or union context. Rather, I encourage educators to think about the ways in which civility, as a Canadian public good, has influenced their teaching and worked against the humanity of those they presume to include. For teachers and union activists who experience "governmental belonging" (Hage, 2000, p. 46)—those who feel proud to be Canadian—a concrete activist gesture might involve turning the analytic lens inward before presuming to act on behalf of others. Why are you proud to be Canadian? After articulating a list of reasons, consider how each item on the list comes through in your teaching and everyday acts. For those with "passive belonging" (Hage, 2000, p. 46)—those who have felt excluded by English or French Canadian nationalism at one point in their lives— meaningful activism might involve reflecting on the barriers to full belonging. What would have to change for you to feel that you are not only welcome in Canada but that Canada belongs to you? These two cognitive-affective exercises will not revolutionize our country but they are more likely to support anti-colonial activism than is any large scale policy solution generated by those who believe they stand outside of the problem.

References

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487-510). New York: Oxford Press.

Coleman, D. (2006). *White Civility: The literary project of English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Froese-Germain, B., & O'Haire, N. (2007). Perspectives on education for social justice, social justice in education. *Professional Development Perspectives, 6*(4), 2-3.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (G. N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston, MA: Boston Beacon Press.

Hage, G. (2000). *White Nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. New York: Routledge.

Kant, I. (1959). *Foundations of the metaphysics of morals* (L. Beck, Trans.). New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Marx, K. (1906). *Capital: A critique of political economy*. New York: The Modern Library.

Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state and utopia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1986). *The fragility of goodness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, B., & Charney, M. (1999). *Transforming teacher unions: Fighting for better schools and social justice*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Razack, S. H. (2004). *Dark threats and white knights: The Somalia affair, peacekeeping, and the new imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Rottmann, C. (2008). Organized agents: Teacher unions as alternative educational sites for social justice activism. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(4).

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Shamsher, M., & Decker, E. (Eds.). (2004). *Teaching for social justice: Vancouver, Coquitlam, Maple Ridge teacher research*. Vancouver, BC: British Columbia Teachers' Federation.

Wiegman, R. (1999). Whiteness studies and the paradox of particularity. *Boundary, 26*(2), 115-150.

Notes

[i] "Civility" according to the Canadian Oxford Dictionary is "an act of politeness." "Civil" according to the same source is ""of or belonging to ordinary citizens and their concerns; polite, obliging, not rude; relating to the law; of or relating to the state; fixed by custom or law, not natural; calm." Informed by these definitions, civility in a Canadian context to be an unnatural politeness expected of citizens of the state fixed by custom and law. With respect to racism, Canadians are expected by law to tolerate multicultural difference. It is important to note that the very notion of difference suggests a referent, a person the Canadian Oxford Dictionary characterizes as an "ordinary" citizen. The "ordinary" Canadian citizen—one Coleman (2006) demonstrates is a white, British historical immigrant to this land—must tolerate those whose norms and cultures are different from his/hers. Civil Canadians are expected to tolerate and feel proud of their tolerance of those who embody this difference. What they are not expected to do, however, is alter the norm on which these legal but not natural values and behaviours are based. The argument in this paper is that the presumed neutrality of "civility" and its association with goodness and superiority act as pervasive barriers to anti-racist and anti-colonial activism.

[ii] All page numbers in this section refer to a document distributed at the conference. I am not naming the document in order to retain anonymity of presenters.

[iii] The division between civilized/developed/Occident and uncivilized/developing/Orient has been most clearly articulated by Edward Said in his book *Orientalism* (Said, 1978) but few teacher activists make use of his work.