Australian Nationalism Studies :

Beyond the Fiction of 'One nation = One Nationalism'

Yoshikazu Shiobara

The Japan Society for the
Promotion of Science

Abstract

This paper tries to review Australian nationalism studies, academic achievements whose subjects are nationalisms in Australia, for improving the theoretical framework of nationalism studies. The historical approaches called 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)', which have become mainstream since the 1980s, are not adequate to grasp the complexity of nations and nationalism in the contemporary world, because both 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)' views of nationalism tacitly support the fiction of 'one nation = one nationalism' in contemporary nation states ; there must be or should be just one nationalism within each nation. On the other hand, Australian nationalism studies have been influenced by the social change from the 'white Australia' to 'multiculturalism' in Australia, and have had to deal with the viewpoint from 'others', and the interaction between the 'self' and 'others' <u>within</u> the dominant nationalism. They focus on emerging fragmentation and conflicts between the majority and minorities within a nation state. From this viewpoint, a dominant nationalism always includes the interactions among many groups' subjective realities within a nation state. Consequently, they succeed in avoiding the fiction of 'one nation = one nationalism'. This paper suggests that the major nationalism theories in sociology tend to view nationalism only from the 'centre' or the 'self'. Hence, they need to develop a perspective of the interactions between the 'centre' and 'frontier' or the 'self' and the 'others'.

Introduction

This paper will try to review Australian nationalism studies (academic achievements whose subjects are nationalisms in Australia), which have developed uniquely but have not been introduced to the prominent nationalism theory sufficiently, and to make a recommendation to improve the theoretical framework of nationalism studies. Since the 1980s, the theoretical approaches called 'modernist' and 'ethnicist

(historicist)' have become mainstream. This paper is also based on their contribution for nationalism studies. However, none of these main approaches of nationalism theories are adequate to grasp the complexity of nations and nationalism in the contemporary world. As I argue in this paper, both of these approaches are fundamentally historical perspectives on nations and nationalisms, and when they try to deal with the issues of contemporary nations, these approaches tacitly presuppose the homogeneity of the current dominant nationalism. As these theoretical views tend to see the counter discourses against the dominant nationalism by ethnic and social minorities as the 'others' <u>outside</u> the dominant nation, they overlook the complicated interactions <u>within</u> the discourse of dominant nationalisms. Namely, both 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)' views of nationalism tacitly support the fiction of 'one nation=one nationalism' in contemporary nationalism ; there must be or should be just one nationalism within each nation. Therefore, further theoretical refinement is needed to beyond this limitation, and to appropriate theories of nationalism to contemporary conflicts and redefinitions on nationalisms.

On the other hand, Stephen Castles et al. explain why the Australian case is important in order to analyze the social construction of nationalism in *Mistaken Identity* (1992 [1988]). According to them, the cause lies in some of the ambiguities of the Australian historical and demographical condition. As colonists denied the history of indigenous peoples, and stated that Australia was 'terra nullius'. Castles et al. argues, 'Australian nationalism had to start from a year zero, or it had to regard itself as part of the history of the "British Race".' Moreover, Australia did not experience an independence movement, and became independent by the British Parliament's act in 1901. It means that Australia became independent without establishing its national identity. Thus, Australia has had to try much consciously to define it after independence. Its geographical position, far from Britain and next to Asia, has made this process ever more difficult (1992 [1988] : 7). As a result, the issue of national identity has raised the obvious social arguments in each period in Australia. Thus, many scholars have produced many monographs and theses that have analyzed the social fragmentation on nationalism. Among them, I will focus on the achievement after the 1980s. Since the 1980s a variety of arguments on multiculturalism and indigenous issues have occurred in Australia. As the 'mainstream' Australian nationalism studies have had to deal with these issues, they consequently have developed the discussion that consciously focused on the interaction between

the 'we' and 'others'; the interaction between 'white Australian' and ethnic/social minorities as a major factor of national formation. Such rapid social changes have hastened the internal conflicts and fragmentation on the self–identification of Australia. Therefore, to examine the achievements of the studies are beneficial for the theoretical purpose of this paper. This paper does not aim to criticise 'modernist' or 'ethnicist' and suggest the new theory, but to position Australian nationalism studies in the current theories and improve the theories so that they can analyse adequately the complexity of contemporary issues on nationalism.

