

Fall 9-30-2014

The Colour of Poverty: Understanding Racialized Poverty In Canada Through Colonialism

Seema Allahdini
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholars.wlu.ca/brantford_sjce

 Part of the [Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Allahdini, Seema, "The Colour of Poverty: Understanding Racialized Poverty In Canada Through Colonialism" (2014). *Social Justice and Community Engagement*. 1.
http://scholars.wlu.ca/brantford_sjce/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Laurier Brantford at Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Social Justice and Community Engagement by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

**THE COLOUR OF POVERTY:
UNDERSTANDING RACIALIZED POVERTY IN CANADA THROUGH COLONIALISM**

Seema Allahdini

Submitted to the Social Justice and Community Engagement Program

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Arts in Social Justice and Community Engagement

Wilfrid Laurier University

September 30 2014

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Lea Caragata

Grace-Edward Galabuzi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Race and Racism	9
White, Settler Colonization	13
Oppression, Exclusion and Inequality	19
III. METHODOLOGY	24
Research Question/Problem Statement	24
Theoretical Approach	25
Research Design	27
Data Sources and Data Collection	28
Research Validity	29
Data Analysis	29
Ethical Considerations	30
IV. COLONIZATION	30
Colonization and Theology	30
Biological Theories of Race	38
Modernity and the Enlightenment	40
Colonialism and Globalisms	51
V. POST-COLONIZATION	58
The Nation-State and Decolonization	59
New Philosophies of Race	70
Neoliberalism	80
Racialized Poverty	88
VI. CONCLUSION	99
VII. REFERENCES	103

I. INTRODUCTION

The income gap, also referred to as income inequality, between Canada's rich and the rest of us has been rapidly rising over recent decades (Action Task Force, 2012:8; Macdonald & Wilson, 2010:6). An illustration of this income gap is that between 1976 and 2009, the wealthiest twenty percent of Canadians saw an average of 27.5% increase in their real market income¹, while the rest saw an average 7.9% decrease in their real market income (Action Task Force, 2012:8). Or put another way, the rich were able to get richer while the rest generally got poorer. Another example of this disparity is in Ontario, where despite growth in the Canadian economy before 2008, just under half of Ontario families have seen stagnant or diminished real incomes since 2000 (Ontario Common Front, 2012:13). That one group of society is able to prosper at a given moment is indication that the economy is functioning well by producing wealth, however, that *only* one group is benefiting from this economy is an indication of a deeper issue- unequal distribution (Wallis, Sunseri, Galabuzi, 2009:6). A large factor that has been contributing to, and even amplifying this disparity, are government policies that have reduced taxes for the wealthy, effectively allowing them to get richer, whilst simultaneously cutting public social spending on services and programs, such as education, health care, affordable housing and child benefits, that function to create equity (Ontario Common Front, 2012:9,13). The consequences of such measures is the polarization of wealth in society creating two extremes, while at one end the wealth of the rich has been stabilized and their privilege has been secured, at the other end, people are more exposed to poverty² and living in deteriorating conditions without adequate social safety nets. The latter is the focus of this research, where economic inequality will be understood as a sign of, if not synonymous with poverty.

¹ Market income is the sum of earnings (from employment and self-employment), net investment income, private retirement income, and the items under other income. It is also called income before taxes and transfers (Action Task Force, 2012:15).

² Poverty is measured by the state through a scheme called the Low Income Cut Offs (LICO). It determines an income threshold beyond which an individual's family is considered to be living in poverty (Galabuzi, 2001:76). The LICO considers family size and how much of a family's income is spent on basic needs like food and shelter (Colour of Poverty, 2009:196).

More than this, the issue of economic inequality is compounded when race enters the equation, because communities of colour face higher rates of poverty (Nation Council of Welfare [NCW], 2012:1). In 2005, whereas 6.4% of white families lived in poverty, 19.8% of non-white families lived in poverty, illustrating a difference of three times the rate of poverty, distributed on racial terms (Block & Galabuzi, 2011:5). A report by the United Way and the Canadian Council on Social Development (2004) also highlighted the fact that, between 1980 and 2000, the poverty rate dropped by 28% for white families but jumped by 361% for non-white families (49). That people of colour (racialized people)³ are over-represented in poverty rates is evidence that poverty is becoming racialized, or to name the process, the racialization of poverty. In my research, racialized poverty will be understood as the poverty of people of colour. What is particularly important to recognize about this form of poverty is that, in comparison to their percentage of the general population, people of colour have higher poverty rates than white people, and so more people of colour are exposed to poverty than whites. That people of colour are over-represented in poverty rates means that poverty is becoming racialized. Further, this trend is particularly problematic for two reasons: the first is that often times, poverty is normalized and understood as the result of individual failures rather than of structural and systemic practices, and so the increase in poverty rates or the over-representation of people of colour is seen as acceptable/ natural; and secondly, that poverty is increasingly being racially distributed indicates that deep rooted racist ideologies and structures are encouraging the racialization of poverty.

Racialized groups are disproportionality suffering because they are the ones most exposed to today's labour market requirement of flexibility which has given rise to, contract, temporary, part-time and shift work (Ontario Common Front, 2012:28; Galabuzi, 2001:4). These conditions effectively establish less job security, sub-standard working conditions, intensive labour, excessive hours, and low

³ Whereas the term 'people of colour' is a neutral way to refer to non-white people, using the term 'racialized' indicates the process of categorizing people of colour as inferior because of perceived physical, and socio-cultural differences.

wages with no provision of benefits (Ontario Common Front, 2012:28; Galabuzi, 2001:4). By these trends, one can already see that they are unfavorable conditions for prosperity and meaningful participation in the economy and society.

With the appreciation that the racialization of poverty is in process in Canada, the question becomes, how has this come to be? Why are people of color excluded from a decent standard of living without equitable access to money, rights, and opportunities? Furthermore, why is the organization of society based on race? I believe that it is not only an economic system functioning to create this disparity and inequality, but a social and political system as well. The racialization of poverty itself implies the development of structural elements that destine racialized Canadians to disproportionately high rates of poverty. But, importantly, these developments that lead to marginalization should be seen as a combination of changes in the economy (neoliberal capitalism), and historical forms (settler colonialism) of racial discrimination in the labour market (Galabuzi, 2009:231).

In this light, the focus of my research will be on de-constructing the dominant ideologies and structures that make the racialization of poverty possible and acceptable. This critical, theoretical analysis will attempt to map the historical forms of political and economic racial discrimination in Canada and will use European colonization as the starting point because that was the first moment in the history of Canada that we see large-scale, widespread racial oppression and exploitation. Though colonization was against Aboriginal peoples, my research will consider all racialized groups, Aboriginals and Canadian-born/ immigrants, collectively in comparison to whites rather than one specific racialized group.⁴ Although there is certainly variation in poverty rates between the different sub-groups of racialized people (NCW, 2012:1),⁵ overall, all sub-groups are over-represented in poverty

⁴ It ought to be recognized, that from the perspective of Aboriginals, both whites and racialized immigrants alike are settlers. While I appreciate this classification, for the purpose of this paper, I will analyze Aboriginals and racialized people together, in comparison to whites because overall, both racialized groups are at a disadvantage compared to whites.

⁵ For example, the poverty rate for Aboriginals living off-reserve was 15.2% in 2010 versus 9% for all of Canada (CPJ, 2012:14). Or in 2006, the poverty rate was 40% for Korean's, yet 11% for Filipinos, versus 11% for all of Canada (NWC, 2012:1).

rates when compared to non-racialized people (Ontario Common Front, 2012:20; NCW, 2012:1; Galabuzi, 2011:14; Citizens for Public Justice [CPJ], 2012:4); that is, despite these variations by racial group, overall, people of colour are worse off than their white counter-parts.

In addition, two-thirds of racialized people in Canada are immigrants (NCW, 2012:3), that come from ex-colonized countries (Bannerji, 2000:44), meaning that they have experience with, and historical relationships to colonization and its oppressive and exclusionary ideologies and structures. While I recognize that each racial group has its own history, formation, and demands, the commonality between them is the (white) colonial principles of domination, exploitation and control based on race, which provides a platform from which to analyze racialized poverty in Canada. Within this context, it also becomes necessary to consider the historical social construction and function of race as a concept. Being conscious of the fact that the political, social and economic spheres interact with and are influenced by each other, the primary focus of this research is on the meaning of race at given points in time and how this shapes social relations and especially economic relations.

Because racial discrimination and racialization are complex, multidimensional processes, a comprehensive and exhaustive analysis is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, the purpose here is to begin to de-construct and trace their formations and meanings. This research will be a selective and layered analysis using key moments in history that mark important political, social and economic shifts, and will examine how these impact/are shaped by changing epistemologies about race. Topics that will be included are: the general meaning and function of race from the colonial period through to today in 'post-racial' times (theology, biology, and culture); the political and economic organization of settler colonization; guiding epistemologies from theology (Middle Ages) to secularization (Modernity) and the distribution of power; social/political structures and concepts such as decolonization/nation-state, multiculturalism and colorblindness; and the interaction between modernity, the economy (capitalism), and immigration. The central concern is to draw connections between power and knowledge and examine the ways in which knowledge authorizes and legitimizes power. Overall, the goal of this

analysis is to uncover the ways in which settler colonization used race as an organizing principle in society, largely to oppress, exploit and exclude people of colour, and how this continues to impel our structures/systems today, despite legal and social changes towards equality. That is, 'race' continues to determine participation and outcomes in society, whereby people of colour are still being exploited and excluded. My research will show how the shift from theology to secularization was marked by the rise of European power and subsequently the dominance of European epistemologies. It is by this analysis that a pattern of white (racial) privilege in Canada will become apparent. Throughout my research, the underlying social justice concerns are, oppressive institutions, economic inequality and marginalization, and social exclusion.

Galabuzi (2009) uses the term economic social exclusion to refer to labour market segregation, uneven access to employment, discrimination in employment, and over exposure to unemployment and underemployment (Galabuzi, 2009:235). But the consequences of this exclusion go beyond just the economy. Firstly, meaningful participation in the labour market is needed for basic a livelihood (Galabuzi, 2009:235). Consider the fact that poverty is positively associated with low education attainment, health and nutrition among other deprivations (Galabuzi, 2001:124; United Way & CCSD, 2004:7). Secondly, meaningful participation in the labour market is needed for identity building in creating a sense of belonging and dignity (Galabuzi, 2009:235). This is because poverty gives rise to social exclusion which then has implications for, citizenship, political legitimacy, common ideals, interaction with the criminal justice system, and access to affordable housing (Galabuzi, 2001:124; Curtis et al, 2004: 432). And so, it becomes clear that economic inequalities have social consequences that go beyond the increased chance of low income and low consumption (Galabuzi, 2001:124). It affects the ability to meaningfully realize the right to self-determination, that is the freedom and access to truly and wholly conduct one's life and be able to belong in, participate in, and gain from society. This holistic framing of poverty highlights its dynamic effects and emphasizes how economic life is invariably interconnected and intersected with the social and political spheres. Recognizing this positive

relationship between the economic and the social/political means recognizing that economic power translates to, and or enables social and political power. It is useful to talk in terms of power here because it emphasizes the social and political privileges and advantages that come with being economically stable. Because poverty is distributed on racial terms, and because it gives rise to social exclusions, it is useful to frame poverty as both a cause and result of social exclusion (Galabuzi, 2009:227).

By framing poverty as a matter of social exclusion, an attempt is made to break away from individualistic thinking, that sees/understands poverty as the result of individual failures, and to re-focus the attention on society and the social relations contained within it, that is, structural inequalities (Galabuzi, 2009:229). Structural inequality is important and relevant to analyses of racialized poverty precisely because Canada guarantees legal equality and protection from discrimination, yet still we see a pattern of economic disparity based on racial terms. If the focus was on the individual we could ignore that it was racialized alongside the history of racial discrimination in Canada, and simply blame the poor for their own circumstance. However, analyzing structures helps uncover norms and systems that, directly or indirectly, grant privilege to some and exclude others, *despite* being a free and equal society.

Organizationally, this research will be divided into two chapters. The first chapter will concentrate on colonization, where I will begin by mapping the arrival and establishment of colonial rule in Canada, and how the guiding framework for understanding life/humanity (racially different people) was theology. I will focus on the ways in which the power European's had to determine racial understandings effected the social and economic configurations of the colonial society, to the exclusion of racialized people. This will proceed to an analysis of the rise of biological theories that coincided with, and then superseded theological understandings of racially different people. Special attention will be paid to the ways in which white-dominance was maintained, socially/politically and economically, despite the move away from theological understandings. Biological theories will then be located within a larger, global shift in understanding away from subjective theology of the Middle Ages, towards science, reason and objective truth under European Modernity. The significance of *European*

epistemologies will be emphasized in illustrating how (white) European becomes the norm, against which all others are measured. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of the global effects and consequences of European colonialism, with regards to oppression, capitalist systems, and racialization. The second chapter will concentrate on post-colonization, that is, the time marked by formation of the Dominion of Canada.⁶ This chapter will begin with the concept of decolonization and its relationship to establishment of the nation-state, with regards the continued power of colonial elites and the exclusion of racialized people. The theme of exclusion will be carried on through the analysis of multiculturalism and colorblind philosophies to show the transformation in racial understandings and the consistency of racial exclusion and (white) European normativity. Having set the context of a white-dominant post-colonial society, the ways in which this transfers into our current economy, governed by neoliberalism will be examined. Chapter 2 will end with the close examination of racialized poverty, and racial exclusion from the economy/economic gains, by drawing connections between modernity's values and the current status of racialized people in the Canadian economy.

Rather than attempting to provide some clear, solid answers to some very complex, challenging and deep rooted questions about race and poverty in Canada, the hope of my paper is to re-frame their common understandings, and spark new questions for debate and inquiry. It is ever more important to re-assess our current circumstances, social orders, structures, and norms because they 'pre-determine' privilege and power.

⁶ The federal Dominion of Canada formed in 1867 when three different colonial provinces under British North America came together to form one, unified political body. It was after this time that Canada began building its identity as a nation/community as newly founded 'Canadians' (Mackey, 2009:22).

II.LITERATURE REVIEW

To situate my work within the broader scholarship, I have divided this literature review into three themes that provide a foundation upon which to build my research: race and racism; white, settler colonization; and oppression, exclusion and inequality.

Race and Racism

It is beneficial to begin with some leading understandings of ‘race’ and ‘racialization’, as these will be built upon to de-construct the racialization of poverty in Canada. Analyses of race, racialization and racism are not new; in recent history, many scholars have focused on defining, mapping and assessing the effects of race and racialization in society.

Usually when people refer to race, they are categorizing people based on a variety of characteristics such as, skin colour, hair colour and texture, facial features and the like (Henry, Tator, Mattis & Rees, 2000:5). But what needs to be acknowledged is that there is no fixed definition of race (Satzewich, 1998:26; Omi & Winant, 1986:60-2); for example, there is no true and definite ‘brownness’ or ‘whiteness’. Therefore, it is more suitable to understand race as a social construction. This means that social forces and relationships located in particular historical contexts, determine what race is. As such, the definition of race and its significance is always being negotiated and re-formed (Satzewich, 1998:26; Omi & Winant, 1986:60-2). For this reason, the theory of ‘racial formation’ can be used to describe the reciprocal process by which, social, economic and political forces establish the meaning and importance of racial categories, and how they too are in turn shaped by racial meanings (Omi & Winant, 1986:60-2).⁷ This emphasizes that there is no primary meaning of race because race gets shaped *and* shapes

⁷ It should be noted that there are other theories of race that explain it as something that emerges from ethnicity, class, or the establishment of the nation-state: ethnicity theories understand race as related to ethnicity and focus on ethnic tensions and incorporation; class based theories explain race as a function/result of economic inequality, and nation-based theories explain race as a product of colonialism alone (Omi & Winant, 1986:52). However, I find a social constructionist perspective appropriate in capturing the unique, autonomous and complex nature of the concept of race in social conflict, political organization and ideological meaning (Omi & Winant, 1986:52).

through complex processes. This theory of race will inform this research by examining how physically/racially different people were conceptualized and treated by (white) Europeans, in the context of colonialism until today. The crucial aspect to note here is that racial formation theory proposes that race is a central organizing principle of society (Winant, 1994:270) and cannot be reduced to or caused by some other, more significant social relationship (Omi & Winant, 1986:60-2; Winant, 1994:270), for example class or gender. To name race as an organizing principle of society means that race is an independent factor from which others factors can derive their value or classification from. Race then, is not the product of some other social relationship but takes on its own form, and is also responsible for shaping relations and outcomes, much like other factors such as class, gender and the like.

The process of applying race to people and formulating ideas about who they are is called racialization. It is an inherently dialectical process of self and other, where the racialized self is assessed positively and the racialized ‘other’ assessed negatively based on cultural/biological features (Hier, 2007:30). The process of “othering” can be understood as the method of defining oneself in comparison to the other by reference to distinct characteristics such as race, class, religion, gender and the like.⁸ In the socio-political context, the ‘other’ is essentialized and is constructed as a threat or dangerous (Stokes & Melendez, 2001:xxx). Essentialized here means narrowing the diversity of identities that exists amongst people, into fixed categories of people with perceived definite and shared characteristics/ traits.

Racialization is made possible by the social constructionist interpretation of race (Kobayashi & Johnson, 2007:4), and can be defined as a process in which constructs of race establish unequal differences between people that are taken to be real, and that then impacts political, economic and social life (Tanovich, 2009:157; Kobayashi & Johnson, 2007:4; Satzewich, 1998:26). The process begins with

⁸ Though psychoanalytic theories often accept that “othering” is a universal method of defining oneself, it has different connotations and implications when used in the socio-political context (Stokes & Melendez, 2001:xxx).

interpreting human characteristics, as signs of important racial difference, and then creating racial groups based on the perception that these characteristics are shared. Personality, behavioral and social traits are negatively attributed to each group by race, and thus race becomes a symbol of meaningful social differences between people (Tanovich, 2009:157; Wysong, Perrucci & Wright, 2014:278). However, this is where a paradox becomes apparent. Despite race being a social construction that most people are willing to accept has no cognitive or empirical influence, people's actions reflect a belief that race is real; though race is not real, it continues to have real consequences (Wallis & Fleras, 2009:x; Allahar, 1998:351). Given that racialization was successfully converted into objective structures that dictated access to resources, opportunity and power in Canada (Wallis, Sunseri & Galabuzi, 2009:8), it can be argued that race has been principal to the establishment of Canadian society and economy (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:94; Galabuzi, 2001:38; Shadd, 1991:1; Wallis et al., 2009:8).

One effect of racialization is racism. A well-rounded, sociological definition of racism is: those ideas that draw group boundaries by using the concept of race or real or biological characteristics, and evaluate these racialized groups as having negative characteristics (Satzewich, 1998:38). Assumptions underlying this definition are that, there needs to be a process of racialization for racism to occur and that there has to be some negative assessment involved (Satzewich, 1998:38; Hier, 2007:30). Racism as ideology and discourse involves of a wide range of coded narratives, rhetorical arguments,⁹ words, ideas, images and practices, which together allow individuals, groups and institutions to construct some sense of community; however, this inherently requires defining who counts as 'us' and who the 'others' are (Henry & Tator, 2007:118). In this way, racism denotes exclusion (Goldberg, 2009:5).

Overall, and most significant to my research is the relationship between racism and power. Defined by the dominant/white group, racialized ideology (from which racism comes) as a shared

⁹ Examples of coded narratives and rhetorical arguments can be found in beliefs such as, 'the issue is not race, visible minorities have cultural problems,' or, 'racial diversity in society causes racial conflict,' and even, 'everyone experiences discrimination at some point' (Satzewich, 1998:36).

system of beliefs and values, actually supports the organization, preservation, and control of specific (white) forms of power and domination; thus this ideology provides the framework for excluding and marginalizing people of colour in Canada (Henry & Tator, 2007:117). If racialized ideology maintains certain forms of power, then it follows that, racialization should be understood as a historical process that has shaped social life and is embedded in dominant ideology (Kobayashi & Johnson, 2007:5), and as such, current race issues are a reflection of, and resistance to historically rooted race and colonial relations (Wallis et al., 2009:13). Since the domination of colonial powers and their implementation of particular bodies of knowledge, racialized ideology has functioned to maintain white power and privilege, and make acceptable the exclusion and plight of racialized people in Canada. Specifically, racialized poverty needs to be understood as an effect of colonial historical processes that gave meaning to 'race' in Canadian society. From then, race and racialization has become embedded in dominant ideology, creating particular norms and standards that have functioned to privilege some and marginalize others. Specifically, although race is not a fixed concept, it tends to function in patterned ways that privilege Whites as superior to people of colour (Satzewich, 2007:56). I will be uncovering how this occurs throughout the shifts in ways of knowing and understanding. In addition, the nuances within Canadian ideology and policy will be analyzed to show how racialized people are still locked into a dichotomous "us" and "them" relationship, such as through multiculturalist and colorblind ideology, where whites are upheld as the norm.

According to Wallis and Fleras (2009), and Galabuzi (2001), a critical reading of the Canadian context reveals that race mattered in the past, race matters today, and race will matter in the future (v, x; 102). Against claims that Canada is race-neutral, Canadian society is constructed and ordered to benefit particular interests at the expense of others, with the end result of race central to determining people's identities, experiences and outcomes (Wallis & Fleras, 2009:v, x). That it has become meaningful to consider people on racial grounds suggests that society has ascribed normative values and expectations to identifiable features therefore establishing a racial social order. Over time, and through social actions

that give meaning to race, this normative order becomes part of the way of life and the culture, which people internalize and maintain through socialization (Li, 1998:116).

This research is a critique of the Canadian white normative order that directly and indirectly encourages racialization/racism and the privileging of whites, through government policy and socio-cultural values. The way this will be framed is by analyzing the structure of a white, settler society that historically sought to establish and maintain a white (colonial) society. Specifically, I will be mapping how race was understood in the context of settler colonialism, and how it functioned as a central organizing principle of society. This is not to say that the concept of race was a product of colonialism, because reality is much more complex than this. Rather, that during settler colonialism, in addition to many other internal and external influences at the time, race became important for society with regards to relations, outcomes, knowledge, and belonging, and set the standard of white being the norm against which people of colour are judged.

White, Settler Colonization

Alongside the racialization of people of colour, the racialization of the white has become increasingly important to analyses (anti-racism). This body of works has come to acknowledge that whiteness is constitutive of an array of normative practices by which whiteness has been more valued and privileged than other racialized groups; it holds the white body as the normative standard. Through normalization, whiteness has become naturalized and perceived as an incontestable reality, or positive 'truth', rather than a product of social construction in which the white imagination has affirmed itself (Kobayashi & Johnson, 2007:10). This critique of whiteness will provide the basis on which to examine privilege and racial exclusion in Canada. In mapping racial formations since colonization, it is hoped that a pattern of (naturalized) white normativity will become apparent, as exemplified by dominant epistemologies, immigration policy and patterns, and multicultural and colorblind philosophies.

One way of naming this naturalization and privilege is by the term ‘white supremacy’. *hooks* (2013) argues that the racially unequal society we live in is a white supremacist society, rather than a racist society. Whereas racism generally refers to explicit racial offenses and acts of discrimination, white supremacy identifies the ideological and philosophical grounds for racism (177). Put another way, it is the ideology of white supremacy that gives rise to race and overt acts of racist discrimination; it gives value to white skin and grants privilege to whites (Hooks, 2013:3-6, 177; Wallis et al., 2009:1). Believing that whites are superior necessitates viewing all racialized as inferior, or sub-standard, because they are not white thereby pre-destining whites to dominance and worthiness versus people of colour. White supremacist ideology comes to be through a complex set of processes, directly and indirectly, through science, literature, scripture, law, culture and political rhetoric. The consequences of which are a presumed naturality about, white entitlement and privilege, the marginalization of the racialized and, European belonging and non-European servitude (Goldberg, 2009:3). Such ideology produces a racial hierarchy at the expense of the racialized evidenced, both historically and at present, through the racialized disparities in education, health, unemployment, housing, arrest rates, and poverty rates (Jennings, 2001:338). It is important to recognize that racialized disparities are not one-dimensional and limited to a particular aspect of life; racialized poverty is only one among many instances where people of colour are, and have been disadvantaged and marginalized in society.

While some resist acknowledging Canada as a white supremacist society because of its extremely harsh connotations and its conflict with guaranteed protection of human rights, one need only look at Canadian norms and standards to recognize that Europeanness/ whiteness is the norm against which all others are judged (Hooks, 2013:3-5)¹⁰. A dictionary definition of supremacy is, highest in authority, status or power (Hawker & Hawkins, 1999:323); highest is the key word here because it simply means having more. In Canada, I believe this superiority can be identified in two ways, one is to

¹⁰ See Chapter 2 for language of ‘colorblind’ and ‘multiculturalism’.

look at who has the most power, and the other is to look at who has the least power- economically, politically and socially.¹¹ First, at the highest level of authority and power in Canada, the government, we see that decision makers are, and have always been majority white (Monture, 2007:199). This gives us an idea about who is controlling society and defining the terms of social, political and economic organization and relations, including the distribution of power itself. Combined with the fact that deleterious social conditions such as poverty and imprisonment are racially distributed against people of colour, we begin to see a racial disparity in power in Canada. Thus, supremacy here means overall patterns of power/privilege and exclusion.

The question then becomes, who is the white in white supremacy? And how and why did white become the normative standard? What were the circumstances that encouraged and made possible the privileging of whiteness? A logical starting point is the analysis of European colonization, but specifically settler colonization, because this sets the context of racialization in Canada. Though I do not agree that European colonizers came to Canada with the purpose of establishing a white supremacist society, I think that inherent to European settler colonization, is the building of a white settler society. A white settler society can be defined as, the building of an overseas duplication of European society with the same culture, values and institutions that reproduces those of the original/'home' country (Galabuzi, 2001:39). Thus, supremacy emerges from settlement because it entails building a homogenous, home-like (i.e. white, European) society with the same values. However historically, the process of establishing a settler society is less peaceful than one might imagine. Settler societies in North America are built on, and sustained through policies of extermination, displacement or assimilation (Lawrence & Dua, 2009:220; Mills, 1997:28), and in all three cases, power, domination and exploitation are used in favor of (white) European settlers. Before exploring the theories and characteristics of settler

¹¹ By using the term white supremacy, I am not implying that all people of colour are eternally doomed, or that there exists a conspiracy of extremists at all levels of society that function to purposefully discriminate against all people of colour. Nor am I implying that all white people are at an advantage compared to all people of colour.

colonization in more depth, it is beneficial to begin with an understanding of the broader umbrella of colonialism and its significance for social and economic life.

Colonialism was centrally shaped by, and formative in, racial ideology and meaning. It was colonial powers and their interpretation of race that directly shaped the structure, and configuration of colonial order (Goldberg, 2009:11). However, the present is undoubtedly shaped by the past, and where Aboriginal peoples, and where I believe *all* racialized people stand in relation to society cannot be understood without an advanced and comprehensive historical understanding of colonialism and its current forms of those old relationships (Monture, 2007:207). That is, uncovering the structures and patterns of white privilege and racial exclusion that have been perpetuated since colonization.

In theorizing colonialism, Osterhammel (1997) brings attention to the fact that the colonial project was multidimensional and often did not follow strict imperial strategies. For a better understanding, he argues that one needs to consider the fact that colonial endeavors also took shape from, conditions of overseas localities, the intents and opportunities of colonial powers, and by the larger international system (4). In order to appreciate the multidimensional aspects of colonialism, my research will consider: the political organization of colonization and nation-state; social structures from a white settler society to the Canadian nation; economic structures of capitalism from colonial resource extraction to neoliberalism; and the evolution of epistemologies from theology to secularization. Combined, these elements will help de-construct the processes through which race became an organizing principle in society, and how this has negatively impacted people of colour.

Overall, colonization was a project primarily concerned with the relationships between the people and money (population & capital). Whereas home countries had lots of wealth/money and labour but not enough land to fulfill their needs, colonized countries (colonies)¹² had lots of land but a shortage

¹² The term colony has two defining characteristics. First, a colony is a political body that is governed by an external entity, and secondly, a colony is also an external entity that replicates and recreates itself in a given context (Veracini, 2010:3). Essentially, a colony is a social construction- contextual, malleable, with many factors shaping it. It is not just a linear, fixed project, where an outside power enforces a project on an inside power.

of labour and wealth/money (Foley, 2011:15). Colonization was thereby able to relieve the home country of its excess, while providing a space for their prosperous growth; colonizers were able to exploit foreign locality resources to their benefit, and simultaneously create a market for their goods (Foley, 2011:16). This is crucial to understand because it frames the intent(ions) of colonization and the purposes of the colonial project – money, wealth. It was solely European economic concerns and goals that initiated and defined the colonial projects; colonization was not a consideration of wealth and prosperity for all people, but was strictly limited to (white) European colonizers and not the colonized.

As mentioned previously, Canada was a particular form of colonization, settler colonization, which is distinct from others and functions under a different framework. Primarily, settlers see the lands as the foundation for exploitation for the purposes of resource extraction, industry, and commerce, supported by law (Bateman & Pilkington, 2011:2). Implied here by the word exploitation, is that one group economically benefits at the expense of another, by using and manipulating them for their own gains. As such, settler colonialism was conceived of almost entirely in economic terms (Foley, 2011:26; Norrie, Owsam & Emery, 2007:9), which establishes the unequal context for race relations and economic inequality that existed at that time.

Settlement colonization is the establishment of self-maintaining societies that are not significantly dependent on supplies from the home country or on trades with indigenous groups. Settler colonizers perception of their, to be land was that it did not have any legitimate political authority- there were no ‘rulers’ (Osterhammel, 1997:6; Bateman & Pilkington, 2011:1). This idea can be identified by the legal term Terra Nullia/Nullius, meaning the land to be settled belongs to no-one and is empty (Wallis et al., 2009:1), thereby legitimizing occupation and settlement.¹³ In this way, settlers understood themselves to be the institutors of political orders, by exclusion and suppression, and assumed their sovereignty through the very conceptualization of ‘settlement’. That is, because settlement requires

¹³ A detailed discussion of the significance of this idea with regards to ‘discovery’ will follow in Chapter 1.

colonizers to establish their own society, colonizers pre-determine their political sovereignty and legitimacy by discounting and denying others theirs, even before reaching overseas localities (Veracini, 2010:3-4). If the goal of settlers is to be independent and self-sustaining, it follows that one needs political power and control to do so and to flourish. That settlers they see themselves as originators of political orders of an empty land, grants them privilege and superiority, effectively establishing a hierarchy and expectation of (white) European dominance or supremacy versus all (racialized) non-Europeans. This is achieved by discounting and devaluing 'others', and delegitimizing/ignoring other political authorities in favour of themselves.

Since settlers move across space from home countries to another, it is possible to classify them as migrants. However, settlers are unique migrants because they are achieved by conquest, not mere immigration (Veracini, 2010:3-4). To accomplish settler colonization, settlers must become the dominating majority, which thereby enables them to claim some form of indigeneity. It is only by becoming the majority, that colonizers lose their status as such (Veracini, 2010:5). It follows, that already existing indigenous populations were not integrated into the settlement order and granted a lower status, but were instead coercively fought down and driven back (Osterhammel, 1997:6; Bateman & Pilkington, 2011:1). Encouraged by the perception that Aboriginals were 'subhuman' (Bateman & Pilkington, 2011:1), in addition to their perceived lack of legitimate political authority, settler colonizers were able to rationalize the settlement project and take the necessary steps to become the majority. As such, settler colonization was as much about shaping European sovereignty as it was about shaping indigenous sovereignty, which still has consequences for Canada today.

Furthermore, colonialism was about the creation and implementation of new bodies of knowledge, for example classification/science and race, which permitted conquest and were formed by it. In fact, colonizers governed a colony by defining, coding and restructuring different forms of knowledge (Osterhammel). This is significant because it highlights an intricate relationship between power and knowledge; though knowledge production/implementation is a complicated and reciprocal

process, those whose values become dominant or are imposed, hold the power to define the terms for understanding, and therefore distribution and exclusion; in this way, the control of knowledge grants privilege.

A concrete Canadian example is in the implementation of residential schools that were funded by the government and administered by various Christian missionaries (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:181). Under this policy, the government forcefully removed Aboriginal children from their families/homes and isolated them in far-away residential schools (181), where a European style of education, with its values and morals, and religious philosophies, was imposed and outright sought to destroy Aboriginal culture and values, and create white/European minded children out of Aboriginal children (182-3). The existence of such schools exemplifies the hierarchy of knowledge/power wherein Europeans perceived their ways to be more advanced and valuable, and reinforced European racist assumptions of (white) superiority over Aboriginals (182).

With regards to this research, the interest in power and knowledge is in how Europeans interpreted and gave meaning to racially different 'others' vis-à-vis the goals and structures of settler colonization, and the distribution of power this involved. This means examining the ways in which ideology about racialized people complimented and encouraged settler colonization, therefore granting and securing European power and dominance. The most illuminating critique will come from uncovering the relationship between colonization and modernity, and the transfer of powers through knowledge-control after colonization. Though seemingly neutral, the epistemologies of modernity were conceptualized by Europeans, implemented worldwide, and still generally exist today. Through the perpetuation of these ideologies, European privilege is maintained.

Oppression, Exclusion and Inequality

The common thread between racialization and racism, white supremacy, and settler colonization is imbalanced power structures that result in inequality and exclusion, where the ones with power are

able to oppress and exclude others while gaining privilege; this creates unequal circumstances.

Definitions of the terms power, oppression, inequality and institutional racism will be provided.

Firstly, power can be defined as the capability of a group or individual to control/affect the political, economic and social orders and organizations, in addition to the decisions, actions and values of other groups or individuals. Such power can be realized by the ability of the group or individual to enforce rewards or punishments on others by shaping knowledge, values or preferences of others (Phillips, 2003:26). This definition highlights that power is multidimensional, interconnected, total and all encompassing. Power extends into all areas of life and ways of being/knowing, including the standards and norms that society is organized and abides by. This is significant because during colonization, it was white European settlers that had the monopoly of power and were able to establish and implement social structures, norms, and rewards (exclusion) based on *their* views, and this continues today. I want to be critical of the way society is currently organized and the values it functions from, for example rationality and individualism, to illustrate the historical unequal distribution of power causing racialized exclusion and marginalization *because* of certain norms and structures.¹⁴ A final dimension of power is that of the business elite. This power is realized through the market directly, and through the ability to perpetuate capitalist ideology and influence of politicians and the public at large, indirectly (Phillips, 2003:28). It is therefore interesting to note how the power of wealthy people to encourage a certain economic system, functions to secure their power and wealth.

In addition to economic power, settler colonizers used political power to establish their settlements and prosper; as outlined previously, this involved the oppression and exploitation of Aboriginal people. But what exactly is oppression, and how does it relate to privilege? Freire offers a powerful and convincing conception of oppression. Uniquely classifying it as a form of violence, he

¹⁴ Power can be derived from three sources, ideology, the division of society by class/gender/race *etc*, and the social institutions where power is exercised such as the media, schools, the legal system, property rights, treaties, religious institutions, the market itself, and the state (Phillips, 2003:26). Though there are difference sources of power, the primary source of interest in my research will be ideology.

defines oppression as any circumstance in which an individual/group objectively exploits another individual/group, or restricts their capacity and ability for self-determination (Freire, 1993:37). Here I draw the connection between oppression and poverty because racial issues are themselves a reflection of historically rooted racial inequality, and poverty limits the capacity for self-determination. Combined, I believe that historical forms of oppression against racialized people has given rise to other, more subtle forms, of racial oppression and marginalization such as racialized poverty. That oppressors can exploit and limit self-determination, means they see themselves as more normal, deserving and worthy in comparison to the oppressed, and can therefore use them for their own gains. An important point that Freire brings to the forefront is the privilege of the oppressors/dominant classes. He argues that they do not perceive their exclusive entitlements and wealth as privileges, but instead perceive them as earned rights from hard work. From this view, wealth is the result of individual achievement, and those with less are expected to be appreciative of the dominant classes for any support they may provide (Freire, 1993:41-2). Oppressors also perceive the oppressed as ungrateful/jealous, thereby commanding the need for close supervision for fear that they may become the enemy. Freire frames this dynamic as a necessary function of the system of oppression, because liberation of the oppressed would undermine the authority of the oppressors (41). There are a few important points I find necessary to highlight in this conception. Firstly, that entitlements are not seen as privileges resonates with settler colonization because settlers did not see their sovereignty/political legitimacy as a privilege as they genuinely perceived the lands to be rulerless and lacking political authority. Secondly, because today's society is understood as meritocracy, whereby people are rewarded in proportion to their skills (Marsh, 2013:128), (whites) in power do not see their power in terms (racial) privilege. However, this denies the history of oppression and domination that suppressed and dispossessed racialized people in order to establish and secure European power and prosperity. Thirdly, viewing the oppressed as potential threats in need close supervision provides the rationale for oppression because it is only by constructing them as inferior and underserving, can oppressors legitimize and maintain their dominance. Applied to racialized poverty, if

the exploitation of (racialized) people is needed to accumulate wealth, to make the them equals would diminish the structures of exploitation that have allowed oppressors to gain in the first place.

If power enables oppression, and both can be classified as the broad structures of control, then social exclusion and inequality can be seen as their consequences. A good definition of social exclusion refers to the structures and processes of inequality between social groups, that determines access to the resources which shape the quality of membership in society over time; this effectively creates and re-creates a network of unequal outcomes (Galabuzi, 2009:228), bringing to light the interconnected and diverse effects of structures of inequality. Social exclusion can be identified by four elements: exclusion from civil society by legal and institutional means; exclusion from social goods to meet needs of groups, such as income security, homes for the homeless and accommodating those with disabilities; exclusion from opportunities to meaningfully participate in society; and exclusion from economic well-being in terms of consumption, access to income and the economy (Galabuzi, 2009:228). I find it useful to think of these four elements of exclusion as exemplifying what is missed when individuals or groups cannot realize the right to self-determination. This is because, excluded individuals/groups are purposefully constricted and limited by the denial of access to important resources for belonging/progress and prosperity. In this light, I believe exclusion functions to maintain dominance and power, and solidifies a particular way of knowing/being as the correct way *through* the exclusion of others.

Inequality can have many different definitions. From a macro-level of analysis, inequality can be defined as the product of public policies, social structures, and human behavior (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:137). The definition of equality applied here refers to equity, where equal outcomes is the focus rather than equal opportunity (153).¹⁵ An equal outcomes approach is concerned with the fair distribution of goods and services in society, and critiques structures and systems for their

¹⁵ Equity is more suitable here because it considers an individuals/groups social location as the foundation for differential treatment, and permits reasonable accommodation in order to achieve equity. Reasonable accommodation refers differential treatment that does not benefit one group over another, but makes adjustments to remove barriers that a group faces to establish a balanced playing field eg. wheelchair ramp (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:153).

discriminatory effects. One such way is by looking at how neutral rules may create unequal outcomes (153-4). This occurs when equal standards are applied to unequal contexts (154), and minority needs and experiences are ignored under the philosophy of formal equality. This effectively accelerates discriminatory effects in already unequal contexts (Fleras & Elliot 2000:83; Monture, 2007:201) because there is no recognition of historical marginalization/ exploitation which should warrant specific, rather than universal rules to achieve equal outcomes. This type of analysis is particularly beneficial to my research because Canada is a society of supposedly guaranteed equal opportunity through laws of equality and anti-discrimination, yet is still a society in which racial disparity exists as exemplified by racialized poverty.

Such disparity between the values in law and the reality in society can be explained by institutional racism. Institutional racism can be defined as the organizational processes and practices that are used to directly or indirectly discriminate against 'others', and goes beyond the consideration of individual acts of racism in the work place (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:82); this racism is seen as a structural product of the institutional configuration of society and as an outcome of patterns of social relationships and the ideologies underlying social systems (Barrett, 1991:85). Of interest here is systemic institutional racism which refers to the subtle forms of discrimination at the institutional levels of society and encompasses the rules, organization, norms, goals, and procedures of social institutions (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:82).¹⁶ Applied to the analysis of racialized poverty, I will be uncovering the social relationships and bodies of knowledge that govern, and are influenced by, the institutional structures of society and how these structures and their norms reflect these social systems.¹⁷ By these structures and norms of the nation-state, a pattern of white normativity and privilege that is rooted in settler colonization, will become apparent. There are a few points to consider about systemic racism: it is harder to

¹⁶ There are certainly different, less formal forms of systematic racism that persist today for example discriminatory actions like ethnic jokes or racist cartoons or, the distortion of rules to purposely exclude racialized groups (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:82)

¹⁷ One method of analyzing institutional structures is to examine their policies and philosophies such as: immigration policy, multiculturalism policy/philosophy and legal colorblind philosophy (see chapter 2).

identify/detect because it is generally discreet and implicit; it can be unconscious; and, what I find most important to acknowledge, is that *only* the context and consequences matter, not the intent (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:83; Monture, 2007:201). In this way, to argue that laws of equality ensure that society, the economy and political organization are fair and equal, or that neutral norms and rules did not intend on creating inequality and discrimination, is irrelevant. This is because, in the context of a (white) settler society, their consequences and outcomes, that have been racially distributed, are what matters. Thus, it does not then matter whether there was an intention to establish a white supremacist/ white-privileged society- what matters is that it has been established and has racially exclusionary consequences. Central to systemic racism is the idea that when organizational rules and practices embody and promote white experiences as the norm and as necessity, they are racist because they penalize others on personal grounds (*difference*) not based on merit and capability (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:83). In so doing, a racial and Eurocentric social order is maintained and preserved (91).

III.METHODOLOGY

Research Question/ Problem Statement

With the appreciation that poverty has been defined and distributed on racial terms, the research problem is to understand the causes of this racialized poverty, and will focus on ideology, power and knowledge production to do so. The analysis will inform how the construction of race, though presumed to be biological at the time, was used during colonization to create a racial hierarchy that defined value, freedoms, and access to resources and self-determination. In so doing, the ways in which race as an organizing principle under colonialism is still being used today will be made evident. It is in this way that the emergence of poverty as a racial issue can be traced and understood more fully. By understanding the formation and maintenance of racialized poverty through a colonial lens, the purpose of this study is then to re-frame thinking, and prompt new questions around poverty so that there can be new solutions to address poverty that racialized. Only once the function of race in poverty and society as

a whole is dealt with can society progress towards a truer equality and eliminate further social injustice. It is hoped that by historically situating the societal creation and use of race in politics, culture, and the economy, new approaches to the elimination of poverty will specifically target the standardized racial ideology and the current oppressive functioning of state institutions.

Given the stated purpose, the central question that will be guiding this research is, how has colonialism effected racialized poverty in Canada today? All research will flow from this question by deconstructing the issue into its parts: colonialism, race, and the economy. Other questions will inform this broad question by examining the relationship between the parts: what is the relationship between race and colonialism? How are colonialism and capitalism connected? What are the implications of decolonization? What framework of understanding connects colonization to today? How has capitalism historically excluded people of colour? What rationalities (multiculturalism and colorblind) have impacted the ways in which racialized poverty is dealt with? In answering these questions, an analysis into the complexity of racial order and its relationship to poverty becomes possible. It will also become clear that there is no one cause of poverty, but many things, overlapping and mutually reinforcing have influenced, shaped and informed how we think about racialized poverty and in effect allow it to happen.

Theoretical Approach

In order to analyze and deconstruct how colonialism has affected poverty today, a few key guiding theoretical frameworks will be used. Selected frameworks are beneficial to this issue because they enable certain analyses to take place, and allow certain questions and challenges to be made. Additionally, various theories and approaches will be used rather than single approaches because it provides a more comprehensive understanding of the relationships between, power, knowledge, and race and wealth, in relation to self-determination, inclusion/exclusion, and oppressive harms. In what follows, an understanding of the issue of racialized poverty through colonialism will be dissected into its parts: colonialism and race, capitalism/class and race, and colonialism and ‘post-colonialism’, to

highlight assumptions and beliefs that make the argument and analyses possible. In particular, the frameworks used are, social construction of race, as previously outlined; critical theory (Creswell, 2013) including critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012) and Marxist theory (Wolff & Resnick, 2012), and intersectionality. Through the application of these frameworks to the research question, it will be shown that: there can be emancipation from the oppressive functions of race because race is a socio-historical construction; poverty can be eliminated because it has been socially created through the implementation of a particular form of economics; and, through the values of modernity, colonial modes of power still exist today and impact society and the relations/functions within it.

First, a critical theoretical framework informs this research by exploring social institutions, historical domination and social struggles. Critical theory holds the assumptions that reality is co-constructed between individuals who are interacting within systems/structures that provide some individuals with more power than others (ontology), and that privilege and oppression are based on various social/cultural categories such as gender, race, class and the like. Thus, reality is discovered through the study of social structures, freedom and oppression, power, and control (epistemology) (Creswell, 2013:37). From a critical standpoint, it is then necessary to consider how society has been organized since colonization with regards to race and class, what social institutions have existed, and how these have functioned to produce and maintain certain forms of power and knowledge that have historically privileged white Europeans. Specifically, my research focuses on privilege and oppression based on race, which falls under critical race theory (CRT). Though there are variations of CRT, its basic tenets include: racism is normal and ordinary rather than anomalous and is harder to recognize under formal equality/ colorblindness; there exists a social structure where whites are privileged over people of colour; race is a social construction and forms in particular socio-historic contexts without inherent, fixed meanings; and because of their unique experiences of racial oppression, people of colour have meaningful contributions to share about race and racism with others (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012: 7-10).

Another form of critical theory used here is a Marxist critique of capitalism. There is an abundance of critiques about capitalism's uneven distribution and benefits and at the core of many of these critiques is the Marxist analysis that states, capitalism is an economic system that depends on inequality to function. This happens through the division of labor by class- the bourgeoisie (capitalists) are the upper most class with ownership of most of the economic resources, and the proletariat (labourers) who are the working class serving the interest of the bourgeoisie; although labourers reap some economic rewards from their work, they are exploited by the capitalists (Wolff & Resnick, 2012). Though this is a strong critique will be used in this research, Marx fails to include any discussion of human characteristics such as race, gender, sexuality and the like, thereby ignoring the potential influence of these factors on capitalism itself. My research will go beyond a Marxist analysis and will include the intersectional analysis of race and class within capitalism. Specifically, an intersectional approach assumes that the different social/cultural categories (race, sex, class etc.), that (identity) oppression is based on, do not act independently from each other, but shape/ are shaped by one another (Spade, 2013). Here, the consideration of multiple factors, namely race and class, will be used in understanding poverty and exclusion, in relation to (colonial) elites in power.

These critical frameworks highlight racialized poverty as a social justice issue precisely because the social and economic orders that exist today have been formulated and governed by a small group of elites to ensure their privilege and power through particular forms of knowledge control and production. The use of these frameworks together will add to the body of knowledge on racialized poverty by analyzing the relationships between, power, knowledge, race, and wealth, in relation to self-determination, inclusion/exclusion, and oppressive harms.

Research Design

Using these frameworks, racialized poverty will be examined through a partial mix of methods. Primarily this research will be a critical theoretical/conceptual analysis. A theoretical approach is well

suited here because I find current understandings of poverty, specifically racialized poverty, and their subsequent solutions inappropriate and ineffective. Thus, I am interested in the ways in which poverty and race are understood and talked about in society as a whole and through state institutions, and how this developed. By historically locating the creation and use of race through colonialism, it is hoped that through this theoretical research, those working for social justice around poverty issues will re-examine their ideas and analyses to be more critical of the composition and function of state-institutions, as *sites* of racial discrimination and oppression. I want to expand upon current understandings of racialized poverty by specifically framing it through a colonial lens in hopes that there can be new, inclusive, and more just ways of social organization where equality is realized, and not merely promised.