The Fiction of 'One Nation＝One Nationalism' in Contemporary Nationalism theories

Since the 1980s, there have been two main approaches in sociological nationalism theories called 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)'. The 'modernist' approach insists on the discontinuity between the modern nations and the pre–modern cultural communities. On the other hand, some scholars who have emphasised the importance of the role of the pre–modern elements in the formation of modern nations were called 'ethnicist (or historicist)'. Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm are called the prominent scholars of 'modernists'. On the other hand, Anthony Smith is recognised as a leader of the 'ethnicist (historicist)' (Hutchinson 1995; Yoshino 1997: 23 – 36).[1] However, both 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)' are fundamentally historical perspectives. Of course, these scholars have quite an academic interest in the situation of the resurgence of ethnic nationalism after the Cold War. Actually, one of their important achievements was to deny the fiction of 'one nation＝one state'; there must be or should be just one homogenous nation within each state. However, when they try to analyse contemporary situations of

---

1) Although this kind of usage of the term 'modernist' is popular in contemporary nationalism studies, some scholars like Dixson and Smith argue that some of 'modernists' are similar with 'post modernists' (Dixson 1999; Smith 2000), and some scholars include nationalism critics by Cultural Studies like Stuart Hall into the 'modernist' approach (Eley and Suny 1996: 6 – 29). Therefore, in the context of nationalism theories, the term 'modernist' means a position that tend to see a nation, which is one of the most important factors in the modern world, as a cultural artifacts, while in other contexts this tendency is called 'post modernist'.

nations and nationalisms, they tend to see the dominant nationalisms as they have already become homogenous, because their historical analyses have revealed the construction process of such homogeneity. That is to say, their approaches do not deal with another fiction of 'one nation=one nationalism' in contemporary nation states; there must be or should be just one homogenous nationalism within each nation.

Both 'modernists' and 'ethnicists' tend to grasp the contemporary dominant nationalisms in terms of the relationship with 'others' outside them. Therefore, the presumption of the homogeneity within the dominant nationalisms themselves remains. For example, in *Nations and Nationalism* (1983), Gellner emphasised the importance of industrialisation as a social precondition for the emergence of nationalism. According to Gellner, nationalism emerged because industrialisation requires the homogeneity of culture in society for labour force. Nationalism promotes the cultural homogeneity based on the dominant high culture. On the other hand, Gellner argued that other pre–modern cultures or ethnic groups tend to be assimilated with the dominant national culture without resistance (1983: 43 – 50). In this sense, Gellner accepted the fiction of 'one nation=one nationalism' when he examined contemporary nationalisms.

Like Gellner, Anderson did not adequately consider the possibility of the fragmentation of dominant nationalism and the juxtaposition of various imaginations within a nation. One of Anderson's academic interests in *Imagined Communities* (1991 [1983]) is to show the cause of the vitalization of 'sub–nationalisms' in contemporary Western countries (1991 [1983] : 3), and on the other paper, he suggests the possibility of 'long–distance nationalism' in the global information society (1991 [1983] : 12 – 13). However, in these discussions Anderson only suggests that there might be 'other' nations within a nation state — the possibility of which 'smaller non–dominant nations can exist within a state' — and does not refer to the possibility that the dominant nationalism discourse itself is diverse. For Anderson, smaller nations are 'others' outside the dominant nation. Therefore, the dominant nation itself remains homogenous.

In Nations and Nationalism since 1780 (1992 [1990]), Hobsbawm suggests the importance of the analysis of nationalism from the viewpoint of 'below'. He realises that 'ordinary people' might have different kinds of self–identifications from those of which the dominant official nationalism tries to force on them (1992 [1990] :

10). Nevertheless, when Hobsbawm discusses the worldwide resurgence of ethnic nationalisms in the late 20th century, he argues that such ethnic nationalisms are historically less important in the contemporary world because of the progress of the globalisation. He argues:

> What is the nature of this cry of distress or fury? Time and again such movement of ethnic identity seem to be reactions of weakness and fear, attempts to erect barricades to keep at bay the forces of the modern world (1992 [1990] : 170).

From his viewpoint, contemporary ethnic nationalisms are merely 'reactions' of the dominant nationalism. Therefore, in Hobsbawm's view, the ethnic nationalisms are outside the dominant nationalism.

As an 'ethnicist (historicist)', Anthony Smith criticises 'modernist' and argues that the pre–modern 'ethnie' is important for the emergence of nations and nationalism. Smith defines 'ethnie' as 'a named human population with myths of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more elements of shared culture, a link with a homeland, and a measure of solidarity, at least among the elites' (2000 : 65). However, in Smith's view, the 'ethnic revival' in the contemporary world can only be recognised as 'the revival of ethnies'; the resurgence of old small 'ethnie' (1986 : 217 – 221). Smith also positions them as 'others' of a dominant ethnie. In this sense, Smith's approach is not much different from 'modernists'.