To supplement my theoretical analysis, I am also interested in borrowing from the instrumental case study method. Instrumental case studies are used to understand a specific issue, problem or concern, and requires the selection of one, bounded case to illustrate the issue (Creswell, 2013:99). As the researcher I want to understand the issue of racialized poverty in Canada, and so to be able to situate my theoretical analysis, the final section of my analysis, *Racialized Poverty*, will use some data from 1990 until 2014. These dates have been selected because it was during the 1990s when Canada's racialized population radically increased (Boyd & Vickers, 2004: 258). Though this is not a case study, using some of its methods will help reveal patterns and correlations between the theoretical analysis of race through Canadian history and the reality of racialized poverty on the ground.

Data Sources & Data Collection

Primarily, the data I will be using are other theorist's constructs around colonialism, race, and capitalism/poverty. Using what has already been assessed and theorized, this research will re-theorize the formation of racialized poverty by bringing the different theoretical elements together to inform the broader picture of racialized poverty. This will generally come from books and online journal articles. In addition, as in line with the case-study method, this research will use multiple sources to inform the

study as well as provide supplemental information to illustrate or provide other perspective/critics the theories examined (Creswell, 2013). Examples of sources include: secondary sources where others have conducted their own research and interpreted and analyzed the data; grey literature from non-governmental organizations and associations; public government records; and documents. These various data sources are used to highlight to diversity of opinions and or issues.

Research Validity

Though the concept of validity denotes objective, universal truths often associated with positivist, quantitative work, there are ways in which qualitative research can be the equivalent of 'valid' (Creswell, 2013:244). Two such ways I will apply to my research are triangulation and the clarification of research bias. Triangulation refers to the use of multiple and varying sources, methods and theories to provide supporting evidence (Creswell, 2013). As this research is a theoretical study, I will naturally be consulting a variety of interdisciplinary theories and sources to go beyond the compartmentalization of the issues within racialized poverty and colonialism, such as colonialism/race, or capitalism/class. Perhaps most importantly, I need to be reflexive of my own position in my research. I do not claim to be neutral in my work because at the heart of this research is my assumption of a racially ordered and discriminatory society, against claims that state-institutions and society as a whole are 'post-racial'; all my research and analyses will flow from this perspective and will aim to critique claims in support of the post-racial argument.

Data Analysis

The theories that will form the body of this research will be organized into the categories and that come out of the research question, colonialism (power/race), race (capitalism/class), and poverty (capitalism/ race). As part of the analysis I will be looking for, connections and relationships that are made between the different topics, the omission of certain aspects or issues/critiques, and the

contradictions between claims. In interpreting the data, I will examine how the topics/issues interconnect, shape, overlap and contradict each other to answer the research question, how has colonialism effected poverty today? In borrowing from the case study method, the context of poverty in Canada will be described, and proceed to draw themes that emerge from this, and finally make generalizations of what can be learned about racialized poverty from the case. This will illustrate the implications these theories have on reality, to uncover a pattern of race as a key factor in poverty/economic outcomes, opportunity.

Ethical Considerations

As this research is a theoretical analysis, my ethical considerations will not consider participants. Instead, ethical considerations are the proper representation of different racial groups, and groups with different economic incomes. I must also include true, comprehensive details of theories and situations/contexts in order to paint a representative picture of racialized poverty and colonialism in Canada. In this way, I will not only provide information that supports my argument, but other information that may contest and challenge my argument, and provide my interpretation and analyses in response. Finally, a note about my social location. I must be clear that although I am a first generation female of colour who has experienced direct and indirect racism, I have not personally experienced living in poverty and so cannot speak on behalf of those who have, and are. This being said, I believe my experiences as a female of colour have provided me with some unique, critical analyses of social relations and power, which have helped me gain depth and insight for this analysis of racialized poverty.

IV. COLONIZATION

Colonization and Theology

This chapter is centered around colonization and closely examines how social and economic relations were formed, and how Europeans and non-Europeans were given meaning during the colonial

project. The analysis will unfold in a chronological order, beginning with early resources extraction and then later, colonial settlement. Through these colonial projects, special attention will be paid to theology and science as the bodies of knowledge informing the decisions and practices of colonizers with regards to racial understandings and physically (racially) different ‘others’; that is, the relationship between power and knowledge and the social and economic outcomes for both the colonizers and colonized based on this dynamic. The shift away from religion and towards science will be located within the global change to secularization under the umbrella of modernity, and will examine the establishment of certain values and principles that then became worldwide. The final part of this chapter will take a step back from Canada specifically, and will analyze the global effects of colonialism with regards to racialization and the economic configuration of the world. Analyzing the developments in this way makes clear the evolution and transformations in ways of being and knowing since the first moment of large-scale racial oppression Canada, and shows the complexity and interplay between different factors that enable and establish a white-dominant/privileged society.

Racism was made possible by two tenets of imperial knowledge, that certain (racialized) bodies were inferior to others, and that these inferior bodies were *synonymous* with inferior intelligence and language (Mignolo, 2011:143). This symbolic meaning predetermined one’s social place in society (Kobayashi & Johnson, 2007:4), and thus (unequal) access to society’s resources and benefits (Smedley, 2001:18). This illustrates race as an organizing principle of society, since race was indicative of knowledge and thus worth, and a hierarchy was imposed that benefited whites.

Between the fourteenth and nineteenth centuries (Mignolo, 2011:8-9; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:53), European nations assumed the right to conquer, colonize and exploit nations abroad and worldwide; this was complimented by the keen belief in converting people as part of the Christian duty. Simultaneously, the capitalist system was expanding and as such there was an increased need for cheap labor, cheap resources, foreign markets and options for investment (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:53). These three elements combined show the network, complexity, and overlap of many factors during colonialism that gave rise

to a particular social-historical context with specific meanings and functions. This analysis will begin with the first two elements, colonization and theology to situate the political, social and economic order that was dominated by Europeans and subordinated Aboriginal peoples, and will examine what this meant for racially different groups.

Though Canada's first settlers were Aboriginals (First Nations) from more than 11,000 years ago, immigration of Europeans dating back to the 1600s has largely influenced the social-scape of Canada (Galabuzi, 2001:38), though colonial Europeans had been shaping Canada from before this time. At first, between 1300 and 1600 (Mignolo, 2011:8-9), the primary goal of the colonial project was resource extraction by the fur trade (Mackey, 2009:19). During this time, Europeans actually found it beneficial to partially include¹⁸ First Nations because of their expertise knowledge/skills in the fur-trade, and their manpower was needed in battling competing colonizers such as the French and Americans (Mackey, 2009:19; Monture, 2007:207). I believe it is clear by the configuration of this relationship that Europeans used exploitation to maintain power/control of land, and economic stability and growth through extraction. Moreover, this exploitation was *racialized* because it was (white) Europeans gaining at the expense of (racialized) Aboriginals. Another example of racialized economic exploitation is in the fact that wealthy Europeans were also owners of slaves in Canada (Pentland, 1981:1; Henry et al, 2000:70; Galabuzi, Cr, 39). During the colonial project, Europeans sought ownership of people from other colonized areas such as Africa (Henry et al, 2000:70) and the West Indies (Pentland, 1981:1), *in addition to* enslaving hundreds of Aboriginals (Pentland, 1981:1; Galabuzi, 2001:39). Although slavery was not so widespread in Canada (Henry et al, 2000:70), the fact remains that commodities were made out of racialized bodies, and white Europeans gained wealth and held power from this.

¹⁸ I use the term partial here to show that Aboriginals were not excluded and suppressed to the same degree as during settlement colonization. During the early colonial project, Aboriginals were accorded some respect because they were useful in meeting colonizer goals.

With this recognition of unequal, economic, race-relations in early colonial Canada, my interest lies in the ideologies that encouraged and shaped these social relationships. Many argue that colonization was enabled by conceptualizing Aboriginals as inferior (Monture, 2007:207; Wallis et al, 2009:3). In line with this perspective, I will be looking at two prominent frameworks used to give meaning to and interpret people of colour, religion and biology. Firstly, during resource extraction, religion was the primary marker of *difference*¹⁹ between peoples. Christian theology was dominant and differentiated between Christians, Jews and Muslims by reference to ‘blood’ (Mignolo, 2011:8-9). During this time, the world was also dichotomously divided by religion, (white) Christian and (racialized) non-Christian, where the latter were perceived to be ‘wild’ and ‘untamed’, and suffered immense violence for being who they were (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:52); it was accepted that it was the Christian duty to civilize these ‘untamed’ groups (53). What should be acknowledged here is that though this inferiority was understood by reference to religion, it was still applied against racially different groups of people vis-à-vis white colonizers.

When Europeans ‘discovered’ other people, termed ‘natives’, who physically looked different to themselves, questions arose as to whether or not these people could be considered part of the human race/species, and if so, in what ways they fit in (Omi & Winant, 1986:58; Mackey, 2009:19).²⁰ Under Christian theology, ideas were sparked about converting these people into Christianity, but also about how these people should be treated (Omi & Winant, 1986:58; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:53). It can be argued that given the, expropriation of property, denial of political rights, forms of coercive labor including slavery, and the overt extermination of populations during colonization, Europeans upheld a

¹⁹ I use the term *difference* to describe the recognition that, dominant groups saw the ‘racial’ differences between groups of people as signs of inferiority. *Difference* denotes subordination.

²⁰ It ought to be recognized that assigning racial difference (hierarchy) was not inherent to interactions between people who looked physically different from each other. It is well documented that during the Middle Ages, those in Southern Europe had substantial interaction with people from Africa, and the Near and Middle East. Where people from the racialized communities lived in Southern Europe, their status was not automatically assigned based on their appearance. However, it was those in Northern Europe that had much less contact with *different* others, until the Age of Discovery (Smedley, 2001:4).

worldview in which they saw themselves as superior beings and *the* children of God, and all else as subordinate “others” (Omi & Winant, 1986:58). It follows that this worldview, of which race was a crucial part, provided the reasoning for granting freedom to some, and denying rights and freedom to others (Omi & Winant, 1986:58; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:53). By this, we see the beginnings of race as an organizing principle in society. Though not necessarily understood like this at the time, religious divides were about classifying racially different others and determining their role and status in society. It determined the allocation of power and wealth based on European understandings of God and the (white) European self as the basis of measurement. Their theological worldview was undoubtedly subjective, and automatically devalued those that were not Christian- like them.

Specifically, there were two key issues in negotiating moral theology with such racial exploitation: first, how would civilized Christians understand exploiting others, and second, how could this transpire without seeming to contradict their morality and duty to civilize (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:53).²¹ Theology impacted race relations in the wide acceptance of a concept called the “Great Chain of Being”, which hierarchically categorized all forms of life before God, ranging from animals at the bottom to humans, arranged by race, at the top; within this chain, racialized people were closer to animals than whites. The consequence was that it legitimized differences in status and inequality by invoking the ‘naturalist’ argument, that this is the way God made things and to disobey this state of nature would be to defy God (Omi & Winant, 1986:59; Smedley, 2001:16). More broadly, this lent itself to the growth of a ‘superior cultures’ line of thinking (Omi & Winant, 1986:58), wherein (white) Christians believed it to be their duty ‘save’ lower levels of civilization by regulation and imposed servitude (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:53). I would like to bring two points to the forefront here. First, the naturalist argument meant that racialized understandings were seen as incontestable, fixed, ‘truths’.

²¹ This is not to say that Christianity itself was deliberately exploitative, but simply that Europeans believed it their duty to civilize non-Christians and used exploitation and oppression to fulfill their goals. Given the apparent disconnect between the European perception of European righteousness and their exploitative and oppressive practices against Aboriginals, my interest is in what bodies of knowledge or rationalizations existed that blinded Europeans from recognizing this disconnect.

Though the frame of reference was religion and not ‘nature’ as we understand it now, the naturalist argument solidified these *differences* as such. Secondly, the notion that they could be saved is important to recognize because they were still somewhat ‘included’ in the scheme of society, contingent on their ability to change and assimilate. In this way, racialized people were not wholly ‘outside’/excluded, although certainly exploited and marginalized. However, this perception dramatically changed with the rise of scientific theories of race that coincided with religious understandings (Omi & Winant, 1986:58).

It is within this larger context that hooks argues that religion is an important site for ideologies of domination. For her, most people learn philosophical dualism from religion, splitting the world between good/bad, worthy/unworthy, which provides the philosophical basis for white supremacy and others forms of domination (hooks, 2013:177). The philosophy of dualism suggests that things are fixed without variation in meaning and being, and without the possibility of being two things at the same time. It makes standards clear-cut and definitively institutes an ‘us’ and ‘them’ philosophy that symbolizes inclusion and exclusion. Dualism becomes generalizing and self-preserving because it privileges one’s own way of understanding and one’s own identity against all others. This comparison inevitably pre-determines privilege and authority based on the category under which you fall under, for settler colonizers the category was of (white) Christian, and will have consequences for the later movement into modernity. Also under the influence of theology, righteousness and immorality had become spatialized- that is, they became located within certain geographic locations. Dividing space in terms of morality meant that non-European space was taken to be a wild and depraved and in need of moral saving by Europeans (Mills, 1997:46).²² The racial consequence of dividing space by morality, yet locating morality only within Europe, was that only whites could be perceived as moral and worthy, effectively delegitimizing and devaluing racialized people. That space has such symbolic meaning

²² It should also be noted that (white) Christian critiques were not limited to people of colour, but also applied against other white people, such as those from different parts of Europe- for example the Irish, Slavs and poorer Europeans. For further reading, see Nell Irving Painter’s, *The History of White People* (2010).

carries with it serious implications for power and worth. During colonization, it granted Europeans superiority and therefore power, based on a European Christian way of being that was applied to all. Moreover, this legitimized European conquest because Europeans saw themselves as destined to, and responsible for, helping others by ‘moralizing’ them.

The relationship between Europeans and Aboriginals changed over time as did European understandings of racially different people. Though during the earliest colonial project of resource extraction, Aboriginals were accepted as part of the human race and seen as capable of development and having souls (being ‘saved’), there was a massive change in ideology when the colonial project shifted to settlement between the late 1700s and early 1800s. During the shift, and with the rise of many negative stereotypes, Aboriginals came to be thought of as incapable of civilization (Mackey, 2009:20-1). This is why some make the argument that the ideology of racial superiority grew out of the need to expand the European Empire (Wallis & Fleras, 2009:xv). On a mission to establish a white settler society, Europeans used war, conquest and treaties to ensure their control over land, resources and the fur trade which had originally belonged to Aboriginals (Galabuzi, 2001:38). This use of political oppressive and violent force secured European dominance and legitimacy and enabled European wealth. By stripping First Nations of their means to livelihood (land, resources and the fur trade), political and economic gains were made by Europeans alone at the expense of First Nations. In direct contrast to existing policies of assimilation, settler colonization was accomplished by systematic policies of economic exclusion, genocide, and segregation that purposefully sought to oppress and eradicate the Aboriginal population (Galabuzi, 2001: 38). From this, the first form of settlement developed. It aimed to grow an agricultural settlement population that was able to supply its own labour, with support of imported cheap labour of European servants. Through this, socially and ethnically homogenous spaces of European settlement began in Canada, which later provided the basis for European nation-building (Osterhammel, 1997:6)

This indigenous dispossession was ultimately required to fulfil the project of settlement- the establishment of an economically independent, ‘indigenous’, homogenous, European society. Since settlement requires colonizers to become a majority in order to assert their indigeneity and legitimacy to rule the land, the forceful eradication of Aboriginal people essentially created the space for settlement to occur. The primary economic concerns of settler society building and economic growth were shaping, and being shaped by oppressive and violent policies, which in turn actively sought to create the necessary conditions for settlement: suppression and exclusion of Aboriginals. In so doing, Europeans claimed the legitimacy and authority of dispossession through the elimination of already existing peoples and then through the denial that it ‘belonged’ to anyone in the first place (*terre nullius*). The fact that these were oppressive policies against Aboriginals effectively inferiorized them in comparison to white settlers through the denial of power; it was white life over indigenous life. Subsequently, a homogenous white settler society emerged that directly and indirectly held white as the norm. This was maintained by selective importation of labour from Europe alone (Norrie, Owram & Emery, 2007:xxi; Galabuzi, 2001:13; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:262), largely limiting economic participation to Europeans. That this provided the basis for nation-building suggests that, at its outset, the Canadian nation was largely white and therefore emerged from the success of settlement ‘indigeneity’.

Though during colonization exclusion and marginalization was targeted at the First Nations, it set the tone for the society that would grow from this (Kobayashi & Johnson, 2007:7; Galabuzi, 2001:38; Monture, 2007:207); that is, a particular race-class complex and racialized inequality in both social and economic outcomes. Against this background, Canada’s economy has been racialized in favor of Europeans from the start, where during the pre-industrial society, European gains were only made possible by the exploitation and exclusion of First Nations people (Galabuzi, 2001:38; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:94). Today, this inequality continues in our globalized capitalist economy, where racialized poverty is on the rise.

Now that it has been partially demonstrated how European conquerors interpreted racially different people through theology during the project of resource extraction, and how social relationships formed from this, the racial ideologies that accompanied the shift to settlement must also be outlined. In analyzing these changes, the framework through which we can understand race and racialization today will be made evident. Specifically, the shifts in knowledge away from religion (theology) and towards science (secularization under modernity) is the key link between racial exploitation in the past to now. Although meanings transformed, the economic and social outcomes were similar- the inferiorization, exploitation and exclusion of non-whites. The questions to be answered next are, first, what are biological theories? And second, how does this tie in to modernity?

Biological Theories of Race

Coinciding with theological bases for inferiority were the rise of scientific notions of race (Omi & Winant, 1986:58). Before the late 1700s in the earliest uses of the term ‘race’, biology and hierarchy were not a part of its definition. Instead, it referred to a lineage of people or line of descent who were thought to have a shared history in common. It was not until late 1700s and early 1800s, that race became associated with biology, used to differentiate between groups of people seen as being inherently and biologically different in physical, social and intellectual ways (Satzewich, 1998:27). This was prompted by the development of classifications of living organisms, when scientists and scholars were keenly interested in identifying and classifying variations in the human species (Omi & Winant, 1986:58).²³

²³ Critics may argue that the concept of race(ism) is a product of individual irrationality or hate (Wallis & Fleras, 2009: xvii, 93), however an assumption underlying this research is that race is not. Rather, the concept of race is illustrative/an effect of Enlightenment thinking, practices and endeavors. Enlightenment was largely concerned with the classification, understanding and controlling of the diversity of plants, animals and peoples in the world. To order the world’s diversity into a large, comprehensive scheme served two purposes, however: on an elementary level it was to create order from chaos, but more broadly it was to fulfil modernity’s need to explain the whole of the *human* experience, albeit in a very thin and superficial way (Wallis & Fleras, 2009:xvii; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:51). This is in part the victory of rationality- to organize the races was seen as accomplishing the modernist goal of understanding the human experience, and succeeds in rational thinking.

The implications of scientific racism are two-fold: the creation of a biological definition of race which involves the racialization of the body and the belief that groups of people share characteristics and phenotypes; and the introduction of a hierarchy of races where (white) Europeans were seen as the most advanced and thus privileged, while non-white others occupied the lowest ranks and were seen as backwards and less evolved (Rattansi, 1994:54; see also Mills, 33). It was also during this period that race became closely connected to progress²⁴ in that only certain ‘races’ were seen as capable of achieving progress, not all of humankind as previously accepted (Mackey, 2009:21). Through biological theories, people were socially given significance based on selective phenotypic characteristics (racialization) and it was believed that these classifications were natural and fixed, not constructed/fabricated by society (Li, 1998:115). Furthermore by using the esteem of science, the superiority and dominance of some races, including the ‘white’ European race, was verified and legitimized subsequently exonerating them from any responsibility for advancing the lives of subordinated groups (Wallis & Fleras, 2009:xvi,53).²⁵ What can be taken from this transformation in understanding, is that although religious theories had declined in popularity, race was still an organizing principle of society and continued to determine social and economic outcomes based on the standard of European whiteness. Science’s appeal to objective truths meant that the racial hierarchy was not seen as a structure of privilege, but an objective structure of nature- though the definition of nature had shifted from God to science. Further to this, inequality and exploitation became naturalized and acceptable because it was against people of colour who were not like ‘us’; people of colour were perceived to be genetically, and innately inferior and therefore less worthy than white Europeans. Such theories of race set in motion standards of acceptability and belongingness that favoured (white) Europeans (Mills,

²⁴ Progress under modernity means, the endless capacity for “self-improvement through effort and intelligence” (Gillen & Ghosh, 2007:32; MacQueen, 2007:38) and the idea that, “societies move through consecutive stages to reach ultimate pinnacle of evolution” (Mackey, 2009:21). To me, progress indicates the desire for human advancement and a better life through growth and development.

²⁵ It should be noted that though race was understood to be a biological concept, its definition was never agreed upon or solidified (Omi & Winant, 1986:58).

1997:33). Though Europeans did not necessarily invent biological theories to serve their purpose of exploitation, they were undoubtedly influenced by these theories and utilized them to their own advantage.

It was not until after World War II, during which biological theories of race rationalized the horrific mass murder of Jews, that theories of scientific racial superiority were discarded (Satzewich, 1998:25; Smedley, 2001:17; Wieviorka, 1994:176), and deemed wrong and dangerous, both morally and politically (Goldberg, 2009:330). Subsequently, a process of de-racialization occurred which necessitated the condemnation of racist ideas and practices (Satzewich, 1998:25). However, despite the changes after World War II, racial discrimination is still apparent in the norms society holds and in the distribution of resources and capacity to realize self-determination new racism, democratic racism; despite the denunciation of scientific race theories, the fact remains that race is still an organizing principle, with real meaning attached to it.

At this point, the rise of scientific explanations and understandings of race needs to be situated within the larger global context that saw a shift in epistemology- of knowledge, of economy, of the human condition. Coinciding with scientific theories were two major global changes/shifts. The first change was triggered by the Enlightenment and saw the shift into the period of modernity, and the second is modern globalisms.

Modernity and the Enlightenment

Western Modernity (modernity) is the name given the period after the Middle Ages, and can be conceptualized as a broad epistemological framework that spans over different time periods up until today, but that all share some common principles for understanding the world. The philosophies that define (characterize) the modern Western world are human reason and rational behavior, which are

upheld as the essential mechanisms of social progress (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:199).²⁶ Modernity was prompted by three particular changes, the economy, epistemology, and the devaluation of human life. Through colonialism, colonizers and the West were able to replenish their resources indefinitely, by reinvesting surplus to grow production, thereby changing the dynamics of the economy.

Epistemologically, a major shift occurred in the 1500s when advancements in science meant that now people could control more of their environment (nature) than ever before. It was through both of these changes, in addition to the Industrial revolution,²⁷ that the third shift occurred- the devaluation or dispensability of human life, and life in general. The principle of free trade made possible the dispensability of human life in allowing man to become the commodity (slavery) (Mignolo, 2011:6); the value of human life was forsaken for increased production and accumulation of wealth (Mignolo, 2011:6, 184).

Modernity includes the total of cultural, political and economic transformations prompted by the European Enlightenment with its concentration on and celebration of the individualized subject, western man, reason and progress (Rattansi & Westwood, 1994:3; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:51), against irrationality and barbarism and tyranny (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:26, 199).²⁸ Here, I believe the individualized subject achieves the ultimate break from nature and gains the freedom to be an autonomous subject, in charge through reasoned thinking. It implies that one is no longer subject to the laws of nature or social structures, and assumes a neutral, level playing field for all.

As modernity was inspired by the Enlightenment, it is helpful to examine what the Enlightenment was. The Enlightenment is the European name given to the period of time between the 1600 and 1700s (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:26). The philosophy of the Enlightenment held that all people

²⁶ This holds true for all periods of modernity, from the Enlightenment in the 1700s, to scientific positivism in the 1800s, and the modernization period of the 1900s (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:199).

²⁷ The Industrial Revolution signifies the change in production from hand-led to machinery led production (Mignolo, 2011:6)

²⁸ Though there is no universal agreement over the specific period of modernity, and whether or not we are in a post-modern era, many can agree that it was the transformation of reason and science as the framework to understand nature and humanity, in the context of the Industrial revolution (Rattansi, 1994:22).

were competent of self-guidance because of, and by using, reason (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:199-200). Under Enlightenment, it is because of reasoned thinking that science and technology came to be accepted as new sources of material progress and well-being. Here, science replaces religion as the framework for understanding, and material happiness replaces religious salvation as the purpose of life. Reason here was upheld as a fixed and universal notion, in the sense that it was not specific to the subject, a nation, an era or culture (199-200). The way I understand reason is as a way of breaking with nature and conquering it. It implies objective truths and facts, symbolizing its un-attachment to social contexts, emotions and other social aspects that would make it subjective and relative, rather than universal. It upholds calculable, scientific thinking as the best and most efficient form of thinking for the best outcomes in life (progress), and is defended as the ‘right’ way to think. In this way, reason and rationality are seen as neutral *and* all-knowing. However, reality proves otherwise (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:199-200).

The paradox of reason was that it privileged Europeans over others in its perception that Europe was the most developed and advanced in reasoned thinking and its emancipation from nature. The consequence was to relegate all other places and people to a lower status of having only the ‘potential’ for reason. Combined, this meant that it was Europe’s perceived duty to help the world, to lead the world in progress and towards reason (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:199-200).²⁹ I believe it is important to recognize the Eurocentricity of reason at this point. It is through the philosophy of reason that Europe remains at the center, and reaffirms the dominance of their ways of thinking and understanding as the base standard (the norm) that all should strive to measure up to. In this way, I believe reason denotes an expectation of whiteness/ Europeanness, and is exclusionary of racialized ways of being and knowing. In addition, the philosophy of reason reaffirms Europe’s role in guiding all others towards

²⁹ There is a tendency to believe that because Western civilization is the most recent civilization, it is the best kind of civilization and should be followed around the world. However, European modernity’s role as the global model, and its effects on Western civilization has been overlooked/taken for granted (Mignolo, 2011:xiv).

reason/progress. This essentially means making all others more like Europeans, in order to achieve a better and more 'enlightened' ('truthful') world. Consequently, I believe Western Modernity is racialized. It was conceived of by white Europeans, but was applied to all (racialized) people in all contexts. The terms of what counts as rational were established by Europeans, and as such matched who, and how they were. European ways of thinking became the standard of measurement of value and applicability, which had the effect of devaluing and excluding people of colour, and providing the rationale to exploit them. Hence, reason had imposed standards and norms that by their nature were not inclusive of 'other' races/people, again, signaling a form of zero-sum dualism. Similar to the rationale for subordination under theology, rationality is perceived to be natural and 'the way things are', and so, cannot be changed. When applied to colonization, European power is legitimized and solidified. Whereas first Europeans ensured control and power by self-asserted sovereignty and the imposition of their Christian ways of knowing, with the shift in knowledge towards science and reason, the dominance of European ways of thinking and understanding is maintained- it is *still* their way, above and on top of other ways.

In support of this analysis is the fact that, while modernity is marked by the rise of rationality it was also a time marked by European expansion and conquest. At some level then, the encounters with 'others' shaped what rationality meant (Rattansi, 2011:36), though we know that Europeans already perceived themselves as better and more advanced, wealthier and with more political autonomy/legitimacy than others through the ideology of settler colonization. Thus, an understanding of Western racism is not possible without the consideration of how Western identities were formed and shaped by real and imagined encounters with 'others' (36). In this way, the seamless association between identities such as 'European' or 'white' with concepts such as rationality and civilization, and their production of binaries (eg. backward/advance), were not natural but instead the effects of processes of imperial exploitation and colonial domination (36). As noted before, binaries create a zero-sum situation which inevitably leads to the privileging of one's own group to the exclusion of others. It involved defining

rationality and values by comparing it to that which it is not (white European versus racialized), yet still used this as the universal framework by which to judge other people. This framework can hardly be inclusionary and objective if its very meaning was established through dualistic thinking; since Europeans were seen as being advanced in rationality, then non-Europeans were seen as lagging behind.

At the same time, morality became intertwined with a normative science; in analyzing lessons learnt from experience, ethics (social norms, values and morals) became rationalized and calculable by any reasonable person, rather than being dictated by a divine being. Through this, morality becomes acceptable and just to all people who are capable of reasoned thinking (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:199). What this tells us is that the definition and standards of morality came to be established through reasoned thinking. By this understanding, anyone that used reason could determine what correct morals were. However, if rationality was defined by Europeans, and if it was believed that Europeans were more advanced in rational thinking than others, then accordingly, Europeans were also more advanced in morality than others because only they were able to correctly determine morality. The problem here is that rationality was seen as universally applicable and was upheld as an objective 'truth', and by conflating morality with reason, the subjectivity and social construction of both is denied, and European superiority and privilege is reaffirmed. Further, if values and morals can be rationalized, it means there is a base level from which to judge everything else as right or wrong, as progressive or not, but this is laden with Europeanness. From this analysis, it makes sense that under the framework of European understanding and definitions, non-European understandings of values and morality gets undermined and delegitimized for not meeting the standards imposed by Europeans.

Foucault outlines a unique relationship between knowledge, truth and power, and is particularly critical of the modern project because of this. This includes the claims of 'truth' and the classification of all life, experiences, and understanding into science and reason. Despite its claims to universality, Foucault asserts that modern reason is culturally specific to Europeans. For Foucault, Enlightenment values such as autonomy, freedom, human rights and the like, provide the basis upon which to impose a

particular identity on the modern individual, which happens through the normalization of rationality (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:204-5). Through reason and objective calculation of good and bad, one is supposed to come to the common realization that independence, freedom and the like are the ‘correct’ and proper ways to live to achieve progress and development (modernity). As such, rationality creates a universalized subject, who itself fits with the modernist agenda, but that is characterized and judged by European values and standards. In this sense, rationality is coercive in that it becomes a mechanism to control the minds of people rather than to liberate them (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:204-5). This happens by imposing the ‘rational’ way of thinking and being as the generic, bare minimum standard for all people, forcefully making everyone submit to European interpretations of humankind and the human condition. If rationality is normalized, and autonomy freedom and human rights are the values it implies, then a particular (European) standard of being and understanding is set. Only if you comply with these ideals that are European, can you be accepted as a modern, rational individual. Rather than allowing people to have a diversity of ways of being and knowing, they are fixed into a dualism- (European) rational or (non-European) irrational. Put another way, Europeans delegitimized other epistemologies by proclaiming that their own epistemologies were universally applicable, privileging their epistemologies under the pretense of objectivity and truth. Since it is universalized, it becomes the standard of measurement from which to judge peoples worth in a fair, logical and right way. Also in critiquing claims to truth, Foucault noted how such knowledge claims were made only by experts who asserted these as objective truths; it was the appeal to ‘truth’ that granted knowledge power (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:204-5). Foucault raises a good point. Experts are the gatekeepers of knowledge and by their specialization in a particular field, they are entrusted to guide us and tell us what knowledge is and is not. However, if claims to truth are not actually objective truths, but are instead relative to a particular culture for example, then the power and generalizability granted to such ‘true’ knowledge claims is unwarranted.

From the examples above, it becomes apparent that Europeans perceived ‘real’ knowledge, like scientific knowledge, and the ability to understand and grasp the world, to only be possible in certain (white/European) places and not in others. Subsequently, these other places were seemingly locked into a permanent state of ignorance and irrationality without European intervention (Mills, 1997:44-5). Again, this calls for domination by Europeans and asserts their legitimacy and superiority in meeting the goals of modernity and progress, through exploitation and domination. For Europeans, they become the global center of rationality with the power to certify local (native) knowledge claims (Mills, 1997:45). This is illustrated by settler colonization which only accomplished its goal by delegitimizing Aboriginal political authority and organization, and denying them any authority/ sovereignty over their own land and resources. In addition, this maintains a superior ‘us’, and inferior ‘them’ dichotomy.

Ergo, Quijano and Mignolo assert that Eurocentrism is not a matter of geography but of epistemology (Mignolo, 2011:19). By this, they highlight that European expansion was not a mere matter of geography and the spread of European people around the globe. More profoundly, it was a matter of European monopoly over ways of knowing, understanding and interpreting the world (rationality and morality), and thus European power and privilege over all others. It was about European values and ideologies consuming the world and being imposed on all people, and embedded as the ‘right’ and ‘only’ ‘universal’ way of being. It was about establishing a system of European supremacy with respect to knowledge and values, effectively producing Europeaness (epistemology) as the blueprint for humanity. But, as we have seen, intrinsic to this epistemology was the exclusion and delegitimization of (racialized) non-European others.³⁰

Under a modern framework, an illustrative point of this control of knowledge and its

³⁰ It is important to recognize resistance, and acknowledge that every context was different in how it unfolded. Epistemological dominance and superiority was not simply thought up this way and then actualized, because it is a much more complex, multifaceted, indirect and direct process than this. Whether one internalized these ways of knowing is different to how Europeans perceived and treated racially different others based on these perceptions. My interest lies in only in how Europeans understood things and what their actions were based on these understandings.

implications for inequality and oppression is the actual process of racialization and its significance as a way of interpreting/ organizing the world. Mignolo argues that the process of Western racialization/ classification was initiated by whites, mostly scientists and academics, and occurred in a top-down manner. Colours such as yellows, browns, reds and blacks were assigned to populations worldwide, without their consent and input (Mignolo, 2011:45). Further, he asserts that racialization was an essential epistemological *pillar* of western civilization because it fit wholly with the enlightenment/modernity project of science and reason, and made sense through classification of humankind. Against this background, he argues that white knowledge gets privileged over others, because it was only whites who were able to determine racial classifications and thus create institutions of ‘real’ knowledge. Though on the ground there may be racial diversity, assimilation, and educated people of colour, he contends that the conceptualization and organization of modern epistemology (science, philosophy, and earlier Christian theology) was directed by white men, and continues to be so (Mignolo, 2011:45). This argument is powerful because it suggests that (white) Europeans were privileged for being able to identify and give meaning (racialize) to others and that this indicated their superiority in knowledge. Interestingly, I believe they were privileged once more for not belonging to these newly identified racial groups, since they were perceived as inferior people. Also, if racialization was assumed to be a ‘real’ knowledge (reason, science), and such knowledge is what characterizes modernity, then it makes sense to assume that Europeans fit with the ‘modern’ label by using reasoned thinking, *and* that racialization is part of the modern project. Through this process, racialization becomes rationalized and rather than being a social construction, seen as something fixed and as a positive achievement for progress and apprehending the world. I believe that this logic encourages or even solidifies race as an organizing principle and maintains a racial division in society that privileges whites, because *they* are the ones interpreting bodies colour and defining their meaning and significance.

Another example that illustrates the hegemony/power Europeans had through ‘real’ knowledge claims was in the language of discovery. In talking about early historical travels, the word ‘discovery’

shows that what is implied by their use, is a standard of whiteness. That is, if no white person has been to place to ‘discover’ it, then the place is considered a blankness and an emptiness that cannot be known (*terre nullius*). A space only truly becomes *a* space when (white) Europeans have recognized, or perceived it to be (Mills, 1997:45, 49). Not only does this assume that only whites are capable of apprehending the world, that is, the perception of real knowledge, but it also resonates with the theorization of settler colonization; European settlers presumed colonized land to be lacking legitimate political authority until they instituted it, thus settlement was sought, legitimized and encouraged because the land was perceived to be rulerless. Here, only Europeans were seen as ‘real’ people who had the right to conquer and be free, and the legitimacy and authorization to economically benefit from the land. These ideologies place Europe at the center of knowledge and denies all others the possibility for power, sovereignty and self-determination.

But ‘discovery’ was about more than just space. It was also about identity as we have seen throughout. Racially different others re-affirmed European superiority for Europeans first because of the privileging (white) Christian identity, and later because of the privileging of white (biological) identity over others; all else were inferior by comparison because their (racialized) bodies and ideologies were interpreted by Europeans in such a way so as to not align with European values and ideologies. I want to highlight the fact that the formation of Western identities has been fundamentally impacted by European encounters with ‘others’, met, conquered and exploited during discovery (Rattansi, 1994:36). Building on the idea of discovery, Rattansi rightly recognizes that it was not only a process of ‘discovering’ the ‘other’ in encountering new kinds of people, but it was equally about the discovery of the western self and defining what that meant (Rattansi, 1994:36). As noted earlier, the meaning of rationality was inevitably shaped by interactions with racialized groups, as was morality. But there is a more profound way this identity was discovered/shaped- through the invention of the concept of ‘modernity’ itself.

It needs to be recognized that modernity has no ontological reality (Mignolo, 2011:78). This is because modernity uses time to establish its meaning, wherein the European starting point was in the

then-present,³¹ characterized by progress and development. However, in order to properly distinguish and define the modern that was characterized by these things, it needed a juxtaposition to that which it was not. Since the modern referred to the then-current advanced European ways, located in the then-present, the non-modern needed to be understood as behind the then-present - that is, in the past. As such, the creation of the term 'traditional' signified the non-modern/non-current, *and* gave meaning to the modern. In this way, both modernity and traditional were constructions of western and modern thinking, through which 'modernity' became self-defining and self-realizing by the very creation and imagination of 'tradition' (Mignolo, 2011:160). And so, through the use of time, a timeline was established that determined how developed a place was in relation to modern and tradition, therefore determining its value (Mignolo, 2011: 160; Peet & Hartwick, 2009:129). Hence, the measurement of value is biased and socially constructed by Europeans, based on Europeanness and a superficial understanding and conception of time. I say superficial here because these places did not exist in the past tense- they were present and functioning at the same time Europe was. However, the reference to time indicated that developmentally and rationality wise, these places were not yet as advanced as Europe, and so they were non-modern and ideologically 'behind'. This has the impact of restricting inclusion and therefore securing privilege because only (white) Europeans fit the standard of modern, which they themselves set through a dichotomous comparison to others.

Here, Mignolo's argument about the colonization space become extremely relevant, and quite telling of the formation of 'us' and 'them'. For it is only through the colonization of space (the control and the taking over of a land and peoples), that the rhetoric of modernity (progress and modernism) was able to devalue and delegitimize the 'tradition' of the colonized (Mignolo, 2011:160). It was through time, located within in the conquered space, that cultural differences were categorized based on their proximity to modernity or tradition. Thus, it is more telling of power relations to consider the

³¹ Since the creation of the modern and traditional happened in the past, the term then-present/then-current refers to the period in which Europeans created the modern.

differences between ‘modern’ and ‘tradition’ as colonial or imperial differences, rather than cultural differences (Mignolo, 2011:161). What Mignolo means by this is that the terms ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’ are often used in reference to cultural differences, indicating more or less progressive values and cultures, respectively. But this reference distorts the understanding of how these terms were created, and what their use actually is- to define an ‘us’ and ‘them’ and the terms of inclusion and superiority on the basis of European standards of knowledge/values. What is most interesting is that these terms are still very popular today in referencing ‘racialized’ peoples and cultures, and so the terms of reference continue to hold Europe as the norm and racialized as the ‘other’. From this critical analysis of the concept of ‘modernity’, Mignolo argues that time was crucial in building the imagination of the modern/colonial world, whilst also being a mechanism for controlling knowledge *and* pushing an agenda for society based on progress and development (Mignolo, 2011:161). Knowledge construction set the tone for, and determined what acceptable forms of being, knowing, and therefore organizing and relating, were to be. In this way, the modernist framework set itself up for success by outlining how humans should understand humanity and ultimately themselves (rational, individual, progress, science-truths), and then realizing concepts and that matched these understandings, for example racialization, and the concept of modern/traditional.³²

Thus, we see how knowledge was controlled and constructed to create, shape and maintain racism, based on theological claims or claims to reason and truth (Mignolo, 2011:xv). Knowledge helped legitimized racial exclusions. For Europeans, it framed ways of being and knowing so that Europeans appeared advanced and as legitimate superiors. Race as *difference*, was first shaped by religious knowledge of (white) European Christianity, then dramatically changed through modernity and the introduction of ‘true’ knowledge through science and reason. Throughout, (white) Europeans have gained in political, social and economic power because the terms of reference have always held Europe

³² Other examples that will be discussed in the following sections are economics, and the nation-state.

as the objectively correct, advanced and normalized standard; built into the framework of modernity is a European subject who is rational, moral, progressive and able to ‘correctly’ apprehend the world, and dialectic ‘other’ who is none of these things.

Colonialism and Globalisms

With an understanding of how the colonial project politically, socially and economically functioned, and how colonial life unfolded to exclude people of colour through guiding epistemologies and rationalities, it is also necessary to consider colonialism in a global context. This is because the global context illustrates the spread of racialization and the economic systems of exploitation, that together provide the foundation upon which to understand the perception and treatment of racialized people in Canada today, and the inequality of the economic system that Canada has implemented which inadvertently has allowed for the racialization of poverty.

The experience of colonialism was not limited to Canada since its oppressive structures and effects were felt globally. Consider that in 1900, 90% of Africa, 56% of Asia, and 98% of the Pacific were still under colonial rule, versus only 27% of the Americas (MacQueen, 2007:24). What can be gathered from these facts is that: European expansion and political domination had reached all corners of the globe; Europeans had implemented a worldwide system of economic exploitation, since colonialism was about colonial economic growth; and because white Europeans were the colonizers, that the colonized were inevitably racialized people. Therefore, one can speak of colonization as a “shared” experience because of the global spread of colonialism historically, and the processes of racialization that accompanied it (Wallis et al., 2009:1). With the appreciation that colonialism was a global phenomenon, my interest here lies in the particular relationship between colonialism and economics, and the social orders at play within this relationship with regards to race. To examine these elements, I find it useful to outline the meanings and functions of capitalism specifically, and economics more broadly, in addition to the economic arrangements under the global colonial order.

A basic definition of economics is, the body of knowledge concerned with production and consumption (Hawker & Hawkins, 1991). Modern economics was developed against the earlier pre-capitalist feudal order and elitist land owners that supported a mercantilist³³ state, in favor of a new capitalist class who were able to accumulate a lot of wealth (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:24). During the Middle Ages, feudal societies fulfilled their economic needs within and between families, and political and religious institutions. In this society, prices would largely be determined by state or church rules, and the market itself did not determine what would be produced, who would run production and who would appropriate the surplus (Phillips, 2003:10). However, with the specialization of economic functions and the rise of capitalism, responsibility for the allocation of goods, services and wages was given to the market (market economy); the market became 'free'/self-regulating (Phillips, 2003:11). What can be taken from this new market 'freedom' is the inevitable worsening of unequal situations because there is no regulation to ensure fair access and distribution. More than the free-market, capitalism is an economic system that is characterized by the private ownership of the means of production (machinery, factories, tools), used to provide goods and services and produce wealth (Phillips, 2003:14). The underlying guiding principle of capitalism is to achieve the highest profits from the lowest costs (Goldberg, 2009:331). From this guiding principle, one can sense the potential for exploitation by those with more power, since they would be ensuring the highest profits for themselves by paying labourers as little as possible.

Further to this, the logic of capitalism itself is contradictory because it requires businesses to maximize profits, and workers to maximize their wages. The consequence for labour relations is tension between workers who own their labour power and capitalists who own the means of production (Marsh, 2013:129). Whereas capitalists gain their power from access to economic resources and their capacity

³³ Mercantilism was popular during the 1400s-1800s and encouraged the idea that the state should have absolute power. It supported ruling monarchs and aristocratic classes, and sought to build up national power through economics (labour/national resources) rather than citizen military service (Peet and Hartwick, 25-6)

for political influence, workers gain their power from collectively uniting (Marsh, 2013:129-130).³⁴

From this understanding, I believe the basics of inequality become evident, since there will always be a class-conflict in which capitalists ultimately gain, ensuring that capitalism continues to function and employ laborers. I say this because without capitalist wealth, labourers would not be employed, and so to ensure the capitalist system continues to function, capitalists need to make profits and accumulate wealth by cutting costs, one of which could be through labour wages. In addition, as capitalists have more power in terms of money and political sway than labourers, surely any political demands for policies and an environment that enables profit maximization would trump labourer demands for just/higher wages, thereby ensuring capitalist wealth and re-affirming their power. From this, I believe an important question arises with regards to colonialism, if capitalism is a two-tier system, what then are the implications of Europeans being the capitalists during colonization? Whose wealth is secured, and at what cost to others? In answering these question, it helps to situate the emergence of economics as a body of knowledge first.

Overall, economic ideas formed through the philosophical framework of Western scientific rationalism, and much like science, economics is held in high regard for ability to speak ‘truths’ because of its logical formulations and advanced mathematical methods (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:23-4). As a body of knowledge that determines economic relations, functions and distributions, and therefore has consequences life chances and self-determination, it is especially important to note the ways in which the subjectivity of economics may be taken for granted. As previously outlined, scientific rationalism was the product of (white) European interpretations and values and was contrasted to (racialized) non-European ways of knowing. By the perception of economics’ ‘truth’ and ‘logic’ we can also note the influence of European modernity in shaping its meaning and value, but this time specifically with regards to wealth. As modernity conquered the world by reason and objective/universal truths, and

³⁴ Much like racial conflicts, class conflicts take shape according to their contexts and time periods (Marsh in Ry, 129-130)

economics aligns with these standards, then one has to consider the unwarranted power of economics in shaping the way people think about the economy and wealth, and what the expectations are for participation/success within it; especially if we consider that ‘real’ knowledge was only located in Europe and that ‘truths’ gained their influential power from the experts that claimed them to be so. As such, the field of economics can be regarded as a subjective creation that functions to advance the modern project/goals, therefore indirectly maintaining the privilege and superiority of European epistemologies.

Thus, that profit maximization is the sole concern of modern economics under capitalism should be recognized as a subjective goal determined under a Eurocentric, modernist framework. Under economics, profit becomes a way to organize society and there is little regulation to ensure fair distribution or inclusion. However, this is seen as natural and guided by rational economic logic and objective ‘truth’, ignoring the roots of this logic; that is, who produced this knowledge, who verifies this knowledge and the purpose it serves (privilege). This will have consequences for racialized immigrants examined in Chapter 2.

Although generally people perceive the political-economic world we live in as a given, as a natural progression of a market economy (Phillips, 2003:2), we need to recognize how this develops and what other influences there are that shape, or enable it. Like other social fields, economics is highly subjective (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:23-4), and does not exist independent from their material and ideational contexts (14). Economics is specifically formulated with the influence of political and other beliefs, thereby making it non-neutral (23-4). That is, economics and political/ social/ cultural ideas are related rather than independent, and function by shaping and informing each other; this process is complex and intertwined. Settler colonization is a good example this of this overlap, since colonization itself was a political project that sought economic gains. It was political in the sense that it involved the assertion of political power/sovereignty and legitimacy to conquer and dispossess. This naturally effected the social organization of society since (white) Europeans conquered Aboriginals and divided

the space and resources as such. This was also complimented by religious and biological rationales in play at the time, which inferiorized people of colour and legitimized their domination. Settler colonization was also economic because the motivation for colonization was European economic growth and stability since they needed to invest extra capital, and then pursued colonial resource extraction and later settlement.

Having situated the functions and meanings of capitalism and economics, the specific economic arrangements under the global colonial order can be analyzed more closely. As an imperial system, colonialism was able to spread across the whole world in the age of capitalism (Omi & Winant, 1986:39); simultaneously, the establishment of colonial rule was imperative to acquiring natural resources and manpower/labour to foster capitalist international trade that ignited during early modernity (Osterhammel, 1997:71). From this we see the positive relationship between colonialism and capitalism in that both enabled European gains across the globe. Evidence of this is that during the key colonial period, 1400s-1800s, all nations and territories had been allotted a place in the modern world order (Omi & Winant, 1986:39). This inevitably racialized order assigned populations particular economic functions related to, their local resources, ability to resist, geographic location, cultural similarity to Europe, and capacity to contribute to the prosperity of Europe (Walker, 2009:5; Satzewich, 1998:38).