In this way, both 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)' tend to maintain the fiction of 'one nation=one nationalism' when they try to analyse the issues of contemporary nationalisms. Because of this limitation, both approaches cannot carry out enough analysis about the fragmentation and conflicts within a dominant nationalism, which is one of important aspects of nationalism today. These include controversy issues over the citizenship for foreign nationals, conflicts over migration policy, the requirements of rethinking 'national history' from women or indigenous peoples' point of view, as well as historical revisionism by mainstream people as a response of them, and the revitalisation of 'majority nationalism' as a 'backlash' against globalisation. In addition to this analytical problem, these approaches have the ethically dangerous potentiality: the more discussing the 'ethnic revival', the more ethnic groups are positioned as 'others'. Then, the fiction of the homogeneity of the dominant nationalism, which can oppress minorities within a nation state, is

enforced.

A Nation with the Internal Conflicts and Re-definition

To analyse adequately the situations of nations and nationalisms in contempo-
rary world, we have to improve the perspectives of 'modernist' and 'ethnicist' so that
they can grasp the relationship not <u>between</u> the dominant nationalism and 'other'
nationalisms outside the dominant nationalism, but 'otherness' <u>within</u> the dominant
nationalism.   Australian nationalism studies can contribute this task. After World
War II, there have been various discussions in terms of the character of Australian
nationalism.   For instance, John Docker stated that after the Second World War
there were various debates on Australian cultural identity in the 1890s, which was
the important period for the formation of Australian nationalism (1992 : 2 – 3).[2]
Some other important studies were published before the 1980s : in *The Tyranny of
Distance* (1966) Geoffrey Blainey invoked the impact of the long distance from Eu-
rope to Australian national identity, and Donald Horne depicted the aspect of
Australian identity with a bit irony in *The Lucky Country* (1998 [1964]).

One of the most important of nationalism studies in Australia since the 1980s is
Richard White's *Inventing Australia* (1981).[3]   In his introduction, White stated, 'A
national identity is an invention': All images or visions of the Australian nation

---

2)   According to Docker, the radical nationalists in the 1950s argued that the 1890s are to be
    characterised by an optimistic and egalitarian spirit, possible ground of a proud, distinc-
    tive, independent Australia.   By contrast, the New Critics of the 1960s and 70s saw the
    centre of the Australian cultural identity in the 1890s as turning on a modernist–tragic
    spirit of alienation, desolation, solitude, defeat, madness, terror.   In the 1970s New Left
    critics and historians saw the bush workers and labour movements of the period as en-
    closed within an exclusionary racism toward Aborigines and Chinese. In the 1980s, femi-
    nist historians and critics perceived the 1890s as dominated by masculinism, and anti-
    ethnocentric critiques in the 1980s and 90s saw the period as overwhelmingly Anglo-
    Celtic, expressing English language and culture (Docker 1992 : 2 – 3).
3)   In his recent essay, White argues that *Inventing Australia* was NOT a study of a history
    of Australian nationalism but a study of a history of the idealised nation (1997 : 14 – 15).
    In his essay nationalism means self–conscious nationalist movements. However, the term
    'nationalism' includes not only self–conscious movements of nationalists, but also the
    idealised objective of nationalist movements and the subjective reality of nationalists, as
    scholars mentioned in this paper argue. In this sense, *Inventing Australia* was a study of Aus-
    tralian nationalism.

were constructed. White argued that it is important to ask 'what their functions are, whose creations they are, and whose interests they serve', whether or not these images are true or false. White suggested there are three important factors contributing to the making of Australian national identity. Firstly, national identities were invented 'within a framework of modern Western ideas about science, nature, race, society, and nationality.' Secondly, the intelligentsia constituted of writers, artists, journalists, historians, and critics, played an important role in defining Australian identity. Thirdly, the groups who had economic power in society had a major influence on the images of national identity (1981 : viii-ix).

Anderson's *Imagined communities*, Gellner's *Nations and Nationalism*, and Hobsbawm and Ranger's *The Invention of Tradition*, which was another prominent achievement by Hobsbawm in terms of nationalism studies, were all published in 1983. Therefore, *Inventing Australia*, published in 1981, can be seen as a pioneer of the 'modernist' theory of nationalism. Like other 'modernists', White focused on 'the social construction of nation', the important role of intellectuals in the formation of nationalism, and the relationship between the construction of nationalism and the social classes. However, the more important point that White emphasised was that not only the ruling class but also other marginalized groups had developed their own images of national identity, although these were not dominant. Thus, in White's viewpoint, national identity of a nation state is 'continually being fractured, questioned and redefined' (1981 : ix-x). From this viewpoint, White described the history of images of the Australian national identities from 1788 to the 1970s. According to White, there have been a lot of Australian images like 'a workingman's paradise (1830s-1850s)', 'Another America (mid 19c)', 'the outback and bush-life (1880 -)', 'a young boy or woman and wholesomeness (early 20 c)', 'diggers (WW I -)', 'a mature society (mid 20 c-)', and 'urban, industrialised and consumer society (after WW II)'. Most of the images reflected particular groups' economic or political interests. However, there were always alternative Australian images by non-dominant social groups within the dominant group which resisted the dominant national image. As we discussed before, this viewpoint was the one that the 'modernist' scholars tended to lack. At the same time, as in other Western countries, the thought of 'national type' emerged in Australia was affected by the racism which developed from the mid 19th century. In most cases, women were excluded from the dominant national type, or were portrayed as being dependent on men. Indigenous

peoples and non–European settlers were totally excluded.

Compared with the analysis of the period before World War II, White did not carry out enough analysis about nationalism in Australia after World War II. In the last chapter of *Inventing Australia*, White argued that the importance of the concept of 'national types' has been decreasing after the World War II, and thought of the 'way of life' has been developing instead of 'national types' (1981 : 158 – 171). White implied that this change meant racism lost its influence in the Australian society after WW II (1981 : 157). However, in *Making It National* (1994) Graeme Turner argues that even during the 1980s and the 1990s, Australian national types like the 'Larrikin' and 'Crocodile Dundee' have been invented and reproduced (1994 : 15 – 40, 93 – 118). Although biological racism loses its presence in such national types, Turner pointed out that such national types did not reflect the diversity of ethnicities, cultural traditions and that political interests of the contemporary Australian nation state, and women were being excluded from such masculine 'national types' (1994 : 5).

Multiculturalism as Nationalism

White's discussion in *Inventing Australia* made a significant impression upon later studies of nationalisms in Australia (White 1997 : 12). However, studies after White's have shifted their foci towards the analysis of multiculturalism that began to operate earnestly since the 1980s. In *Inventing Australia*, White suggested multiculturalism has been the 'new nationalism' of Australia since the 1970s, but he carried out just a brief analysis of multiculturalism (1981 : 169 – 170). Stephen Castles and his colleagues in the Centre for Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong started their discussion in *Mistaken Identity* (1992 [1988])by referring to *Inventing Australia* (1992 [1988] : 7–9). They agreed with White's suggestion that multiculturalism was the 'new nationalism', and stated, 'we must be multicultural to be national' (1992 [1988] : 5). Then, they developed further analysis of multiculturalism. Unlike White's historical analysis, their viewpoint was basically sociological; looking at the change in the social structure of the Australian nation–state caused by international migration movements and globalisation. Thus, the fundamental insistence of *Mistaken Identity* was that multiculturalism in Australia is a new form of nationalism caused by such social changes. In other words, it is a response from

the 'mainstream (Anglo middle–class men)' Australians who were against drastic social changes (1992 [1988] : 43–56). In addition, the constructive process of multi-culturalism as a political ideology reflected the political interests of the Labour and the Liberal governments, and this process was accompanied by the institution-alisation of ethnic communities (1992 [1988] : 57–80). Therefore, *Mistaken Identity* suggests that multiculturalism has inevitably included the conflicts among parties and lobby groups' political interests.

However, in *Mistaken Identity*, Castles and his co–authors did not see multi-culturalism as an ideal form of national integration. They suggested that multi-culturalism was 'too contradictory and limited an ideology to gain wide and endur-ing support' (1992 [1988] : 145–146), and they saw the limitations of multiculturalism as the limitations of the nation state itself. They implied that multiculturalism is a 'better' nationalism than the White Australia policy, which attempted to intagrate nation by the homogenous 'Anglo–Celtic' culture. However, nationalism itself had essential problems. Therefore, *Mistaken Identity* concluded that multiculturalism was just a product of the transition process of the demise of nation states.[4]

> We do not need a new ideology of nationhood. We need to transcend the nation, as an increasingly obsolete relic of early industrialism. Our aim must be community without nation (1992 [1988] : 148).

As discussed above, the fundamental framework in *Mistaken Identity* was the optimistic 'cosmopolitan' statement of declining nation states and the understanding of multiculturalism as a 'better' nationalism based on such optimism. It was logical that the arrival of the world without nation states in the future would solve the con-temporary problems of multiculturalism. However, Ghassan Hage, a Lebanese Aus-tralian anthropologist, denies such logic in his *White Nation* (1998). He acknowl-edges that he was influenced by the critiques of multiculturalism developed by the Centre of Multicultural Studies in Wollongong (1998 : 15). However, Hage denies the idea that multiculturalism is a 'better' nationalism :

---

4) Although *Mistaken Identity* was revised in 1990 and in 1992, after the Cold War ended and a lot of ethnic conflicts occurred, Castles and his colleagues did not change their funda-mental position (1992 [1988] : 149 – 218).