Another important part of this colonial-economic order was also the commodification of racialized people through slavery. Colonizers around the world were able to create a global network through which cheap labour (slaves) could be provided to other colonizers. Recall that in Canada, colonizers imported slaves from Africa, the West Indies and the U.S., which were other colonized countries.

Through the establishment of such an economic order it is evident that European needs were at the center of all concerns. In terms of resources and labour, Europeans were able to accumulate their wealth through the oppressive system of colonialism; since colonialism necessitated political

domination, it was easier to dictate and impose an economic system that also functioned in their favour. In answer to the questions I posed earlier, the implication of colonizers being the capitalist class in the two-tier system, is that all others were designated as the laboring class. European's were able to secure and gain wealth, and therefore maintain dominance and privilege, *through* the exploitation of others. But what must be emphasized about this exploitation is that, under European colonization, it was against people of colour. That is, a racialized capitalist system emerged where white wealth was secured at the cost of the racialized. In addition, because colonialism spread across the world, it can be said that Europeans held power globally creating a rather unified system of European dominance and racial inferiority.

What is most interesting to note is that it is precisely the rise of European power, enabled by, the expropriation of natural resources from other areas, and the growth/ development of European life by way of new raw materials, cheap labour and new markets, that characterizes modern globalization (Goldberg, 2009:329).³⁵ In other words, this new form of global connectedness spurred by colonization, is specifically recognized for the racialized exploitation of most of the world under the age of capitalism, that sought and achieved European wealth; places across the world were now more connected than ever, but through an oppressive system (colonialism) that was premised on the superiority of (white) Europeans. The complexity is evident here, because achieving something on a global scale is no easy task. However it is remarkable that the political system of colonialism was able to shape and benefit from the capitalist economic system on a global scale, and that this combination of systems was coherently organized by race. This is particularly noteworthy, because in Canada today, our capitalist system functions much the same way, where racialized people are generally exploited and excluded in comparison to whites, although now under the organization of the nation-state rather than colonialism.

³⁵ Unlike others, this globalization was able to stretch across the globe and seriously transformed the world (Goldberg, 2009:329).

In this vein, racial conception and its exploitative ramifications were inherent to this global connectedness (Goldberg, 2009:12). It needs to be acknowledged that the understanding of race was still rooted in science and biology at this time, and so it was widely accepted by Europeans that the white race was superior to all others. This perhaps rationalized economic exploitation of racialized peoples across the world, in addition to the general need to invest capital and accumulate wealth. That colonization had such a far reach also means that colonial ideology of domination and white normativity spread to the very countries where racialized immigrants in Canada come from today (ex-colonized); it is these people who are also most exposed to unemployment and low income in Canada, contributing to racialized poverty. This point is important to my argument because it establishes a commonality between all colonial projects, despite the fact that they all unfolded in different ways particular to their context: the supremacy of white Europeans versus racialized people. This means almost all people have been exposed to, or are familiar with these systems of domination and exploitation and have historically been regarded as inferior by Europeans vis-a-vis white Europeaness. Simply put, most, if not all, (racialized) non-Europeans have been historically devalued in terms of their knowledge, values, morality and culture.

In this chapter, I have tried to show how colonialism was global in its reach, having consequences for race-relations and economic exploitation that favors white European wealth. I have shown how the belief nature, God and the ‘civilizing’ mission under theology, was replaced science, progress and rationality under modernity, and that the common thread between them was: the conceptualization and perception of people of colour as inferior- intellectually and morally- and consequently, or additionally, economically as well. That is, throughout changes in ideology, race had remained an organizing principle that determined participation and outcomes. It is my interest in the next chapter to identify the ways in which this historic relationship between whites and racialized people, based on modern values, has continued to impact Canadians under the political formation of the nation-state, which followed the colonial state. Selected topics will demonstrate the ways in settler

colonization has implicated the Canadian narrative of a white ‘us’ and a racialized ‘them’, and has consequences for political, social and economic participation.

V.POST-COLONIZATION

There are those that argue that civilization has moved passed modernity and that we are now in a post-modern era. For some post-modernity can indicate an analytic framework that critiques the values and ideas that modernity was based on. A post-modern analytic frame is premised on the belief that there is no universal reason or philosophy of progress, since there are several different ways of knowing and being that cannot be judged against universal standard, because such a standard does not exist (Giddens, 1990:46; Mouzelis, 2008). For others, post-modernity refers to an era, although there is no agreement that we are in an era after modernity, or when it began (Rattansi, 1998:22). Post-modernity here is characterized by the values of liberty, diversity and tolerance, where consumer choice and market functions are the primary concerns of these values (Bauman, 1991). In this way, postmodernity means moving away from modern institutions towards new structures of social order (Giddens, 1990:46). Central to my research is the assumption that we are not in a post-modern era. Instead, the values we as a society hold, in addition to the structures that we function under and within, are all based on modern values of reason, progress, the individual and freedoms/rights. The examples that will be used to illustrate this assumption are, the theorization and institution of the nation-state, and its subsequent social and economic philosophies and policies, such as immigration, colorblindness/racelessness, multiculturalism, and neoliberalism. Through the logic and values of each of these with regards to the conceptualization of people of colour, it will be shown how European modern epistemology has endured since the colonial era, and remained the dominant framework for understanding and organizing. Under post-colonization, I will analyze: the change in the political configuration from colonization to the nation-state, often referred to as decolonization; the process of nation-building and economic growth through racialized immigration; the emergence of new ideologies

for Canadian identity and racial meanings, such as colorblind/racelessness and multiculturalism, that propose the end of racial discrimination and equality between the races; the implementation of modern, neoliberal economics and the implications this has for inequality; and finally the impact of the political and social structures under the nation-state in the distribution of racialized poverty and racialized income disparity.

The Nation-State and De-Colonization

Decolonization is widely accepted as the transfer of powers from a (settler) colonial state, to a self-governing successor state (national self-determination). However, serious problems arise when the successor state is actually the (settler) colonial state (Veracini, 2010:105). The creation of the Canadian nation-state in 1867 marked a significant political re-configuration of colonial rule in Canada; it is a re-configuration because it was the political *unification* of colonial provinces (Mackey, 2009:22) rather than the *disintegration* of their power. As we have seen, colonial power was historically oppressive and violent, where between the 1600s and 1800s racialized people in Canada and across the world were dominated and exploited for European wealth and privilege. If the nation-state is premised on the same typology of power (colonial) then this sets the tone for the kind of society that will form under the nation-state, with regards to who the dominant/inferior classes are and the values and standards that society will be governed by.

Since the establishment of the nation-state marked a transfer of European colonial power from the political organization of colonialism to the nation-state, and given that today we continue to exist under the political institution of this nation-state,³⁶ I think it is imperative to analyze: the historical theorization of the nation-state and the principles upon which it was founded; its symbolism of independence and autonomy from the colonial state; the social structures that have shaped, and been

³⁶ That is, we live within the boundaries of a territory called Canada that has its particular laws, customs and values, with an identity that is characterized as Canadian.

shaped by the formation of a Canadian national identity; and the economic system and principles that allow Canada to prosper as a nation. I have chosen to organize my analysis chronologically in order to map the changes in political, social and economic structures after 1867, and set a better context through which to critically examine racialized poverty today. Further to this, I believe that the concept and formation of the nation-state is a good starting point, because it is through the political nation-state that social structures and economic life is governed and unfolds.

As outlined in the previous chapter, there were three global effects of colonialism: the spread of European domination and superiority, worldwide racialization, and an exploitative economic system through which Europeans gained. However, it also had a more profound global effect that has lasting consequences today: universalizing the European idea of the nation-state (Osterhammel, 1997:67). It was during the 1400s that Europe's first instituted the concept and configuration of nation-states, while at the same time pursuing expansion through conquest. Whereas before in Europe, pieces of land were owned independently by feudal lords and monarchs, a shift occurred whereby European monarchs sought to define and delineate their territories by the use of new military technologies in war (Norrie, Oworm & Emery, 2007:5). As will be discussed later, it was also European elites that pushed for the establishment of the Canadian nation-state, which then shaped the distribution of power and the established terms of inclusion, socially and economically.

It is deceptive to refer to settler colonization in the past tense because although colonial projects were initiated in past centuries, "the effects are permanent and the process is still current" (Bateman & Pilkington, 2011:2). Such an analysis stems from the recognition that, the current treatment of Aboriginals as second class citizens and the denial of their ability to reclaim land and resources (Foley, 2011:2-3), is reflective of a historical denial of power and sovereignty rooted in settler colonization. Furthermore from the perspective of Aboriginals, not only have settler colonizers never left back to their home country (Foley, 2011: 2-3), but Aboriginals are also still living within the bounds of the state that was formed by settlers (Veracini, 2010:104). What is implied by this is that, if decolonization/nation-

state signified a retraction of the colonial state³⁷, then at some level this should have involved the reinstatement of Aboriginal sovereignty and power to define and control their territory, resources and political and social structures. Interestingly, this consistent denial reaffirms the goals and foundation of settler projects that were founded on the principle of *terre nullius*. As such, Veracini (2010) argues that Aboriginals have always been denied any state-making capability and have never been eligible for sovereignty (104-5). From the institution of the nation-state and the transfer of powers from one political configuration of the other, there was thus no recognition by those in power, of the ways in which this power was established and maintained. That is, there is no acknowledgment that oppression and domination enabled and strengthened European power and privilege. If this unequal power dynamic is ignored, then it makes sense that the society that forms from this may also be rooted in the superiority of Europeans and the exclusion of racialized others. This will then have consequences for racialize peoples' meaningful participation, and inclusion in society.

Another point that emphasizes the endurance and superiority of European power through the nation-state is that, within the settlement organization of power, sovereignty gets negotiated within, rather than outside of the state/territory (Veracini, 2010:105). In other words, power and legitimacy was always negotiated within by an internal conflict between external others and indigenous peoples. Because sovereignty is negotiated within, the two sovereignties (settler/indigenous) are seen to be intrinsically incompatible, and dialectically opposed (Veracini, 2010:105). The effect of this dialectic relationship on the formation of the independent nation-state is that, it can only be one or the other that claims power and legitimacy. However, since settlement was made successful through the oppression and de-legitimization of Aboriginals, which strengthened European power and dominance, then at the moment when the nation-state was being formed, it was only (white) Europeans that were eligible to

³⁷ This retraction is by the succession of the colonial state by an independent state.

claim this new state. Just as the exclusion of Aboriginals and the denial of their sovereignty was central to the realization of settlement, so too was it central to the realization of the nation-state.

And so, the irony of ‘decolonization’: because of the denial of sovereignty for indigenous peoples, ‘decolonization’ signals the effective continuation and maintenance of colonizing practices and the solidified loss of indigenous autonomy (Veracini, 2010:105). Rather than these (state) institutions operating to oppose the continuation of colonial structures and functions, they effectively perpetuate their values and premises (Veracini, 2010:109; Gillen & Ghosh, 2007:125-6). Subsequently, state culture is ‘derivative’ (Gillen & Ghosh, 2007:125-6).³⁸ This recognition is especially important to my research because it is through nation-state ideologies and policies, such as immigration, multiculturalism and colorblindness, that racialization continues to occur and by which white normativity and privilege is perpetuated. It is by the establishment of the nation-state, dominated by colonial Europeans, that the unequal racial dynamics established through colonization become officialized. This effectively maintains the (white) settler society, and thus its racial understandings and exclusions after ‘decolonization’. So long as the nation-state formation endures, so too will its discriminatory, European supremacist ideals. From these critiques, decolonization can be understood as subjective and defined by Europeans to match their goals of continued power and wealth.

Another aspect of decolonization that continues such colonial racial exclusion and its values relates to modernity. Although the creation of the independent nation-state posed direct opposition to colonial domination, it simultaneously endorsed the philosophical tenets of modernity on which colonial domination was based. These included European enlightenment ideas such as rights and freedoms, equality and constitutional self-government (Gillen & Ghosh, 2007:125-6).³⁹ And so, the very values that informed, shaped and defined the nation-state were the same values that were established by

³⁸ For these reasons, I refer to the creation of the nation-state as independence and not decolonization, because it was through the creation of the nation-state that European legitimacy and supremacy was preserved.

³⁹ The significance of the relationship between the nation-state, human rights and racial discrimination in modern era will be discussed further under heading, New Philosophies of Race.

Europeans that were used to inferiorize, oppress and exploit racialized others. However, as outlined previously, these values were based on European ways of knowing and functioned to fulfil and advance European conceptualizations of ‘modernity’ and progress, and ultimately European power and wealth, against the ‘traditional’. More to this point is that the values and morals of modernity were dialectically defined against people of colour and to the privilege of Europeans. Therefore, the ideological foundation and values of the nation-state are in keeping with the modernist project, and its racially exclusionary principles. That these subjective values were solidified and universalized through the nation-state, means that the institutions that formed from this are also predicated on the same subjective epistemology. This relationship provides the foundation from which to critically assess the access to, and outcomes for racial Canadian belonging and participation.

Moreover, the very notion of independence was itself seen as a natural ‘progression’ and moving forward from colonial rule, which was also in keeping with the modernist philosophies of progress (Veracini, 2010:113). Though this progress of moving forward from colonial rule can be conceptualized as a form freedom (from colonial rule), such progress does not imply the freedom and inclusion of racialized people; it simply means moving forward with the modernist project and its goals. But as we saw before, who defines modernity and progress? And who are the ones seen as having the correct values (reason, ‘real’ knowledge) to fulfill and meet modernity’s goals? The answer to these questions is inevitably (white) Europeans. This complex relationship between modernity and the nation-state underscores the pervasiveness of European epistemology in shaping the organization and understanding of society.

Through this analysis of the relationship between the nation-state and colonial/modernist ideologies, it has been made apparent that the formation of the nation-state maintained the relative, and discriminatory philosophy that influenced colonial rule, and legitimized (white) settler authority/power over others. Strong evidence of this is that the sovereignty of colonial states was transferred from European colonial governments, to governments that were, and still are today, dominated by (white)

Westernized elite who had actually spearheaded the movement for independence (Gillen & Ghosh, 2007:75). That it was European elites who pushed for and gained independence implies that (European) modern values were the basis for structural changes and that they were transferred into the new state. Since it is, and always has been Europeans who hold the power in Canada, it is unexpected that social and political norms and standards, with regards to people of colour, would change much through independence. Since settlement colonization, it has been (white) European settlement successors, using the European modernist framework for understanding, who have been defining social and political structures and delineating the terms for inclusion and belonging.

One such example of this control is through immigration policies and patterns that have contributed to the growth of Canada and defining who Canadians are. Whereas between 1800 and 1900, the early colonial state was characterized by secularism, bureaucracy and military power (Osterhammel, 1997:67) concerned with territory and boundaries, this later shifted when the colonial-state evolved to become a nation-state, and this territory was now seen as belonging to a particular ethnic group (68). But what are the implications for ‘racialized’ belonging if Canada has never ceased to be a white settler society? What are the implications if those in power, who define belonging and therefore economic status, are white, modernist-project idealists?

Historically, Canada has always relied on immigration to build its nation, and to support its labour market (Galabuzi, 2001:3; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:259; Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2008:48; Boyd & Vickers, 2004:270; Trumper & Wong, 2007:153). However, as Mackey (2009) notes, immigration is about more than just nation-building and providing labor because it is also a manifestation of a political idea about who can be included for residency and citizenship and afforded its entitlements and rights (24). If we accept this representation, then we need to be cognizant and critical about who Canada has historically defined as suitable and worthy of its citizenship and rights (inclusion, livelihood, participation). This will be especially relevant to the analysis of racialized poverty, since a large majority of the racialized poor in Canada are immigrants (citation); that is, those now granted

immigration to Canada face similar exploitative and deleterious conditions as before, without full realization of the rights they have now been granted through immigration. Therefore, I want to map the history of immigration with regards to race, and the ideological principles that guided immigration policy and patterns.

Bannerji problematizes the concept of ‘Canada’ as a whole with regards to the idea of belonging. She argues that Canadian nationalism is born out of the success of the ideology of white supremacy, that began during conquest when settlers were anxious/fearful of ‘others’. These apprehensive feelings legitimized the categorization of ‘others’ as aggressors and as inferiors, who were to be handled by genocide, repression and domination (Bannerji, 2000:107). Noting that Canada is a construction made up of certain representations, particular forms of political and cultural communities and their actions, she argues that white ideology was the common basis upon which communities were first created (Bannerji, 2000:64).⁴⁰ Such communities formed in accordance with specific ideas about skin colour, history, language (English/ French) and other cultural aspects that can be included under the conceptual category of ‘white’; the result is the conflation of whiteness (by way of Europeaness) and Canadianness (Bannerji, 2000:64).

From immigration patterns and policies, it can be argued that immigration helped maintain a white society through, selective white inclusion for citizenship, and the import of cheap racialized labour since the inception of the nation-state. Though Canada has always relied on immigration, in the past, and stemming from colonial conquest, Canada had relied on and welcomed immigration from (white) Europe alone (Norrie, Owsram & Emery, 2007:xxi; Galabuzi, 2001:13; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:262). Specifically, immigration became a big concern for Canada during the late 1800s (Henry et

⁴⁰ This is consistent with the previously outlined fact that building homogenous, settler enclaves provided the very basis for nation-building (Osterhammel, 1997:6). If we recall, homogenous enclaves were only enabled through the extermination and suppression of aboriginals which thereby created ‘space’ for (white) settler societies to grow and claim ‘indigeneity’. This status allowed them to exercise legitimacy/authority/control over the land and its peoples – its nation, and this new white society was maintained through (white) selective immigration policy.

al, 2000:78-9; Norrie, Owram & Emery, 2007:xxi), where in response to high labour demands, the government actively sought white immigrants, including British, Americans, Italians, Ukrainians and other Europeans, to settle and farm the land (Henry et al, 2000:78-9). Hence it was settlement and economic concerns that drove immigration at first. Soon after this, in 1910 there existed an immigration list of 'preferred' countries that arranged white countries in a hierarchical order (Henry et al, 2000:78-9).⁴¹ From this, it is notable that soon after the establishment of the nation-state, immigration was overtly structured to benefit whites and exclude people of colour. At this time, biological theories of race were still prominent, meaning that the white race was perceived by Europeans as being innately superior and advanced in comparison to people of colour. This being said, one cannot underplay the fact that there was a white hierarchy as well that held eastern and southern Europeans as the most inferior Europeans in comparison to other whites. However, by the total exclusion of people of colour from immigration, this hierarchy still places all whites above all people of colour, and so I still believe it reinforced the superiority of whites over racialized people. From this, it can be concluded that the beginnings of the Canadian nation were in keeping with (white) European superiority, and subsequently resulted in the formation of a Canadian nation that was defined by and limited to whiteness. Thus, from its inception, Canadian society was organized around race and purposefully sought to form and maintain a white settler society. Moreover, if immigration is a representation of who is worthy of Canadian rights and inclusion/participation, then it is evident that at first, only whites were seen as acceptable and worthy. I believe this sets to context for the terms of acceptance of racialized people in the decades that follow this, and ultimately for understanding racialized poverty. As I will argue in the final section of this chapter, the exploitation of people of colour today is consistent with the historical racialized exploitation from colonization through to early nation-state immigration.

⁴¹ The hierarchical order was: British, U.S., north/west Europe, central/east Europe and then southern Europe (Henry et al, 2000:78-9).

Although immigration was largely restricted to whites, this is not to say that people of colour were not also brought to Canada. However, the terms of their inclusion differed greatly from their white counterparts, since people of colour were only sought to provide the cheap labour European capitalists required (economic), rather than to build the nation (identity). Historically, Canadian capitalists have favored racialized, or inferiorized white workers, such as from South East Europe, for manual work like agricultural, industrial, infrastructure, railway, and domestic work (Trumper & Wong, 2007: 152). Though both whites and people of colour were subject to these kinds of labour, immigrants from Europe were considered 'free' labour in that they were not coerced or forced to immigrate and work,⁴² whereas racialized labour from Africa and Asia was imposed and functioned under coercive contracts that severely restricted their freedom, mobility and ability to earn adequate wages (Dunk, 1998:219).⁴³ This association between race and exploitation indicates that, since racialized people were regarded as inferior, it was acceptable to designate them to taxing, low-skill labour. Building on this, though Chinese, Japanese and South Asians entered Canada by the late 1800, early 1900s, all were regarded as inferior in comparison to whites and were subject to economic exploitation, earning lower wages than whites (Henry et al., 2000:72-77). This is particularly intriguing. While on the one hand, people of colour were allowed to enter Canada and help grow the economy, much like the inclusion of Aboriginals for their skills and knowledge of the fur trade, on the other hand, this inclusion was premised on exploitation (cheap labour) and still maintained a racial hierarchy wherein whites gained privilege and wealth. This is evident through the disparity in pay, where whites were rewarded more than people of colour, simply for being white. What is most interesting about this differential in income is that it persists today!

⁴² Although, it should be noted that European immigrants may have leaving political/religious persecution, or economic challenges (Dunk, 1998:219), indicating that European discrimination was not only against racialized people, but other Europeans that were of a different class, or had different values and beliefs.

⁴³ This form of labour can be characterized as bonded labour, or debt slavery (Dunk, 1998:219)

These kinds of racialized labourers can be classified as guest-work, which is characterized by flexibility, and “just-in-time” (Trumper & Wong, 2007:151) availability to meet immediate shortages of labour. What must be noted is that, for European capitalists this form of work is advantageous because it meets their need for manpower in order to allow their businesses to function to create wealth. However, from the perspective of the racialized labourer, this form of work is unfavourable because of its insecurity and dependence (Trumper & Wong, 2007:151). Given this dynamic, I believe it is the same system of inequality and racialized capitalist gains/wealth that Canada functions under today. If we recall, racialized people are the one most exposed to precarious work, and so they are still the ones exploited for (European) capitalist gains; it is through this, among other things, that racialized poverty arises. Thus, under the two-tier capitalist system, it is clear that Europeans wealth was able to grow at the expense of racialized people.

Another point worth mentioning is that, while racialized people were being brought to Canada for exploitation in the labour market, there were simultaneously various laws and regulations that purposefully, and overtly discriminated against them. One example of this is that, at the time when thousands of Chinese guest-workers were recruited, the first anti-Chinese immigration law passed and imposed a head tax on Chinese men (Henry et al, 2000:78-9; Boyd & Vickers, 2004:263), while totally excluding women and children. There were also several other racist laws in the time after that including, taxes imposed on South Asians, and restrictions that permitted entry only to those who arrived directly from other places resulting in the exclusion of Asians and East Indians until after World War II (Henry et al, 2000:78-9).

By 1952, the government had exclusive authority to restrict immigration on grounds such as, ethnicity, customs, habits, and perceived incapacity to assimilate (Henry et al, 2000:80). To me, this power of discretion makes it easier for Europeans to establish a society that matched European ideals and values, by defining the terms of inclusion, and by outlining who is worthy of belonging and Canadian rights/entitlements. That is, who is allowed to participate in Canada and form its nation. It is

clear by the idea of assimilation, that (white) European was the norm and standard used to judge the acceptability of others, and therefore privileged European ways of being and knowing as the 'correct' ways. Furthermore, I think that zero-sum dualism is again apparent here since potential immigrants were classified into two groups- those like (white) Europeans, and those non-alike. Through this classification, an attempt was made to establish who had the capacity to meet European norms and endorse European values and ways.

It was not until 1967 that immigration policy changed to be race-neutral, and admitted people for labour on a points-based system that considered job training, experience, skills, education, knowledge of local languages and demand for occupation, effectively allowing the entry of people from places such as Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America and Africa (Henry et al., 2000:81). This is not to say that racial discrimination did not exist just because the policy became overtly race-neutral; discrimination persisted in other ways (Simmons, 1998:88).⁴⁴ Despite the introduction of neutral policy, what ought to be recognized is that it was only once European immigration interest in Canada declined, did Canada open its doors to racialized people so that population and economy could continue growing (Henry et al., 2000:83; Galabuzi, 2001:13; Fleras & Elliot, 2000:262).