> Throughout this work, I have endeavoured to show that, despite many differences,
> White multiculturalism and the White discourses of nationalist exclusion — recent-
> ly represented by Pauline Hanson's One Nation — shared a similar fantasy structure.
> I argued that this fantasy structure is, ultimately, a fantasy of White supremacy : a
> well-grounded disposition to imagine Australia as a place where White Australians
> should reign supreme (1998 : 232).

According to Hage, the fantasy of 'White supremacy', or the 'White Nation' fantasy, is a subjective reality of the White people in which the White people are the 'governors' of the nation, and indigenous peoples and non-White 'ethnics' or 'the Third World Looking People' are 'merely national objects to be moved or removed according to a White national will' (1998 : 17 – 19). In *White Nation*, Hage develops an analysis of both the discourses of leaders and intellectuals, and the narratives of non-elite citizens, and reveals the close relationship between them. In particular, referring to Bourdieu, he invokes the concept of 'white aristocracy'. According to Hage, the 'national capital' is a cultural capital by which people are more likely to be seen as nationals within a 'national field'. The national belongings of people 'tends to be proportional to accumulated national capital', and the national capital in Australia is 'Whiteness'; 'The Third World Looking People' do not have national capital. Although aboriginal 'Blackness' is another form of national capital in Australia, it only allows a functional and passive role. Therefore, only 'White people' can be seen as Australian 'naturally'. This is the situation that Bourdieu called 'aristocracy of the field', whose aim is to naturalise the value of their capital and to realise the 'White aristocracy'. 'White people' also aim to naturalise their cultural capital as national capital (1998 : 53 – 62). Hage argues that both White nationalism and White multiculturalism have emerged because this 'White aristocracy' does not function any longer (1998 : 206). When this 'White aristocracy' and the position of white people as 'national managers' are no longer taken for granted, White people try to maintain their supremacy : some people react as 'White nationalists' like Pauline Hanson, and the others aim to develop 'White multiculturalism' for the purpose of maintaining their position as 'national managers'. Furthermore, from Hage's point of view, the public debate on multiculturalism and immigration itself is a kind of ritual to empower White people as 'national managers' (1998 : 240 – 244). However, there was no assurance that this attempt would succeed.

'Others' within 'Us'

The important point of *White Nation* is to grasp that nationalism as an outcome *of the insecurities of people's subjective reality of a society*. Of course, Benedict Anderson has already implied a similar idea in invoking a concept of nations as 'imagined communities' (1991 [1983]). However, Hage develops a more sophisticated analysis than Anderson by using the concept of 'fantasy', a term of Lacanian psychoanalysis.

According to Hage, in Lacanian psychoanalysis, 'fantasy' does not only mean 'an imagined "land of the good life" pursued as a goal by the subject', but also means 'an ideal image of the self as a "meaningful" subject.' Hage argues, '"fantasy" gives meaning and purpose to the life of the subject, and the meaning and purpose that makes life worth living is in itself a part of the fantasy'. Therefore, according to Hage, 'people do not "*have*" fantasies, but "*inhabit*" fantasy spaces of which they are a part' (1998 : 70). In addition, Hage argues that the nation can be understood as an 'object-cause of desire'. In the fantasy space the nationalists pursue in their practices of pursuing/constructing the ultimate 'space of fullness' into which they can melt. Therefore, the nationalists' ideal nation cannot exist as a 'concrete' existence. Their imagined national home is 'a fantasy space in which the nationalists' very being as desiring subjects is staged' (1998 : 73). Finally, Hage emphasises the importance of the conception of 'others' <u>within</u> the nationalists' fantasy. Hage argues that if this fantasy space is to be perceived as possible, 'it requires something to explain its failure to come about'. This is the 'crucial function of "otherness" within the spatial imaginary constructed by the nationalist's fantasy'. Nationalists are allowed by 'the other' to believe in the possibility of such a desired space eventuating. It is in this sense that 'the other is necessary for the construction and maintenance of the national fantasy' (1998 : 74).

Questioning from 'Others'

The scholars who have been introduced above mainly discuss Australian nationalism from the viewpoint of the 'mainstream' Anglo–Celtic population in Australia. On the other hand, the development of the multicultural policy and the increase in the insistence on rights of indigenous peoples have produced a series of

studies which aim to question Australian nationalism from the 'others' viewpoint.
For example, *Alter/Asians* (2000), a project coordinated by Ien Ang et al., tries to de-
pict the dynamics of Asian–Australian identities and to overcome the dichotomy
between 'AsiaAsians' and 'Australia/Australians'. In the introduction, Ang argues
that the categorical 'otherness' is still imputed to Asia and Asians in Australia : the
predominant definition of Asianness in Australia still depends on the lumping to-
gether of all of 'Asia' as if it were a monolithic entity, and an older notion of multi-
culturalism which is based on this stereotype. As a result, according to Ang, the
present multiculturalism is 'a mode of nationalism designed to manage diversity
within the nation's borders' by tending to fix the boundaries among nations and
ethnicities, and 'self' and 'others'. Nevertheless, the everyday practices of Asian Aus-
tralians make such boundaries 'porous' (2000 : introduction). Ang et al. aim to re-
define the notion of multiculturalism and Australian identity into a more compli-
cated and hybrid one by focusing on the Asian culture production and popular
culture in Australia.

In *Creating a Nation* (1994), Patricia Grimshaw and other three scholars of fe-
minist and indigenous studies criticize the traditional view of the Australian nation
as one which has been depicted from the white men's viewpoint, and try to map out
an Australian nation from the viewpoint of the mutual relationship between women
and men, Aboriginal and non–Aboriginal (1994 : 1). Referring to *Creating a Nation*,
Minoru Hokari (2003) suggests that the aim of the historical study of minorities in
Australia, especially indigenous peoples, has changed from that of describing the
'anti–national history' to the 'alternative national history'. This change may be
conductive to producing alternative national narratives in Australia.[5]

In this way, many contemporary scholars are trying to redefine Australian
nationalism as a response to multiculturalism and indigenous issues. Many of them
aim to depict Australian nationalism not as a white–centric one but a more hybrid
one. In contrast, *The Imaginary Australian* (1999) by Miriam Dixson argues the impor-

---

5) The theses of Attwood (1996) and De Lepervanche (1989) can also be seen as the exam-
ples of such attempts. However, Hokari does not fully acknowledge this tendency, be-
cause he is concerned with the danger that when histories of minorities are integrated
into a national history, they will become just supplements of a national history and will
hidden again (Hokari 2003).

tance of the 'Anglo–Celtic' culture in Australian society. Dixson's analysis is based on psychoanalysis. However, unlike Hage, Dixson criticises Lacanian psychoanalysis because it overemphasises the 'linguistified' unconsciousness : 'the unconsciousness is defined in terms of language.' According to Dixson, 'Lacan, then, does not view the unconscious as the source of a uniquely human creativity' : in other word, Lacan has a negative definition of the imaginary (1999 : 18 – 20). In addition, Dixson also criticises the theory of nationalism by Benedict Anderson because it is influenced by Lacan and postmodernism, and his concept of 'imagined communities' was 'finally a textual affair, "imagined" too strongly in terms of a "print capitalism".' Therefore, she argues, 'It finally failed to broach those sources of the nation's hold on people which are most ambiguous, most explosive and troubling' (1999 : 146 – 153).

Dixson expresses her attempt in *The Imaginary Australian* as an 'integrating' project : an attempt to resist the postmodernist discourses which aim to disintegrate the Australian nation and to strengthen the national identity of 'ordinary people' in Australia. Therefore, she emphasised the concept of 'imaginary' defined by Ricoeur : the social imaginary is 'society's foundational mytho–poetic nucleus' (1999 : 4 – 5). According to Dixson, the imaginary is important because it adds to the ability of 'holding' people to a nation, and for Dixson, the source of the imaginary in Australian nation is the 'Anglo–Celtic' culture. Therefore, referring the concept of Anthony Smith, she argues that it is important for contemporary Australian society to emphasise the positive aspect of Anglo–Celtic 'ethnie' to reshape the imaginary of the Australian nation (1999 : 150 – 172). As she herself said, the context of Dixson's discussion is the conflict over the evaluation of the history of the white–indigenous relationship. On the one hand, there is a historical view called the 'black armband' view (although this name was given by its opposition) that criticises massacres and assimilation policies the White people carried out to indigenous peoples, and sees the history of the White Australia as negative. On the other hand, there is a historical view called the 'balance sheet' view represented by Blainey, which insists on the positive aspects of the White Australian history although it acknowledges that it has a few negative aspects (1999 : 12 – 15). From this context Dixson's 'integrating' project is itself a kind of response from the dominant nationalism itself to the fragmentation on the dominant nationalism and national history based on it in Australia.

Conclusion

This brief review which I have carried out above implies that there are three issues of analysis in Australian nationalism studies today.

1 : The analysis focusing on the process of establishing nationalism and its dominant 'fantasy' within a nation state. In this fantasy, the 'others' are given a role and the relationship between a majority and minorities is established. Therefore, it is important to analyse the contents and the establishing process of the dominant 'fantasy', and the position and role of 'others' in it.

2 : The analysis focusing on emerging fragmentation and conflicts between the majority and minorities within a nation state, and the questioning of the position of 'others' in the dominant national fantasy. In this issue, it is important to analyse what fragmentation and conflicts happen, how the relationship between a majority and minorities changes, and what the reasons of the change are.