Thus, it is clear by immigration patterns and policy, that race was a determining factor for social and political inclusion and economic status. Though immigration was largely restricted to whites until 1967, people of colour were inferiorized by whites and economically exploited for white gains. The effect was the maintenance of European supremacy and dominance from settler colonization into the establishment of the settler, nation-state. Assuming that the nation-state creation was itself consistent with modernity and European values and goals, and that independence marked only the continuation of

⁴⁴ Examples of continued racial discrimination are, the acceptance of non-white, female domestic workers who are paid low wages under contract work, in addition to selective acceptance of immigration forms by Caribbean immigration officials (Simmons, 1998:88). Another way this discriminated against people of colour was that the new points-based system effectively restricted immigration to wealthier people, who were highly educated, and could speak English or French (Trumper & Wong, 2007: 154), thereby excluding a large group of workers whose occupations do not require high skills and formal training (166).

a settler society, then the notion of the nation is inherently embedded with (white) Europeaness as the norm, both in its ideology and its social fabric. Though there was a clear preference for whites in immigration, it was only when this preference could no longer meet the needs of the economy- ie, capitalist gains, that Canada adjusted its policy to ensure its continued function. I am therefore critical of this racial inclusion, since it was largely encouraged by economic concerns, rather than a de-racialized understanding of people for inclusion into the nation. With the increasing numbers of people of colour in Canada it can be argued that Canada has evolved from this exclusion from citizenship/ inferiorizing conceptualization of racialized people. Against this argument, I will now try to highlight the ways in which Canada is still a white settler society in which people of colour are upheld against a standard of whiteness (Europeaness), through the philosophies of colorblind/racelessness and multiculturalism. It is through these conceptualizations, and their interplay in the economy that racialized economic exclusion persists despite neutral laws of immigration and equality.

New Philosophies of Race

In addition to immigration, I find it necessary to analyze the guiding epistemologies and frameworks for the conceptualization of race in Canada because this sets the context for racialized exclusion in the labour market. By analyzing the social structures and meanings of race, the complexity of processes that contribute to racialized poverty today can be more properly understood. This is because, although capitalism itself does not contain principles that are inherently racist, for example capitalists and labourers of all 'races' exist, it is through the context of colonialism and slavery that race remains a prominent factor in determining work and labour (Trumper & Wong, 2007:152). In this way, though capitalism's principles and values are not themselves directly racialized, they have been racially implemented and distributed resulting in racialized poverty. To me this disconnect is indicative of a broader norm/ pattern, that can be more fully understood by analyzing the racialized social structures

and orders that function in society. Specifically, these social structures function under the nation-state and define the social-scape/'nation' of Canada indicting who is acceptable and under what terms.

The values of freedom and human rights were derived out of modernity and progress, and as the nation and evolved, new laws were introduced to ensure that all peoples were regarded as equals and were protected from discrimination. In the decades after World War II, when biological theories of race were abandoned, and the racialized population in Canada began to grow, Canada went through a process of 'de-racialization', illustrated by the introduction of legal human rights protection in the form of the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, the Employment Equity Act, and the Multiculturalism Act (Li, 1998:118). As a result of these new laws of equality many believe that we now live in a post-racial or colorblind/raceless society, where 'race' no longer exists or matters. However, though these laws were great feats in the advancement of human rights for racialized groups, and indeed all people, the fact remains that racism still persists (Li, 1998:118). To me, this contradiction is telling of a larger structure and social order at play that maintains a racial hierarchy/white normativity *despite/or through* neutral laws of equality. Thus, while attempting to foster inclusion and equality between whites and people of colour through new laws and by the changing social-scape of Canada, an unequal racialized power dynamic is maintained in terms of language that is used and in terms of who has the power to define the terms of inclusion and equality in the Canadian nation-state. Specifically from the examples of colorblindness/ racelessness and multiculturalism, I will show how Europeans have continued to use the epistemology and values of modernity to define racial meanings, and therefore racial belonging in society, and that it is centered around a white normative standard. Thus though these new legal principles are supposed to create an equal, diversity-inclusive society, they do so in such a way that upholds white superiority of the settler society turned nation-state.

In deconstructing the racialization of Canada and Canadian poverty, it helps to analyze the language used. As Bannerji argues, the language we choose to articulate our political agency matters, because such language is "a bit of ideology" that represents how things/people are conceptualized and

understood (Bannerji, 2000:33). Furthermore with regards to Canada, she asserts that the dominant cultural language maintains an (white) 'us' and (racialized) 'them' ideology, evidenced by designations such as minority/sub/multi-culture (Bannerji, 2000:107), and the use of the term colorblind. From this, it can be concluded that Canadian society, although now free and equal, continues to problematize and inferiorize people of colour, which I believe makes it possible or acceptable to distribute economic inequality on racial terms- racialized poverty.

One way of understanding the persistence of racialization is by analyzing the transformation in the bodies of knowledge around 'race'. Superseding biological (naturalist) theories of race, was the perspective of racial historicism, which views non-Europeans as historically behind, or 'immature' / primitive in comparison (Goldberg, 2009: 18), rather than innately inferior. This new conception of race however, exemplifies the persistence of the European, modernist dichotomy between modernity and tradition, thus implying that European/western cultures and values are still the base measurement of worth and progress against which people of colour are being judged, and negatively so. By locating racialized people in the past, European dominance is legitimized because they continue to uphold themselves as more advanced, thereby inferiorizing and delegitimizing people of colour. Thus, even though under new immigration policy people of colour were increasingly permitted entry/inclusion into the nation, they were not accepted on the basis of equality, but rather through a pre-established hierarchy that was fueled by a (white) European modernist understanding. Hence, the social order of the nation-state after 'decolonization' continued to be premised on the superiority of (white) Europeans. In this light, race remained an organizing principle, albeit under a different, more 'politically correct' name – culture.

With the decline of naturalist theories, new discriminatory theories emerged in their place and with a shifted focus from biological and racial distinctions to cultural differences/inferiority, termed by theorists as *new racism* (Noivo, 1998:227). This "culturalist" form of racial conceptualization has been broadly applied to all immigrants and their descendants, because of the common perception that

immigrants' culture/values, make them incompatible with the dominant culture (227). Thus, it is the negative judgement of cultural difference, rather than biological difference, which has shaped the understanding of racism today (227). Though race has been seemingly left behind in conceptions of *difference*, the fact remains that in Canada, the dominant culture is a white, European culture, and thus (racialized) non-European cultures are negatively assessed against this. Similar to how theological understandings used religion to name *difference*, yet was ultimately applied against racially different others, cultural theories do not name race as the marker of distinction, yet ultimately apply to people of colour. Therefore, the philosophy of cultural difference masks the historical importance of race as an organizing principle in society and declares race-neutrality, but continues racial discrimination through the consistent normalization of whiteness.

Building on this, Goldberg contends that the logic of racial historicism implies racelessness (Goldberg, 2007:207). To understand this further, one needs to consider the relationship between rationality, the nation-state and racialization. First, the establishment of constitutional law that guaranteed formal, legal equality necessitated the ideology of racelessness in order to declare that all were equals and that race was no longer meaningful (Goldberg, 2007:207).⁴⁵ If, as outlined previously, constitutionalism is characteristic of modernity and progress,⁴⁶ and colorblind human rights are a part of this constitutionalism, it follows that racelessness too is part of modernization and progress (Goldberg, 2007:207). As a result, this formal establishment of racelessness, Goldberg argues, fulfilled the nation-state's need to assert itself as a modern formation in contrast to racialized hierarchies/order during the main colonial period; racelessness exemplified state rationality about race, and so it was through the proclamation of racelessness that nation-states claimed their modernization (208).⁴⁷ As such, the

⁴⁵ To be clear, racelessness is not a policy or legal term. It can be understood as an underlying philosophy of formal equality that holds, everyone is equal without differentiation between personal/cultural characteristics like gender/race

⁴⁶ See Gillen & Ghosh, 2007, 125-6

⁴⁷ That the nation-state 'progressed' from colonial racial discrimination, toward denying the existence of race is hardly doing justice to those historically and systemically excluded and oppressed, nor can it be considered an effort to 'include' the previously excluded races. While it is true that racelessness includes people of colour in the

connection between racial historicism and racelessness is the rational progression away from early modern scientific racialization that was needed to fulfil the nation-states goal to be a modern institution, characterized by modern values (rationality and progress). Whereas first the rationality of race was science, it then became racial historicism/culture and finally evolved into racelessness. Rationality is key here because again, it is relative and falls in line with the dialectically define European framework of knowing. From this progression, I then believe that part of this modernization was ignoring the fact that race has been, and continues to be an organizing principle of society, used to determine privilege and power; through racelessness, the perception is that privilege is no longer based on race.

In this way, the philosophy of racelessness can be seen as an effort to move past racial histories and racist inequalities, without fully acknowledging them and their racialized structures; racial social orders are instantaneously replaced with self-proclaimed race-free/neutral social orders (Goldberg, 2007:217; Mills, 1997:77-8), while ignoring the genealogies and histories that shaped racial exploitation, both nationally and globally (Mills, 1997:77-8). In the context of a continued settler society through the formation of the nation-state, the problem is evident here, because simply declaring all as neutral and 'raceless' does not automatically translate to materialized equality or equal opportunity/access, or provide remedy for the oppressive structures that have been historically shaped by race, and which have since granted Europeans the power and legitimacy to dictate that society is now raceless. In this way I would argue that modernization represents a dis-attachment from colonial history and subsequently the de-legitimization of the real experiences of the oppression and violence that people of colour have suffered.

Beyond racial historicism and racelessness, Goldberg also problematizes the philosophy of colourblindness for its maintenance of white as the standard because the term itself means to not see colour. And since historically whiteness has not recognized itself as a racial colour, colourblindness is

sense that it provides formal equality for all, the structures and values itself are European and are measured against Europeaness, and so result in racial exclusion.

ultimately only concerned with those who are non-white. This philosophy therefore implies that because they are not white, people of colour are a problem, indirectly upholding whiteness as the norm and as the measurement of value and merit (Goldberg, 2007:219).⁴⁸ Thus, although colorblindness proposes to eliminate barriers for racialized people, and purposes to change historic forms of racialization, it fails to do so because it is based on a hierarchy wherein white is still the norm. In addition, it is also through this systemic blindness to colour that whiteness evades any self-recognition as an influential power (Goldberg, 2007:219), in effect, securing their privilege by ignoring that it ever existed.

Unfortunately, this process of defining racialized bodies and their meaning, now colorless and invisible, sounds unpleasantly familiar. As we saw before with the rise of biological theories of race, Europeans praised themselves for having founded a new institution of 'real knowledge' - racial classification (Mignolo, 2011:45), indicating their superiority in knowledge. But such knowledge was invented/conceived by Europeans in a top-down manner and imposed its value and meaning in the organization of society (45). Thus, throughout history, it has been (white) Europeans determining and assigning the meaning and value of bodies of colour, and in turn maintaining the superiority of (white) Europeans. Although these meanings have changed over time, at each point racialized people have been dialectically compared to whites, and often inferiorized. Surely, these new declarations of equality differ from earlier overtly racist conceptualizations and establishes a principle upon which real equality may be founded. However, I have reservations about the practical implementation of this equality since racelessness and colorblindness are premised on white normativity. More than this, the principle of racial equality was not inherent/natural, but was granted and deemed permissible by whites, through a

⁴⁸ Despite the logic of colorblindness, the effect of identifying people on the basis of race remains the same, and so rather than implying the end of racism, exclusion on racial grounds continues (Goldberg, 2007:219). I believe exclusion happens at two levels. The first is through the (white) non-recognition of bodies of colour by the notion of being blind to colour, which implies whiteness as the norm. The second manifests in the principle of formal equality which means treating everyone the same and ignoring the differences in peoples lives (Monture, 2007:201). As outlined earlier, by applying equal standards to unequal contexts, minority needs and experiences are ignored, thereby accelerating discriminatory effects in already unequal contexts (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:154,83; Monture, 2007:201).

modern framework for understanding; rather than appreciating that people of colour have always been equal, they can now only be understood as such because Europeans have deemed them to be. To me, this is equality on white terms.

Another form of racialized philosophy that is supposed to ensure Canadian equality and freedom can be found in the policy of multiculturalism. Unlike colorblindness and racelessness, multiculturalism is an official policy that recognizes the cultural/ethnic diversity in Canada. Interestingly, this policy was instituted in 1971 (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:299), a few years after immigration policy became race-neutral. I therefore find it important to analyze the ideological foundations of multiculturalism and how this governed social relations within the nation-state, at a time when the ‘racial’ composition of Canada changed. I want to be clear that my critique of multiculturalism is not say that multiculturalism is not working.⁴⁹ Rather, I am interested in the ideological basis and formulation of multiculturalism and what this signifies for racialized people in terms of inclusion/exclusion within a white-settler nation-state. Through this I hope to make evident the white standards which are implied and embedded both in its name and its manifestation.

In contrast to the direct and indirect privileging of white-conformity that had historically been the framework for Canadian national identity and nation-building, the introduction of multiculturalism policy in Canada marked a significant development in Canada’s social order by officially recognizing groups that were not from British, French or Aboriginal origins (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2008:49). Overall, multiculturalism serves two broad purposes: first, to allow everyone to identify with whichever culture they choose- so long as it does not infringe on others’ rights or violate any laws- and to be treated the same; and, secondly, to encourage social cohesion (rather than diversity) by authorizing and allowing differences to exist without diminishing their interconnectedness or particularities (Fleras &

⁴⁹ I do not want to imply that I believe multiculturalism is merely a conspiracy, because I do believe that some people of colour/ racialized groups can form resistance and find power through multiculturalism (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:314) in that multiculturalist policy by provides a space for them to participate in society.

Elliot, 2000:315). From this I believe there are two underlying elements at play here: the application of modernist philosophy of equality and rights that governs acceptability of cultural being/acting, and, the omission of any reference of equality and inclusion. I say this because I do not believe cohesion necessitates or implies inclusion; cohesion to me refers to peaceful co-existence, whereas inclusion denotes meaningful participation and access to resources/services in society. Thus although multiculturalism boasts diversity, this diversity is in direct relation to modern values.

It can be argued that multiculturalism policy was an attempt to mitigate, and avoid possible social tensions between different identity groups, because it emerged at a time when Canada saw the animosity between English and French intensifying, in addition to an influx of immigrants from poorer, racialized countries. Simultaneously, Aboriginal claims, which were intensifying over land issues, were also cast to the periphery (Bannerji, 2000:9; see also, Fleras & Elliot, 317), demonstrating another way in which the Aboriginal struggle for sovereignty continued to be de-legitimized and denied, while maintaining settler dominance power. Together, these reflect the point I made earlier that multiculturalism was about peaceful co-existence rather than inclusion, because it was an attempt to avoid tensions rather than bring all peoples together under the banner of the nation and ensure their meaningful participation and prosperity. Peculiarly, the pre-existing ethnic diversity among European immigrants did not result in any form of 'multicultural' policy. It was only once immigration was permitted from racialized countries (China and South Asia especially) and *their* diversity expanded, did it warrant some form of special regulation/recognition (Bannerji, 2000:43). Although this has little to do with the principles of multiculturalism itself, the historical context of its creation hints at the continued problematization of people of colour under the nation-state. That is, the increasing non-white diversity was seen as a concern that needed guidelines for belonging and acceptability within white Canada. This official policy now integrated racialized people into the definition of the 'nation', however this was within limits and based on a white normative standard.

One of the presumptions of multiculturalism is the binary opposition between an (white) anglo-Canadian culture as the central/dominant culture, and, all others who comprise its ‘multiculture’ who must be tolerated (Srivastava, 2007:294-5; Bannerji, 2000:78). In other words, it is an ideology and particular standard of whiteness, that defines and constructs the ‘multi’ culture of *different* others (Bannerji, 2000:78; Srivastava, 2007:294-5). This is similar to racialization where races were created but generally did not consider or include whites. According to Bannerji, people of colour are caught in a catch-22 under multiculturalism. Though by their very presence, they constitute a vital part of the pluralist Canadian nation, this ‘vitality’ is predicated on their *difference*, which illustrates the power that white Canadians have over ‘others’ to establish definitions and the terms of inclusion.⁵⁰ As such, *difference* is officialized and neutralized, and organized by a recognition of diversity in culture and identity rather than race, all whilst ignoring racism and colonial ethnocentrism. Being critical of multiculturalism then, means being aware of the way in which it aims to unite peoples and create a sense of nation-hood through ideology, yet inherently fails to do so because of the power-relations embedded within it that still differentiate between a (white) ‘us’ and an (racialized) ‘them’. Such differentiation is the “legacy” of a white settler society instituted by colonialism, and maintains the essence of domination over people of colour (Bannerji, 2000:97). Simply put, through the formation of the nation-state, racialized ideologies that privilege whites, continue to inform the ideologies for racial inclusion and the social structures and orders that form from this; that is, racialized ideologies continue to shape how people of colour are understood in society, and where they stand in relation to white settlers. Though Canada is diverse and has established laws of equality and racial cohesion, there is ultimately a disconnect between the values it boasts and the ideological basis for these values.

What is perhaps most telling of this policy, is that much like racialization through science and the concepts of colorblind/racelessness, it was also created in a top-down manner and defined by (white)

⁵⁰ Far from being a distinction that is power-neutral, this difference is organized through class, gender and race (Bannerji, 2000:97).

Europeans. Evidence of this is in the fact that multicultural demands were not made by people of colour in Canada; rather, their demands focused on racism, discrimination and adjustment difficulties (Bannerji, 2000:44). Thus, through multiculturalism policy the state effectively transformed social and economic injustices into matters of culture (Bannerji, 2000:44), much in the way that racial historicism changed the meaning of race from nature/biology to culture [‘behind’]. Specifically under multiculturalism, education, cultural exchange, policy change and symbolic gestures are put forward as ways of dealing with social inequality. Absent from these solutions though, is any opposition to racist practices and institutions (Srivastava, 2007:291). This transformation of historically rooted political, socio-economic injustices into matters of culture, transfers the responsibility of equality to the individuals of society, rather than recognizing the political and social structures that have oppressed and marginalized, and created inequality. To shift the blame of inequality/injustice from government institutions and structures onto individuals, but particularly individuals of colour, essentially masks the privilege of those in power who have largely been responsible for of these socio-economic injustices. Through this top-down officialization of cultural differences, whites are again the authority in assigning meaning to people of colour, giving them the name ‘multi-culture’ and again locate whites outside of this classification. Furthermore, it determinately defines coloured peoples’ problems for them and outlines their solutions.

Therefore, while there has been significant change (progress) in the conceptualization of people of colour, these changes have been premised on modern values and understandings. More than this, these changes have lacked the ability to undo, and eliminate the structures of racial privilege that have been historically established, and continue to base ideology on a standard of whiteness. It is also these structures that ultimately influence and shape the economy and the organization of, and distribution of gains within it.

Neoliberalism

From the arguments thus far, I have attempted to illustrate the effects of settler colonization in establishing a sense of white normativity in Canadian society specifically through the nation-state formation and the subsequent policies and social structures that have emerged under it, such as through immigration, and principles of racial equality and non-discrimination. The final piece, having established the political and social context of Canadian society, is to analyze the economic sphere and its relationship to the political and social, and how racialized poverty emerges from this. This section will begin with a brief analysis of the guiding economic theories since colonization, namely neoclassical (neoliberal) and Keynesian economics. From this a critical analysis of neoliberal economics, which governs our economy today, and its relationship to modernity will ensue. I am particularly concerned with how neoliberalism fosters an environment of acceptable inequality and how this hides power and privilege. It is through this, that racialized economic inequality can be situated and more fully understood. Although I am not an economist, and exploring Canadian economics and the economy in any depth is beyond the scope of this paper, I still find it is useful to understand the general functionings and principles of the Canadian economy to establish correlations between economic inequality and race. For the sake of this analysis, economics and the economy will be simplified to some degree.

To be sure, Canada has always been a capitalist country. However there have been different guiding theories of capitalism, namely neoclassical/neoliberal and Keynesian.⁵¹ Both these theories are attempts to establish efficient and productive markets and the best outcomes for society, however their approaches differ greatly. To better understand their differences, it needs to be recognized that capitalism is inherently instable, known by its boom and bust cycles (Phillips, 2003:22); this means a fluctuation between periods of extremely high and low productivity and efficiency. The capitalist

⁵¹ In contrast to the existence of classical economics that focused on macro-economics and concerns for the economy as a whole and long-term growth, from the 1870s onwards neoclassical economics emerged and focused on micro-economics, centered around the individual and individual decisions. It was understood that individuals and their decisions would determine prices, income, wealth and growth through the market (Wolff & Resnick, 2012:15). It is also interesting to note the incorporation of modernity's individualism into economic theory.

system theorized that the sum of all individual consumer and investor decisions would result in market success, however, problems arose when those of the *sum* were not in sync with each other (Phillips, 2003:22).⁵² Under neoclassical economics, it was believed that the market would self-correct in these instances however some were skeptical of this (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:56; Phillips, 2003:121). This was especially so after market failure through The Great Depression in the 1930s (Phillips, 2003:136), marked by the, instability of currencies, decrease in trade, and mass unemployment. From this point, the emphasis on ‘self-correction’ declined and economic stability was sought through government regulation (Norrie, Owram & Emery, 2007:339; Wolff & Resnick, 2012:16). Now under Keynesian economics, government action would stabilize the economy, and provide the social security/stability for citizens through the establishment of social safety nets (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:283; Phillips, 2003:141), with regards to pensions, unemployment insurance, health care, and education. Through this, the citizen-oriented ‘welfare’ state formed (Phillips, 2003:141).⁵³ It was around the mid-1970s, in the face of increased inflation and decreased productivity (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:77), that businesspeople of the neoclassical framework began to critique Keynesian economics, and slowly the idea of government regulation declined as did social spending (Wolff & Resnick, 2012:21-2; Phillips, 2003:141). This revival, and slight adjustment of neoclassical economics is often referred to as neoliberalism (Wolff & Resnick, 2012:336). This resurgence through neoliberalism will be the focus of my analysis because it is in this context that we see racialized poverty on the rise.

Often times, economics is perceived as pure market relations, independent from social, political and economic power (Phillips, 2003:1). Neoliberal economics is one kind understood in this way (Phillips, 2003:vii). However, by limiting analyses to the market, important issues, such as the quality of life, income distribution and the distribution of political power, are missed (Phillips, 2003:1-2). Implied

⁵² An assumption underlying individualism was that all individuals general have equal access to the means through which economic power is gained (Phillips, 2003:27).

⁵³ Keynesian economics also emphasized full employment and evenly distributed incomes (Peet & Hartwick, 2009:283)

by this is that the economy cannot be analyzed fully without consideration of the, distribution of political and economic power, and political and social institutions that it interacts with, and is shaped by (1).⁵⁴ The way neoliberalism will be understood here is as a form of capitalist economics, in line with neoclassical economics, whose policies and ideologies are excessively concerned with profit maximization at any cost, including to the detriment of society at large. At the heart of neoliberalism is, the philosophy of individualism and privatization that has replaced ideas about ‘the public good’, and the advocacy of absolute freedom of capital, goods and services (economic freedom) across and within borders above other (social) concerns. As such, individual interests in profit trump collective/social interests in welfare and enable the private accumulation of wealth in place of its equitable distribution. Through this, what must be recognized is that political arrangements and social relations are increasingly being determined by the likelihood that they will maximize private profits and ensure economic freedom; that is, neoliberalism encourages political and social orders that function to meet certain economic ideas and goals. Neoliberalism has gained momentum particularly since the 1990s, and in the age of rapid globalization has accelerated international trade and investment, and has been able to implement its ideology across the world.