3 : The analysis focusing on the re-fixing or re-formation of the dominant nationalism. As a response of 2, the majority people might try to fix their conventional form of nationalism again. If that is impossible, they will try to re-shape the form of nationalism discourses so that they can maintain their dominant position in a nation state.[6] Therefore, it is important to analyse the process of re-fixing and re-forming nationalism, and the consequences of this transition. This is the stage of nationalism that Kosaku Yoshino called 'secondary nationalism' (1999 : 8).[7]

---

6) According to Hage (1998), the 'Hanson phenomenon' is the former, and multiculturalism is the latter in the case of Australia.

7) These analytical issues of Australian nationalism studies are based on the concept of 'social construction' of nations and nationalism, which most contemporary scholars share. In a recent study, Anthony Smith calls some scholars of nationalism 'constructionists': they are basically 'modernist' and affected Marxism and postmodernism. Smith argues that the shared character of them is 'a fundamental belief in the socially constructed quality of the nation and nationalism', and criticises such 'constructionists' as seeing nations as a cultural artifact by elites (Smith 2000 : 53). However, Smith's definition of 'constructionists' is too narrow. If 'society' means a net of interaction among people, the nation as a subjective reality emerges from such interactions. In this sense, the conception of 'social construction' should be recognised as anti-essentialism (Senda 2001 : 9 – 10), and most scholars of nationalism, including 'modernist', many nationalism scholars in Australia, and Smith himself, accepts this conception.

These trends suggest that it is important in analysing nationalism to deal with the interactions between the 'mainstream' or the 'self' and 'minorities' or the 'others' within it, which mean people who have been excluded from the dominant narrative of nationalism. This suggestion is crucially important for the contemporary sociological theory of nationalism. As discussed above, although both 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)' historical approaches have crucially contributed to contemporary nationalism studies, they have a limitation in tacitly internalising the fiction of 'one nation＝one nationalism' when analysing contemporary situations. As Yoshino suggests, this theoretical inadequacy derives from the fact that both of these approaches tend to be limited in their scope to analyse the creation of the classic 'old nationalism', or the more recent 'neo-nationalism' in minority regions, and these approaches share the view that nationalist elites have given rise to national identity by using state-systems (1999 : 9 – 13). Therefore, these theories have had a limited perspective for analysing the contemporary issues of nationalism which are caused by the fragmentation and conflict within the dominant nationalism.

Australian nationalism studies which I have discussed in this paper have been influenced by the social change from the 'white Australia' to 'multiculturalism' in Australia. They have had to deal with the viewpoint from 'others' and the interaction between the 'self' and 'others' within the dominant nationalism. Consequently, they succeed in avoiding the fiction of 'one nation＝one nationalism', which both 'modernist' and 'ethnicist (historicist)' approaches presuppose. From the viewpoint of Australian nationalism studies, a dominant nationalism cannot be homogenous : it always includes the interactions among many groups' subjective realities within a nation state. Therefore, while 'modernists' and 'ethnicists' fail to grasp fragmentations and conflicts within contemporary nationalisms, and tend to re-strengthen a homogenous dominant nationalism by discussing 'ethnic revival' excluding 'other' ethnicities from the dominant nationalism, many of nationalism studies in Australia suggest the importance of the interactions among groups and the necessity of dissolving such presumptions of homogeneity when we analyse nationalism. They try to depict the dynamics of the re-fixing or re-shaping of nations and nationalisms, although there are different ideological positions among scholars.

In this way, Australian nationalism studies provide a viewpoint to analyse the complicated issues of contemporary nationalism. This viewpoint can be appropriated for other countries' cases of nationalism. For instance, in her monograph, Tessa

Morris–Suzuki (2000), one of the prominent scholars of Japanese history in Australia, suggests that viewing the Japanese nationhood from the 'frontier', homelands of indigenous peoples extending over the northern part of Japan and Russia, is crucially important to understand the formation of the Japanese nation. She tries to depict the interactions between mainstream Japanese and indigenous peoples, 'others' for the mainstream. I would like to argue in this paper that the major nationalism theories in sociology tend to view nationalism only from the 'centre' or the 'self'. Hence, they need to develop a perspective of the interactions between the 'centre' and 'frontier' or the 'self' and the 'others'. To accumulate further empirical researches based on this theoretical suggestion will be vital to establish a more modified framework of nationalism studies.

Acknowledgement :

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. [1983]. *Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd edn. New York: Verso.
Anderson, Benedict. 1992. "The New World Disorder." *New Left Review* 193: 3–13.
Ang, Ien. et al. eds. 2000. *Alter/Asians : Asian–Australian Identities in Art, Media, and Popular Culture*. Annandale: Pluto Press.
Attwood, Bain. 1996. "Mabo, Australia and the End of History." pp. 100–116 in *In the Age of Mabo : History, Aborigines and Australia*, edited by Bain Attwood. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
Blainey, Geoffrey. 1966. *The Tyranny of Distance : How Distance Shaped Australia's History*. Melbourne: Sun Books.
Castles, Stephan. et al. 1992. [1988]. *Mistaken Identity : Multiculturalism and the Demise of*

Nationalism in Australia. 3rd edn. Sydney : Pluto Press.