Using this framing, I will analyze the interplay between neoliberalism and its market economy, and the current racialized political and social structures in Canada that emerged from colonization. I am especially interested in the ways in which, a neoliberal understanding of an autonomous market, fosters a labour market that reflects the racialized political and social order, in terms of racialized exclusion from the access to, participation within, and the outcomes of the market. My analysis will unfold in two ways. The first will be a critique of neoliberalism and will show how its policies and principles make economic inequality natural or acceptable. In addition, this critique will de-construct the ways in which neoliberalism is ultimately shaped by modern values of individualism, rationality, freedom and

⁵⁴ Another way of naming this conceptualization is by the term, political economy, defined as “a fusion of economic and political theory into one single social theory” (Phillips, 2003:1)

democracy. Having outlined neoliberalism and its implications, this section will conclude with an overview of the significance of the relationship between modernity and neoliberalism for racialized, economic inequality.

Under the umbrella of neoliberalism, particularly during the 1990s, there was massive global and national economic restructuring, which saw a number of changes: the de-regulation of markets, the reduction of the welfare state, the privatization and subsequent commodification of public goods,⁵⁵ increased migration, emphasis on flexible/contract work, and shifts in labour towards non-standard/multiple jobs and longer hours (Galabuzi, 2009:229), free trade, lower taxes and non-government intervention (Wysong, Perrucci & Wright, 2014:46). Together, these changes demonstrate the centrality of profit maximization through cost-cutting, and the individualization and privatization that it encouraged/needed. At its core, neoliberalism holds that individuals and corporations are rational actors that work to maximize their economic rewards in free markets (Wysong, Perrucci & Wright, 2014:46). Evident from this is that modernity's principles of individuality and rationality continue to be promoted and integrated within society, but here as the premises for economic functions and participation. Though this rationality is universally applicable, I have argued elsewhere that the interpretation of what constitutes rational is European, and that people of colour do not meet these standards. Given that the principles of neoliberalism are in keeping with modernity's values, the question then becomes, what are the implications for non-European people and meaningful economic participation? This will be discussed in detail, below.

Neoliberal economics holds four assumptions at its core: that markets are efficient and democratic institutions, the market is about competition between equals (companies or individuals), people are individual actors in society, and that information is available for everyone in the market, equally (Phillips, 2003:4). However, there are three points to highlight within these assumptions. The

⁵⁵ Public goods here refers to health services, social services, education and the like (Galabuzi, 2009:229)

first is that democracy is a peculiar kind of democracy. It is not the political democracy we imagine of representation and one person-one vote, but instead, democracy is monetized and implies one dollar one vote (Phillips, 2003:4). Thus, money truly is power. Secondly, neoliberalism encourages competition over fairness, and assumes a level playing field for all people to participate in the market. But, this denies the social and political structures, historically established, that have functioned to discriminate against and marginalize certain people in the access to, and participation within the economy. For example, it denies how settler colonization through to formation of the Canadian nation-state was politically, economically and socially dominated by white Europeans, whilst being exploitative and/or exclusionary of people of colour. In other words, assuming a level playing field does not ensure that barriers have been removed for all people to meaningfully participate in the economy. Thirdly, it regards people as individuals in society. Going back, the shift from theology to secularization was about man conquering nature through reason and 'real' knowledge, and individuality I believe was the ultimate proclamation of this. By neoliberalism accepting modernity's individualism, it too assumes the individual can be independent from the social and political contexts in which they are inevitably embedded in and shaped by, whilst simultaneously denying other ways of organizing, such as collectives. This will inevitably have implications for understanding economic inequality and poverty.

Building upon this critique, neoliberalism is also often praised for its ability to encourage and establish freedom. However, as Goldberg notes, this is a particular form of freedom. This freedom, he asserts, is one of flows: of capital, of goods, of services and of information (Goldberg, 2009:332); this is in direct contrast to the positive and negative legal freedoms one would generally associate with socio-economic justice such as: of association, of religion and from cruel punishment to name a few. More importantly, this appeal to freedom is playing on the very values of modernity that characterize progress- constitutionalism, autonomy and rationality. Since capitalism advertises itself as fulfilling modernist goals, it should be recognized that it was then shaped by, and accepting of (European) modern ways of knowing. This not only legitimizes and empowers modern epistemologies once again, but

simultaneously delegitimizes and discounts other (racialized) ways of knowing.

Through neoliberalization, Canadians are regarded less as citizens and more as individuals and customers/consumers (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2008:48), or to phrase it differently, it transformed the idea of citizenship into a market-based citizenship. But the shift towards individualization was also concurrent with the restructuring of the nation-state away from the welfare state in the mid-1970s (Goldberg, 2009: 331). It was in the spirit of the free market that new meanings formed about what is considered 'public' and 'private'; consequently, many services deemed 'public' under the welfare state had become partially or fully privatized (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2008: 48). Despite these changes, it should be noted that neoliberalism does not call for the elimination of the nation-state, but simply a transformation of its priorities towards private interests (Goldberg, 2009:332-3). By modern individualization, a person becomes responsible for their own success and prosperity, and the government is absolved of any responsibility for ensuring society's welfare, or removing the barriers that were put in place throughout history. In this vein, I believe an assumption underlying this philosophy is that individuals are rational actors, and so, through reason, they can determine and follow the steps needed to provide for their own welfare. To me, individualization also complements the goal of profit maximization, because it is through privatization/ reduction of social spending, that profits can be made, which is primarily encouraged by the philosophy of individualization. In addition, I think this correlation between the retraction of the welfare state and individualization is key because it results in a double harm for certain groups of people; since people of colour experience higher rates of poverty and exclusion in the labour market, and since racial politics are entrenched in the marginalization of the poor, then the retraction of the welfare-state not only targets and penalizes the poor, but more than this, it targets people of colour (Mirchandani & Chan, 2008:178).

Such individualization also has consequences for the people who hold the power and define inclusion and social organization of the nation-state. As noted previously, decision makers in Canada have always been majority white (Monture, 2007:199). In their positions of authority, they seek to

portray themselves to as *individual* subjects, with no relation (no social-location) to their history or the history of the country, and who have attained their status and authority by merit rather than privilege (Monture, 2007:199). The consequence of striving to be a neutral, ‘un-located’, if you will, subject, is that there “can be no general right to humanity for all individuals” (Monture, 2007:199). What I understand by this statement is that, if those in power believe they have earned their freedoms/rights, privileges and power, then it reinforces the idea that they have worked to attain that level of authority and privilege, and that others should work harder to do the same. Further, I think there is the assumption that those in power have the right kinds of knowledge and values which grants them this legitimacy/authority and privilege, and that those without such authority are sub-standard and lack the correct values and knowledge. This rationale detaches them from, and ignores the histories of oppression and domination that afforded these (white) groups in power the superiority and power over *different* others. This means, the European elite who gained independence for Canada, and who still hold power today, do not see themselves as successors of white settlers and as a privileged class *because* of colonization. Although the terms of reference for European dominance have changed (religious, science and now culture), how can there be equality and justice for historically exploited people of colour if the ones in power are still claiming the legitimacy of this authority?

I would argue that the most fundamental aspect of individualization is that it attributes economic inequality to individual failures to maximize on opportunities in the market (Galabuzi, 2009:229), rather than structural and systemic discrimination in the access to, and participation within it. In this light, poor blaming is commonplace in explaining and understanding poverty where perceived individual failures such as bad choices, lack of values and bad work ethic are seen as the causes. However, there are many hardworking and educated people who are poor, and this is because they face institutional and structural barriers (Marsh, 2013:128). Perhaps the biggest challenge in adopting a non-individualized understanding of poverty is that our society is understood as a meritocracy (Marsh, 2013:128), though I will argue below, that even this idea is fundamentally subjective. Thus, from this analysis of the

principles of neoliberalism, it can be argued that the beliefs and values we hold as a society allow us to believe that the inequality that exists is fair (Marsh, 2013:138), which sets the context for understanding the acceptability of the exclusion of racialized people in Canada, and the subsequent racialization of poverty.

The individualization of poverty ignores the structural logic of poverty and inequality, and fails to appreciate the beneficiaries of poverty and the stability of poverty in rich societies (Marsh, 2013:128); this highlights the fact that capitalism functions in a zero-sum way *and* provides the framework for it to function as such (rationality, individualization, class divisions/conflict). Firstly, capitalism is unbalanced to begin with because it involves the conflict between the two classes. From this, it can be seen that capitalists are the beneficiaries of poverty, because they can only accumulate wealth by cutting costs, most notably by exploiting others for cheap labour. This relationship is where the reference to the stability of poverty stems from as well; since capitalism requires disparity in wealth for capitalist profit maximization/ accumulation, and this is achieved by cutting costs through exploitation, wealth is secured for the owners of production, and as such, capitalism can continue to function while poverty continues to be generated. This is of course bearing in mind the fact that economics is itself a subjective, modern body knowledge and so profit maximization as way of organizing is not natural, nor is its exploitation inevitable. Thus, that poverty exists, means that it has been created and instituted through by human decisions, and that it has been racialized is no accident.

From this analysis of the logic and policies of neoliberalism, four key connections can be drawn between neoliberalism and modernity. First, neoliberalism is a form of economics, and economics emerged out of western scientific rationalism. Secondly, neoliberalism is based on two guiding principles of modernity, individualism and rationality. However, one has to remember that these principles have been dialectically defined. Despite this, neoliberalism uses these perceived neutral principles, *as* neutral principles for market participation, in order to show its modernization and progress/rationality of economic functions, relations and outcomes (from Keynesian). I say this because,

much like how racelessness/colorblindness showed the rationality of racialization by declaring neutrality and equality, so too does neoliberalism claim the rationality of economic inequality by declaring neutrality and equality. Thirdly, neoliberalism identifies itself as a modern framework since it endorses the modern values of the individual and reason, but also of freedom and democracy. What is interesting to note is that these latter values are characteristic of modern, nation-state constitutionalism. By playing on these values, neoliberalism indirectly maintains and legitimizes this modern formation. This is especially true because neoliberalism does not propose to eliminate the nation-state, but rather modernizes, and changes its function to meet private interests. Moreover, this change in functions symbolizes the rationality of the economy from Keynesian economics, and so the change in the economy constitutes the modern progress of economics. Finally, exploitation under a modern framework is further legitimized. From an early-modern understanding, the capitalist exploitation of people of colour was logical because people of colour were deemed inherently inferior. Today, under a neoliberal framework, it is still logical to exploit people of colour through capitalism, because it claims that this exploitation is unrelated to their 'race'.⁵⁶ This is because under individualism, it is perceived that people can succeed if they make the effort and take the necessary steps. Thus, whoever gets exploited or is left behind in the economy is entirely the fault of those individuals and their personal failures. By hiding behind the philosophy of individualism, I believe exploitation that is racialized becomes acceptable through the denial of its racialization.

Racialized Poverty

As I have argued thus far, European colonial power has played a pivotal role in establishing and

⁵⁶ To be clear, I am not implying that capitalism is inherently racist. However, I am recognizing that historically, capitalism has functioned by exploiting people of colour to the privilege of whites, and continues to function in the same way today.

enforcing particular racial understandings. Throughout Canadian history, a European, modernist framework for understanding and organization has endured and shaped our political, social and economic formations and relations. I have used the majority of this paper to contextualize the issue of racialized poverty, and have attempted to demonstrate the ways in which, despite great changes, an unequal power dynamic has been maintained since the colonial project of the 1600s, and has functioned to privilege white Europeans over people of colour. The final part of my analysis will bring the many, complex pieces together in order to argue that racialized poverty has been directly impacted by the establishment of a white, settler society. Specifically, I will suggest that the lingering effects of European colonial dominance, continue to exclude and exploit people of colour in Canada through the application and implementation of modern epistemologies and values. Specifically, I will analyze, the perception of immigrants' morality, the exclusion of racialized immigrants from economic gains and secure employment, the status of racialized immigrants in Canadian capitalism, and the disparity that exists overall, between racialized people and whites.

In Canada, the development of capitalism, with its class formation and conflicts, has largely been administered by the state. Specifically, who should be allowed to come to Canada, for what work, and definitions and standards for skills and certifications have been shaped by race and ethnicity (Bannerji, 2009:90). In the context of a white settler society, this means that Europeans have been the gatekeepers with power to determine and govern where wealth can flow, where and how it can be attained, and by who. Moreover, it has been Europeans that have perpetuated the European, modernist idea of economics itself. Given this, the important question to be answered is, what are implications for racialized inclusion and participation and outcomes?

When immigration policy became race-neutral through the institution of a points-based system, the social-scape of Canada became more racially diverse (Henry et al., 2000:81). Whereas in the 1980s, people of colour accounted for less than 5% of Canada's population, by 2006, this population had grown to 16.2% (Block & Galabuzi, 2011:4). Also particularly noticeable is the increased growth of the

Aboriginal population, where between 2006 and 2011, the population grew by 20% versus 5% for the non-Aboriginal population, meaning that Aboriginals constituted 4.3% of all Canadians by 2011 (Statistics Canada, 2011). Statistics Canada has also made the projection that by 2031, racialized groups will constitute 33% of the population (Block & Galabuzi, 2011:4). What helps explain these figures is that more than 78% of recent immigrants are in a racialized group (Ontario Common Front, 2012:28), and two thirds of all racialized people are immigrants (NCW, 2012:3). By these figures, we can assume that the racialized population in Canada will continue to grow, therefore making it more important to consider the perception of these racialized immigrants and the realities they will face when they start life in Canada. Most importantly, special attention needs to be paid to the fate of immigrants because the majority of racialized people living in poverty are immigrants (66%), whereas Canadian-born racialized people constitute 25%, and non-permanent residents, 8% (NCW, 2012:5).

Despite being dependent on immigration, thus far, Canadians have generally had mixed feelings about particular immigrations and immigrants (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:259), such as those from eastern and southern Europe, and those from racialized countries. This is because immigrants are often viewed in a negative light, perceived as groups that: take away jobs, housing and education; destabilize moralities and encourage crime; and who overcrowd access to, and exploit scarce resources (Fleras & Elliot, 2000:271; Henry et al, 2000:84). Considering that the majority of immigrants today are racialized, it is interesting to note how these perceptions construct the social, moral and economic unsuitability of immigrants for Canadian belonging vis-a-vis a conceptualization, and standard of a westernized 'us'; this maintains a dialectic relationship between rational and righteous (white) Canadians, and irrational, unskilled and immoral (racialized) others. Such dualism, I believe, protects and reinforces the definition/characterization of the Canadian nation, as a white nation, against non-white inferiors. What is more, this racialized moral ideology reflects Canada's early colonial settlers who sought to build and maintain a (white) European settler society, against uncivilized and immoral others. This perception of immigrants thus maintains the inferiorization of non-Europeans, and, as I will

argue, fuels their exclusion from meaningful economic participation despite being qualified to warrant economic rewards. However, such perceptions of immigrants ignores the various studies that have contrarily concluded that immigrants, take less jobs away than they make, have used less services than they have paid in taxes, and are more likely to be self-employed, high-skilled and educated (Henry et al, 2000:84). This is in addition to the fact that that immigrants have been screened for qualifications and skills, and actively sought by the Canadian government to grow the economy and population (Galabuzi, 2001). It is in spite of all of these facts that racialized immigrants are judged to be inferior, and especially based on a perceived lack of morals and values. By these perceptions, it would seem that morality is still located in (white) European space using European standards, as it was in the beginning of modernity, and I would argue it also maintains the (white) settler as the superior. This is because perceptions of racialized people are still committed to upholding Canadian, that is, white European, as the acceptable and legitimate norm. In applying Freire's construct of oppression here, we can uncover a stable relationship of sustainable inequality and oppression. He argues that oppression is maintained through the denial of liberation, but that this denial of liberation is rationalized by perceiving the oppressed as potential threats (Freire, 1993:41-2). Applied to racialized immigrants and poverty/inequality, their exclusion and marginalization is justified because they are perceived as immoral and undeserving. This in turn, legitimizes their exclusion and secures oppressive powers; I will try to indicate this relationship through the contradictions and patterns of racialized economic exclusion.

Consider the fact that immigrants are 75% more likely to be working poor, that is, be employed yet still live in poverty (Stapleton, Murphy, Xing, 2012). Given that the majority of immigrants belong to racialized groups, this translates to higher rates of poverty for racialized immigrants. Although racialized immigrants make up the majority of the working poor, other racialized groups also constitute the working poor for example, in 2005 in Ottawa Aboriginals constituted 9%, which was more than the percentage of working poor immigrants, and persons with disabilities, but less than the percentage of recent immigrants, and the category of non-Aboriginal racialized people (Social Planning Council of

Ottawa, 2005:23). In addition, I believe the term working poor denotes two things. The first is that people are employed yet not earning enough for the basic means of survival because their employment is in low-wage, temporary and or contract work which does not permit wealth/prosperity. This analysis is supported by the previously mentioned fact that, racialized people are more exposed to the effects of the labour market's requirement of flexibility that has given rise to these kinds of work (Ontario Common Front, 2012:28; Galabuzi, 2001:40). However, it should be noted that while not all racialized immigrants face precarious employment, large numbers do (Gupta, 2008:147). Flowing from this is the second point, the realized success of capitalist exploitation in that, owners of production employ laborers and accumulate wealth *by* exploitative underpayment, which results in the realization of the working poor. But as the percentage makes clear, immigrants are disproportionately affected by this kind of work.

Some of the reasons racialized immigrants specifically face structural challenges in employment revolve around prior learning skills, job experience, and devaluation of accreditation by provincial licensing bodies. But the irony is that, it is precisely qualification in these areas that grant them immigration, through the points-based system, in the first place (Galabuzi, 2001:16). And so, a contradictory gap is created between skills required for immigration and actually attaining employment/compensation once in Canada (Galabuzi, 2001:16). This begs the question, if racialized people meet the requirements for immigration eligibility through the objective points-based system, why then when they get here are they being excluded, for not having Canadian experience or not having succeeded in Canadian qualification/ standards exams (16). This is perhaps the most telling aspect of my argument of racialized poverty. It is accepted that we live in a meritocracy where it is the responsibility of the individual to earn and ensure their own success and wellbeing. Since our society is understood in this way, it makes sense that that immigration eligibility would be determined under the same framework of measurement. However, from the exclusion of skilled and qualified racialized immigrants, it is obvious that this meritocracy is ultimately subjective and the standards it holds are far from universal. Thus,

what I believe should be taken from the contradictory gap is that it is precisely the same hierarchy of knowledge that existed at the dawn of modernity that exists now, whereby European's believe themselves to be more advanced in 'real' knowledge, and that such knowledge is only possible in some spaces. By denying the legitimacy of immigrant skills/ qualifications, non-European forms of knowledge are devalued and discounted only because they did not originate in Europe/belong to Europeans. Thus though merits may gain them immigration to Canada, they do not permit their wealth or meaningful economic participation.

Furthermore, given the endurance of settler colonization through the formation of the Canadian nation-state, and the terms for social belonging are laden with white normativity (colourblind, multicultural), it makes sense that the privileging of (white) European knowledge in the economy as the 'right' knowledge, has continued despite the increase of racialized immigration and the provision of laws of equality. Based on the purposeful exclusion and devaluation of racialized immigrants, there is still the privileging of (white) Canadian knowledge as more advanced than that of racialized people. Thus there can be no other way of theorizing this purposeful exclusion and disparity, despite being fully qualified to warrant economic rewards. Moreover, I believe the inclusion of racialized people through immigration resonates with the historical forms of discrimination in immigration, because through both, racialized people are brought to Canada, and are economically exploited in comparison to whites. Although now many racialized people enter Canada through immigration, as opposed to guest-work, I do not believe they are entitled to, or can realize the same rights that others are granted through immigration. My reasoning for this is the continued exposure of racialized people, and racialized immigrants especially, to poverty and the deleterious social conditions that are intertwined with it. Also, this discriminatory reality fits well with the dimensions of power outlined earlier; power is the ability to grant rewards and impose punishments based on values and ideologies defined by the powerful (Phillips, 2003:26). In relation to Canadian immigration and the economy, (white) European's hold the power to define who is suitable for immigration and Canadian society, and therefore worthy of

Canadian belonging and rights, and also to define what 'real' knowledge and skills are for participation within the economy. Such power is then realized in the denial of (racialized) immigrant economic rewards, based on racially established meanings and structures.

Since Canada continues to depend on immigration to meet the needs of the labour market (Galabuzi, 2001:32), I find it necessary to de-construct this need for labour within the context of the capitalist system. Although it is an advancement that racialized people are now increasingly allowed into the Canadian society and through immigration are sought to grow the economy, one needs to consider the terms of this arrangement. Given that there are only two, contradictory capitalist classes, the question becomes, which class are racialized people filling? Evidenced by historic racial exploitation, in addition to the continuing racialized exclusion from the labour market and economic participation/gains, one can conclude that immigrants are brought to Canada to fulfill the laboring class of capitalism rather than as the owners of production who are able to accumulate wealth (through exploitation). I say this because Canada's problem has always been its abundance of land and resources, but a shortage of labour. In contradiction to this analysis would be that immigration has been granted based on their qualifications and skills, that is, their capacity to meaningfully contribute to the Canadian society as it sees fit. Stemming from this requirement of high skills and education, it may be argued that Canada's desire for immigrants is not *only* to fulfill the laboring class. However, ultimately by their denial of meaningful jobs for their lack of Canadian education and skills, immigrants are devalued and placed in an inevitably exclusionary and exploitative situation- a catch-22. Since racialized immigrants generally face barriers in securing stable, well-paying jobs, for the sake of survival, they are forced to take up temporary, wage, and unsecure labour with no benefits and little reward. What must be recognized is that it is precisely these kinds of jobs that, in turn, enable and secure wealth of the capitalist class, and create poverty. Thus, racialized immigrants are effectively locked into a state of exclusion/exploitation because of the persistence of European norms and standards of knowledge and being, which are privileged and universalized as the base-measurement for worthiness and participation.

Above all, the unconscionable exclusion and exploitation of racialized immigrants needs to be located in the larger Canadian context, because the reality of such discrimination extends to all racialized groups in Canada, regardless of status (immigrant/new-comer, settled and Canadian-born) (Galabuzi, 2001:104). One example is demonstrated by a comparison of racialized immigrants to non-racialized (European) immigrants. Rather than having much in common with each other in terms of outcomes for low income and unemployment, Galabuzi (2001) notes that racialized immigrants share similar outcomes as Canadian born racialized people, not other immigrants (Galabuzi, 2001:17, 104). This is evidenced by the fact that immigrants from Europe and the U.S. find easier employment than immigrants from other places (Fleras, 2010:128). Another example of this is in incomes, where first generation racialized men in Canada earned 68.7% of what first generation non-racialized Canadian men earned (Block & Galabuzi, 2011:4). It is interesting to note that people who are new to Canada will generally have a different experience based on their 'race'. This means that racialization is very much alive today, and consequently that perceived *difference* will determine their inclusion and participation both in the economy and society at large. But where did this perception/ preference come from? How does it come to be that racialized people across the board share a similar fate?

In further support of this analysis of the overall racialized disparity is the fact that, regardless of whether or not racialized individuals are Canadian born or immigrated here, statistics show that overall non-white Canadians earn less than white Canadians (Li, 1998: 122; NCW, 2012:3; Ontario Common Front, 2012:20). In 2006 specifically, racialized people earned 81.4 cents per dollar that whites earned. Such disparity is amplified when gender is considered alongside race; in the same year, racialized women earned only 55.6 cents per dollar that non-racialized men earned (Block & Galabuzi, 2011:11). While this disparity exists between people of colour and whites, it should also be recognized that Canadian-born racialized people have a higher average income than foreign-born racialized people, and between these two classifications, falls the average of Aboriginal incomes (Li, 2008:27); a solid example of the continuing impact of colonization is that in 2006, the median income for Aboriginal

peoples was roughly 30% lower than the rest of Canadians (Macdonald & Wilson, 2010:3). Such a reality helps to explain why, in 2009, 45% of Aboriginal men aged 15-64 were of low-income versus 34% of non-Aboriginal in the same category (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2013:12). Facts such as these are evidence that overall in Canada, whites have been allowed to prosper while people of colour have been restricted and are missing out.