De Lepervanche, Marie. 1989. "Women, Nation and the States in Australia." pp. 36 – 57 in *Woman–Nation–State*, edited by Nira Yuval–Davis and Floya Anthias. Houndmills, Basingstoke : Macmillan.

Dixson, Miriam. 1999. *The Imaginary Australian : Anglo–Celts and Identity 1788 to the Present.* Sydney : University of New South Wales Press.

Docker, John. 1992. "Dilemmas of Identity : the Desire for the Other in Colonial and Post Colonial Cultural History," *Working Papers in Australian Studies*, Sir Robert Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London. No. 74.

Eley, Geoff and Ronald G. Suny. 1996. "Introduction : from the Moment of Social History to the Work of Cultural Representation" pp. 6 – 29 in *Becoming National : A Reader*, edited by Geoff Eley and Ronald G. Suny. New York : Oxford University Press.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford : Basil Blackwell.

Grimshaw, Patricia. et al. 1994. *Creating a Nation.* Ringwood : Penguin Books.

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

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1992. [1990]. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780.* 2nd edn. Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. and Terence Ranger eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Hokari, Minoru. 2003. "Anti–Minorities History : Perspectives on Aboriginal–Asian Relations." in *Lost in Whitewash : Aboriginal–Chinese Encounters from Federation to Reconciliation*, edited by Penny Edwards and Yuanfang Shen. Canberra : Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University (forthcoming).

Horne, Donald. 1998. [1964] *The Lucky Country.* 5th edn. Ringwood : Penguin Books.

Hutchinson, John. 1995. *Modern Nationalism.* London : Fontana Press.

Morris–Suzuki, Tessa. (translated by Masahiko Okawa) 2000. *Henkyo kara nagameru : Ainu ga keiken suru kindai* (Viewing from the Frontier : The Modernity which Ainu People are Experiencing). Tokyo : Misuzu Syobo (first published in Japan).

Senda, Yuki. 2001. "Kouchikusyugi no keifugaku (The Genealogy of Constructionism)" pp. 1 – 41 in *Kouchikusyugi toha nanika* (What is Constructionism?), edited by Chizuko Ueno. Tokyo : Keiso Syobo.

Shiobara, Yoshikazu. 2001. "Koutei nasyonarisumu to shite no maruchikarucyurarizumu : gendai ousutoraria ni okeru kokumin tougou gensetsu no saikouchiku (Multiculturalism as Official Nationalism : the Reconstruction of National Integration Discourses in Contemporary Australia)." *Ousutoraria Kenkyu* (Journal of Australian Studies) 13 : 33 – 45.

Shiobara, Yoshikazu. 2000. "Syakaigaku ni okeru nasyonarisumu kenkyu no riron teki tennkai (Theoretical Development in the Sociology of Nationalism)." *Hogaku Seijigaku Ronkyu* (Journal of Law and Political Studies). Tokyo : Keio University, 46 : 569 – 591.

Smith, Anthony D. 2000. *The Nation in History : Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism.* Hanover : University Press of New England.

Smith, Anthony D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations.* Oxford, UK and New York, USA : B. Blackwell.

Turner, Graeme. 1994. *Making It National : Nationalism and Australian Popular Culture.* St Leonards : Allen and Unwin.

Walker, David. 1999. *Anxious Nation : Australia and the Rise of Asia 1850–1939.* St. Lucia : University of Queensland Press.

Walker, David. 1997. "Australia as Asia." pp. 131 – 141 in *Creating Australia: Changing Australian History*, edited by Wayne Hudson and Geoffrey Bolton. St. Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

White, Richard. 1981. *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980*. North Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

White, Richard. 1997. "Inventing Australia Revisited." pp. 12 – 22 in *Creating Australia: Changing Australian History, edited* by Wayne Hudson and Geoffrey Bolton. St. Leonards: Allen and Unwin.

Yoshino, Kosaku. 1999. "Rethinking Theories of Nationalism: Japan's Nationalism in a Marketplace Perspective" pp. 8 – 28 in *Consuming Ethnicity and Nationalism: Asian Experiences*, edited by Kosaku Yoshino. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i press.

Yoshino, Kosaku. 1997. *Bunka nasyonarizumu no syakaigaku: gendai nihon no aidentiti no yukue* (A Sociology of Cultural Nationalism: the Future of the Identity in Contemporary Japan). Nagoya: Nagoya University Press.