Another example that emphasizes this racialized disparity is in the well documented unequal access to employment for racialized groups, evidenced by their higher unemployment rates (Galabuzi, 2001:16). Specifically in 2012, whereas the unemployment rate for non-Aboriginals in Canada was 7%, it was almost 13% for Aboriginals; this disparity is echoed across most Canadian provinces (Employment and Social Development Canada, 2013). The issue with higher unemployment rates is that it inevitably realizes poverty. Without employment⁵⁸, you cannot have an adequate income, and without adequate income, you cannot provide the basic needs for survival, let alone have the capacity for meaningful participation and inclusion in society. Combined with the retraction of the welfare state, racialized people are placed put in a taxing position- they need to survive but have little or no income and inadequate safety nets from the government.

Moreover, racialized groups suffer this fate despite having high educational achievements. (Galabuzi, 2001:16; Wallis et al. 2009:7; Yalnizyan, 1998: 28). Reflective of this is the fact that 44% of racialized people between the ages of 25 and 64, hold a university certificate, diploma or degree, compared to 25% of non-racialized people (NWC, 2012:3). This income inequality persists for Aboriginals as well despite rapid increases in educational attainment over the last decade. The one exception to this disparity is that Aboriginals with university degrees have largely been able to move passed the income gap between them and non-Aboriginal Canadians (Macdonald & Wilson, 2010:3-4).

⁵⁸ This is not to say that employment guarantees prosperity, because this ignores the reality of a large group of people who make up the working poor.

More than this, racialized immigrants specifically also tend to have higher levels of education than whites or Aboriginals, yet still fall behind in terms of employment, income and access to higher level jobs (Fleras, 2010: 126). Normally one would associate higher education with higher economic rewards; educational achievements should warrant merits since in our society knowledge is taken to be proof of competency and skills. If racialized people are accepting the value of education and are meeting these requirements, then why are they not being rewarded? Since racialized people are generally highly educated, then it does not make sense that they are excluded from secure, and prosperous employment and the opportunity for real economic gains.

Ergo, that such disparity exists for all racialized groups indicates the function of discrimination at a structural, systemic level (Galabuzi, 2001:17, 104). More importantly, the racialized disparity and exclusion in the above examples make clear that there can be no explanation for these differentials except race. I strongly believe the facts I have included here are indicative of a larger trend that pertains to race, and that stems from the white settler society. I say this because regardless of status and education, racialized people are over-represented in poverty rates, overall have higher unemployment rates, and even when they are employed, generally earn less than whites. If people of colour are earning less, then one can assume they are living a less secure/stable standard of living than whites, with less social and economic power than whites. Thus, the implications for inclusion are that, based on income alone, whites are more suitable/enabled to be included. Against arguments that racialized people are incompetent/ill-suited for the jobs, is the fact that many are highly skilled and educated, including racialized immigrants who have been assessed and allowed entry based on these factors. Also against claims that racialized people lack the cultural values and morals of Canadian society, is that even Canadian born racialized people are excluded from the labour market and face similar outcomes to their (racialized) immigrant counter-parts. To be more clear, Canadian-born racialized people grow up in Canadian society, in the same educational system, social system, and culture, around the same values, yet are not able to reap the same economic rewards as other Canadians. From this I conclude that in

Canada there exists a direct and indirect preference, and standard of judgment that uses white as the norm and thereby privileges whites over people of colour. To me, the facts show a perception of racial inferiority or undeservingness from which whites benefit. But the key to this disparity is uncovering what encourages this preference of whites.

As I have argued throughout, Canada functions on a white normative standard that emerged from settler colonization and became embedded in the nation-state. From the examples of immigration patterns and policies, in addition to the philosophies of colorblindness/racelessness and multiculturalism, it has been made apparent that, despite the increasing 'racial' diversity in Canada and changes in laws and philosophies, the ideological bases of social and economic organization and belonging have stemmed from modern, Eurocentric values and interests of a white settler society. That is, these changes have been rooted in modern thinking, and in the process have attempted to ignore the past and deny its implications for the structures, relations and outcomes in contemporary Canadian society. Such ideologies indirectly function to maintain European dominance and identity, by inherently classifying non-Europeans as *different* 'others' who are to be kept outside of the conceptualization of the (white) Canadian identity. To me, this disparity exemplifies the essence of political economy, and the interplay between social, political and economic institutions, and social, political and economic power. Though neoliberalism, and capitalism in general, are not racialized, the fact that they continue to function with racialized distribution, is telling of the intricacies, overlap, interaction, and mutual reinforcement of the different structures in society. Together, the political, social and economic structures coherently maintain the privilege and power of whites, and the exclusion and exploitation of people of colour. I want to place emphasis on the fact that through all of these complex, interrelated political, social and economic processes, certain groups are perpetually benefiting from this structure and organization- whites and white wealth- whilst other groups are perpetually excluded and exploited- peoples of colour. If this is broken down to the bare bones of the issue, in a comparison between settler

colonization of the 1500/1600s to centuries later in 2014, it is irrefutable that in Canada overall, white Europeans still hold power and wealth at the expense of racialized people.

VI.CONCLUSION

In response to the ever-increasing racialized income gap, and racialized distribution of poverty in Canada, I posed the question, how has colonialism affected racialized poverty today? In answering this, I have demonstrated the ways in which (racialized) historical events have shaped, and continue to shape Canadian society in terms of its political, social and economic structures and powers. Specifically, I have established how, since colonization, Canada has remained a white, settler society through which, and by way of many complex, interrelated and mutually reinforcing processes, a white normative standard emerged as the foundation of the Canadian nation, state.

The first stage of my analysis started with the examination of European settler colonization, and the economic exploitation and political suppression that ensued to enable European wealth and dominance, at the expense of racialized people. Also considered, was the impact of theology in inferiorizing people of colour, specifically Aboriginals and other racialized groups, and guiding and legitimizing oppressive practices against these people, Aboriginals and racialized. Next, the transformation from a theological framework of understanding to a secularized understanding was located in the change from the era of the Middle Ages into the era of Modernity. Under modernity, I traced the shift from theological rationalizations for inferiorizing people of colour, to the biological theories of inferior races that replaced it, in order to emphasize that little had changed with regards to racial inequality; under both frameworks, whites perceived themselves to be superior and more advanced than non-whites, which resulted in racialized exclusion and exploitation. I also closely examined the principles and values of modernity, such as rationality, morality, individualism and progress, and critiqued their Eurocentricity, both in terms of the formation of these concepts, and their interpretations and applications against colonized non-Europeans. I particularly highlighted the ways in

which modernity was perceived to usher in an era of objectivity, 'truth' and change from the earlier theological/subjective era, and gained immense power from its claims to universalism. In ending the discussion on colonization, I considered the global impact of colonialism in terms of the reach of its oppressive power, its system of racialization, and its racialized capitalist system of economic exploitation.

The second stage of my analysis focused on post-colonization that was marked by the establishment of the modern, Canadian nation-state. In connecting the past with the present, I began with a critique of the notion-and formation of the nation-state, and the implications this had for strengthening European dominance and power in Canada over people of colour. Racially discriminatory immigration policies and patterns discussed, highlighted this impact of the nation-state through its ability to build and maintain a white society, in which white wealth was able to grow at the expense of people of colour. Building on this, and in further emphasis of the establishment of a white normative standard, I examined the modernist philosophies of racelessness/colorblindness and multiculturalism. I showed how together, these illustrated principles of equality yet had racialized undertones because a white normative standard was used in formulating these philosophies, thereby indirectly contradicting their values. Having established the political and social context of post-colonization Canada, the next aspect of this analysis looked at the economic sphere. Particularly, I focused on the relationship between modernity and neoliberalism, and how a neoliberal economy fosters an environment for racialized poverty, especially through the rationalization of individualism that puts the blame of economic failure on the individual. The final part of this inquiry drew in the ideas from both stages of my analysis to provide some explanations as to why and how people of colour, both immigrant and Canadian born, are excluded from the economy and are denied economic rewards. I outlined the relationship between the historically racialized political and social structures that continue to function today, and the economy, and how both reflect a perception or belief that people of colour are underserving/inferior- as they have always been since colonization.

Thus, from my analysis, it has become clear that settler colonization, in the form of a white, settler society, provides the basis for political, social and economic structures in society today, subsequently resulting in the systemic discrimination of people of colour. That is, one way colonialism has effected racialized poverty today is through the institution of European, modern bodies of knowledge under/ and since colonization, and the unequal, racialized distribution of power this involved. I have demonstrated how since settler colonization, Europeans have held the power to determine, define, and implement certain bodies of knowledge, and the terms of political, social and economic inclusion and participation, and therefore determine its relations and outcomes. In this way, the superiority and legitimacy of white Europeans, and the exclusion and exploitation of racialized people, emerged in Canada through colonization and have endured under the formation of the settler, nation-state. In the process, and despite many changes in ideology and conceptualizations, privilege has always been granted to white Europeans. Though on the surface it would seem that epistemologies have transformed and evolved, from overtly racist to overtly neutral/equal, the fact remains that all these changes in ideology are rooted in European-defined, modern thinking- the individual, reason and progress. More than this, the effects/outcomes that have emerged from these changes in ideology are consistent with the outcomes that were produced under colonization. Simply put, throughout Canadian history until now, people of colour have always been at a disadvantage in a white-normative society, resulting in racialized exclusion and exploitation. People of colour have always been: compared to white Europeans (Christianity, biology, modern/traditional, colorblind/racelessness, multiculturalism); regarded as *different* (theology, biology, culture); and as such lacked the political and economic power to meaningfully participate in Canadian society to the same degree that whites have (resource extraction, slavery, immigration exclusion, guest-workers, racialized poverty).

With the appreciation that one's racial identity has real consequences for social and material outcomes, it cannot be stressed enough that our systems of guaranteed equality and non-discrimination are not working. The attempt to create a race-neutral, progressive Canadian society has accelerated the

divide and disparity between different racial groups, because such principles ignore the histories of racial oppression and exploitation that have granted privilege and power indefinitely. In so doing, these progressive measures have failed to truly remedy and alter racialized perceptions, functions, interpretations and distributions that have been historically established. By the contradictory philosophies of equality and consistent patterns of racial exclusion and exploitation, it is clear that racialization is embedded in Canadian political, social and economic institutions, meaning they persist despite, and *through* changes towards equality and neutrality.

The justice issue of racialized poverty in Canada requires much more attention, not only in academia but also in government policy, and society at large. Its racialization must be properly acknowledged and addressed as such, with particular recognition of the *overall* disparity between racialized people in comparison to whites, in addition to the consideration of the sub-groups of racialized people. If left unchecked and unchanged, people of colour will continue to fall behind for generations to come, for no reason other than their socially constructed 'race'. Since historically, race has been given meaning/value and defined in a top-down manner, I believe a good starting point would be the involvement of the racialized poor in dialogue, organization, public education and policy making about poverty, as well as racial equality. More than this, I would urge those working towards social justice to be critical of the bodies of knowledge that society's norms, standards, functions, organizations and structures are based on. We, as a collective, need to re-think ways of being so that all peoples can realize their right to self-determination and meaningfully participate in, and gain from society, "for to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others" (The Telegraph, 2013).

REFERENCES

- Abu-Laban, Y., & Gabriel, C. (2008). Selling (out) Diversity in an Age of Globalization. In M. A. Wallis & S. M. Kwok (Eds.), *Daily Struggles: The Deepening Racialization and Feminization of Poverty* (pp. 47-59). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Action Canada. (2012). *Prospering Together: Addressing Inequality and Poverty to Succeed in the Knowledge Based Economy*. Action Canada.
- Allahar, A. Race and Racism: Strategies of Resistance. In V. Satzewich (Ed.), *Racism & Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies & Strategies of Resistance* (pp. 335-54). Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Bannerji, H. (2010). On the Dark Side of the Nation: Politics of Multiculturalism and the State of "Canada". In M.A. Wallis, L. Sunseri & G.E. Galabuzi, & (Eds.), *Colonialism and Racism in Canada: Historical Traces and Contemporary Issues* (pp.73-97). Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.
- Barret, S. (1991). White Supremacists and Neo-Fascists: Laboratories for the Analysis of Racism in Wider Society. In O. McKague (Ed.), *Racism in Canada* (pp. 85-101). Saskatoon, SK: Fifth House Publishers.
- Bateman, F. & Pilkington, L. (2011). Introduction. In F. Bateman & L. Pilkington (Eds.), *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture* (pp. 1-9). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

- Block, S. & Galabuzi, G. (2011). *Canada's Colour Coded Labour Market: The gap for racialized workers* (No. 11-05). Ottawa, ON: Wellesley Institute.
- Boyd, M., & Vickers, M. (2004). The Ebb and Flow of Immigration in Canada. In J. Curtis, E. Grabb & N. Guppy (Eds.), *Social Inequality in Canada* (pp. 258-72). Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada Inc.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (2013). *Report on Equality Rights of Aboriginal People*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from http://www.chrc-ccdp.ca/sites/default/files/equality_aboriginal_report_2.pdf
- Citizens for Public Justice. (2012). *Poverty Trends Scorecard*. Ottawa, ON: Citizens for Public Justice.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Curtis, J., & Grabb, E. (2004). Social Status and Beliefs About What's Important for Getting Ahead. In J. Curtis, E. Grabb & N. Guppy (Eds.), *Social Inequality in Canada* (pp. 393-409). Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada Inc.
- Davies, J. B. (2004). The Distribution of Wealth and Economic Inequality. In J. Curtis, E. Grabb & N. Guppy (Eds.), *Social Inequality in Canada* (pp. 85-98). Toronto, ON: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Dunk, T. (1998). Racism, Ethnic Prejudice, Whiteness and the Working Class. In V. Satzewich (Ed.), *Racism & Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies & Strategies of Resistance* (pp. 201-22). Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Employment and Social Development Canada. (2013). *Aboriginal Labour Market Bulletin: Spring 2013*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/aboriginal/bulletins/spring2013.shtml>
- Fleras, A. (2010). *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race, Ethnic, and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Fleras, A., & Elliot, J. L. (2000). *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race, Ethnic, and Aboriginal Dynamics in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Foley, T. (2011). 'An Unknown and Feeble Body': how Settler Colonialism was Theorized in the Nineteenth Century. In F. Bateman & L. Pilkington (Eds.), *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture* (pp. 10-27). Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Gillen, P., & Ghosh, D. (2007). *Colonialism and Modernity*. Sydney, AU: UNSW Press.
- Galabuzi, G.E. (2001). *Canada's Creeping Economic Apartheid*. Toronto, ON: CJS Foundation.
- Galabuzi, G.E. (2009). Social Exclusion. In M.A. Wallis, L. Sunseri & G.E. Galabuzi, (Eds.), *Colonialism and Racism in Canada: Historical Traces and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 227-245). Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Goldberg, D. T. (2007). Raceless States. In G. F. Johnson & R. Enomoto (Eds.), *Race, Racialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond* (pp. 206-32). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press Inc.
- Goldberg, D.T. (2009). *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gupta, T. D. (2008). Racism/Anti-racism, Precarious Employment, and Unions. In M. A. Wallis & S. M. Kwok (Eds.), *Daily Struggles: The Deepening Racialization and Feminization of Poverty* (pp. 143-57). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Hawker, S., & Hawkins, J. M. (1995). Economics. *The Oxford Popular Dictionary & Thesaurus 2-in-1* (pp. 98). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hawker, S., & Hawkins, J. M. (1995). Supremacy. *The Oxford Popular Dictionary & Thesaurus 2-in-1* (pp. 323). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Henry, F., & Tator, C. (2007). Critical Discourse Analysis: A Powerful but Flawed Tool? In G. F. Johnson & R. Enomoto (Eds.), *Race, Racialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond* (pp. 117-130). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press Inc.
- Henry, F., Tator, C., Mattis, W., & Rees, T. (2000). *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Canada.
- Hier, S. P. (2007). Studying Race and Racism in 21st-Century Canada. In S. P. Hier & B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race & Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity, and Change* (pp. 19-35). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- hooks, b. (2013). *Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jennings, J. (2001). A Critique of Race Dialogue and Debates in the United States. In C. Stokes, T. Melendez & G. Rhodes-Reed (Eds.), *Race in 21st Century America* (pp. 331-49). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Kobayashi, A. & Johnson, G. F. (2007). Introduction. In G. F. Johnson & R. Enomoto (Eds.), *Race, Racialization, and Antiracism in Canada and Beyond* (pp. 3-16). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press Inc.

Lawrence, B., & Dua, E. (2009). Decolonizing Anti-Racism. In M. Wallis & A. Fleras (Eds.), *The Politics of Race in Canada* (pp.217-29). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Li, P. S. (1998). The Market Value and Social Value of Race. In V. Satzewich (Ed.), *Racism & Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies & Strategies of Resistance* (pp. 115-130). Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Li, P. S. (2008). The Market Value and Social Value of Race. In M. A. Wallis & S. M. Kwok (Eds.), *Daily Struggles: The Deepening Racialization and Feminization of Poverty* (pp. 21-35). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.

Macdonald, D., & Wilson, D. (2010). *The Income Gap between Aboriginal Peoples and the Rest of Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Mackey, E. (2009). Settling Differences: Managing and Representing People and Land in the Canadian National Project. In M.A. Wallis, L. Sunseri & G.E. Galabuzi, (Eds.), *Colonialism and Racism in Canada: Historical Traces and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 227-245). Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.

MacQueen, N. (2007). *Colonialism*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.

- Marsh, K. (2013). The Causes of Poverty and Inequality in the United States. In R.S Rycroft (Ed.), *The Economics of Inequality, Poverty and Discrimination in the 21st Century* (pp. 127-143). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mills, C. (1997). *The Racial Contract*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mirchandani, K., & Chan, W. (2008). The Racialized Impact of Welfare Fraud Control in British Columbia and Ontario. In M. A. Wallis & S. M. Kwok (Eds.), *Daily Struggles: The Deepening Racialization and Feminization of Poverty* (pp. 47-59). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Monture, P. A. (2007). Race and Erasing: Law and Gender in White Settler Societies. In S. P. Hier & B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race & Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity, and Change* (pp. 197-216). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- Mouzelis, N. P. (2008). *Modern and Postmodern Social Theorizing: Bridging the Divide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- National Council of Welfare Reports. (2012). *Poverty Profile: Special Edition*. Ottawa, ON: National Council of Welfare.
- Noivo, E. (1998). Neither "Ethnic Heroes" nor "Racial Villains": Inter-Minority Group Racism. In V. Satzewich (Ed.), *Racism & Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies & Strategies of Resistance* (pp. 223-42). Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Norrie, K., Owrarn, D., & Herbert Emery, J. C. (2008). *A History of the Canadian Economy*. Toronto, ON: Nelson.

- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial Formations in the United States from the 1960s to the 1980s*.
New York, NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Osterhammel, J. (1997). *Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Peet, R., & Hartwick, E. (2009). *Theories of Development: Contentions, Arguments and Alternatives*.
New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Pentland, H. C. (1981). *Labour and Capital in Canada, 1650-1860*. Toronto, ON: James Lorimer &
Company, Publishers.
- Phillips, P. (2003). *Inside Capitalism: An Introduction to Political Economy*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood
Publishing.
- Rattansi, A. (1994). 'Western' Racisms, Ethnicities and Identities in a 'Postmodern' frame. In
A. Rattansi & S. Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity & Identity on the Western Front*
(pp. 15-86). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Rattansi, A., & Westwood, S. (1994). Modern Racisms, Racialized Identities. In A. Rattansi & S.
Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity & Identity on the Western Front* (pp. 1-12).
Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Satzewich, V. (1998). Race, Racism and Racialization: Contested Concepts. In V. Satzewich (Ed.),
Racism & Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies & Strategies of Resistance
(pp. 223-42). Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Satzewich, V. (2007). Whiteness Studies: Race, Diversity, and the New Essentialism. In S. P. Hier &
B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race & Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity, and
Change* (pp. 67-85). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

- Shadd, A. (1991). Institutionalized Racism and Canadian History: Notes of a Black Canadian. In O. McKague (Ed.), *Racism in Canada* (pp. 1-7). Saskatoon, SK: Fifth House Publishers.
- Simmons, A. (1998). Racism and Immigration Policy. In V. Satzewich (Ed.), *Racism & Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies & Strategies of Resistance* (pp. 87-114). Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Smedley, A. (2001). Social Origins of the Idea of Race. In C. Stokes, T. Melendez & G. Rhodes-Reed (Eds.), *Race in 21st Century America* (pp. 1-25). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Social Planning Council of Ottawa. (2005). *The Working Poor of Ottawa*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www.spcottawa.on.ca/sites/all/files/pdf/2005/Publications/Working-Poor-Report.pdf>
- Spade, D. (2013). Intersectional resistance and law reform. *Signs*, 38(4):1031-1055.
- Srivasta, S. (2007). Troubles with “Anti-Racist Multiculturalism”: The Challenges of Anti-Racist and Feminist Activism. In S. P. Hier & B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race & Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity, and Change* (pp. 19-35). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2014). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: First Nations People, Metis and Inuit*. Retrieved September 29, 2014, from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011001-eng.cfm>
- Stapleton, J., Murphy, B., & Xing, Y. (2012). *The “Working Poor” in the Toronto Region: Who they are, where they live, and how trends are changing*. Retrieved from <http://metcalffoundation.com/publications-resources/view/the-working-poor->

in-the-toronto-region-who-they-are-where-they-live-and-how-trends-are-changing-2/

Stokes, C., & Melendez, T. (2001). Race in 21st Century America: An Overview. In C. Stokes, T. Melendez & G. Rhodes-Reed (Eds.), *Race in 21st Century America* (pp. xix-1). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Tanovich, D. M. (2009). What is it? In M. Wallis & A. Fleras (Eds.), *The Politics of Race in Canada* (pp. 155-65). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

The Colour of Poverty Campaign. (2009). Understanding the Racialization of Poverty in Ontario: An Introduction in 2007. In A. Fleras & M. Wallis (Eds.), *The Politics of Race in Canada* (pp. 196-7). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

The Ontario Common Front. (2012). *Falling Behind: Ontario's Backslide into Widening Inequality, Growing Poverty and Cuts to Social Programs*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Common Front.

The Telegraph. (2013, December, 06). Nelson Mandela: In His Own Words. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/nelson-mandela/9734032/Nelson-Mandela-in-his-own-words.html>

Trumper, R., & Wong, L. L. (2007). Canada's Guest Workers: Racialized, Gendered, and Flexible. . In S. P. Hier & B. S. Bolaria (Eds.), *Race & Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity, and Change* (pp. 151-70). Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

United Way of Greater Toronto & The Canadian Council on Social Development. (2004). *Poverty by Postal Code: The Geography of Neighbourhood Poverty, City of Toronto, 1981-2001*. Toronto, ON: United Way of Greater Toronto.

- Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walker, J. S. G. (2009). 'Race' and the Law. In M. Wallis & A. Fleras (Eds.), *The Politics of Race in Canada* (pp. 5-23). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Wallis, M., & Fleras, A. (2009). Preface. In M. Wallis & A. Fleras (Eds.), *The Politics of Race in Canada* (pp. v-vii). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Wallis, M. A., Sunseri, L., & Galabuzi, G. E. (2010). Introduction. In M. A. Wallis, L. Sunseri & G. E. Galabuzi (Eds.), *Colonialism and Racism in Canada* (pp. 1-12). Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.
- Wieviorka, M. (1994). Racism in Europe: Unity and Diversity. In A. Rattansi & S. Westwood (Eds.), *Racism, Modernity & Identity on the Western Front* (pp. 173-188). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Winant, H. (1994). Racial Formation and Hegemony: Global and Local Developments. In A. Rattansi & S. Westwood, *Racism, Modernity & Identity on the Western Front* (pp. 226-289). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Wolff, R. & Resnick, S. (2012). *Contending Economic Theories: Neoclassical, Keynesian, and Marxian*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Wysong, E., Perrucci, R., & Wright, D. (2014). *The New Class Society: Goodbye American Dream?* Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yalnizyan, A. (1998). *The Growing Gap: A Report on Growing Inequality Between the Rich and Poor in Canada*. Toronto, ON: The Center for Social Justice.