Multiculturalism in Canada, Britain and Australia: The Role of Intercultural Education

Jagdish S. Gundara
UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies
International Centre for Intercultural Studies, Institute of Education, University of London

Abstract

This paper will discuss issues of multiculturalism in Canada, Britain and Australia. The first issue which it will address is that of definitions and terminology. The term multiculturalism will be used to describe aspects of social diversity in these three countries. These include historical as well as contemporaneous dimensions of diversity and difference which need to be addressed through public and social policies, including education. Such policies ought to ensure the belongingness of different groups in a society. Within federal and devolved political contexts democratic institutions can be strengthened if they are inclusive.

The second part of the paper will briefly outline aspects of multiculturalism in the three countries. It describes a history of co-existence as well as one of exclusions especially on the basis of racism. The differences in the three countries include the way in which Canada and Australia as federal states have developed longer term policies to address issues of multiculturalism. In Britain the recent devolution of power presents new challenges to address issues of multiculturalism within the devolved parts of these islands.

The role of intercultural education in assisting the process of social cohesion in a democratic context is an important aspect of state's response to diversity. Failure to do so leads to communities demanding separatist recognition and the development of siege mentalities.

1. Definitions and Terminology

In this session terms like multiculturalism and social diversity are used as descriptive terms to highlight the presence of 'the Other' however this is defined. If issues of inter-group relations and an equitable public and social policy are to become a reality, then minorities and indigenous groups have

to be treated as being central rather than marginal to Canadian, British and Australian societies. Part of the problem which needs to be addressed is the way in which exclusion is institutionalised within education systems. Hence, policies, strategies, practices and functions which do not tackle the exclusions systematically over long periods of time may be ineffective and even counterproductive.

The first issue is how to define culturally diverse or multicultural societies. A taxonomic framework of states based on features diversity used by comparative educationalist Nicholas Hans; and can include linguistic, religious, social class, nationalities and ethnic groups. Using this type of taxonomy all three societies can be seen to have been historically as well as contemporaneously diverse. There are hardly any states which can claim to have only a single culture.

It is however exceedingly important to develop instruments which will negate what Balibar refers to as 'the internal decomposition of the community',[1] which is exacerbated by exclusions. Development of integrative or intercultural measures have to start from negating racism, narrow nationalisms and ethnicisms. Such intercultural learning and understanding can only be meaningful if they can help resolve the practice of 'exclusionary power and powers of exclusionary institutions'.[2] Hence, the task is one of developing a critical interculturalism which is based on sound intellectual foundations and is firmly grounded at the core of inclusive functioning of institutions and societies.

The notion of analysing multicultural democratic societies also requires a critical academic engagement. At one level a taxonomic question can be raised about whether societies have become multicultural or if they have historically been multicultural. At this level there is a need for an intervention by historians and social scientists to provide a taxonomy of what constitutes a multicultural society. If societies are considered to have become multicultural because of the presence of foreigners, refugees, asylum seekers or immigrants then parliamentarians and policy-makers confront a totally different set of questions and issues than if societies are seen as historically diverse or multicultural. If issues of social diversity and migration are subjected to historical analysis then foreigners and immigrants can be viewed as merely highlighting what are the underlying and existing features of cultural diversities and differences in Commonwealth societies based on linguistic, religious, territorial and social class diversity. Hence, terms like 'ethnic' 'national minorities' or 'ethnic majorities' require further analysis. Who defines these groups? How are

these terms used and by whom? Social diversity is complex and its recognition ought not to start and end with indigenous groups, immigrant groups and refugees, normally referred to as 'ethnic groups' especially as dominant groups are seen as not having an 'ethnicity' or ethnic identity. Hence, cultural hegemony based on dominance of one group can lead to de-stabilisation of a state. A historical and contemporaneous analytical framework may make it less likely that such issues can be marginalised in a society. Academics should critically examine the relevance of anthropological and sociological terminology and theories especially if these exclude broader social science considerations.

The terminological issues also revolve around the Janus-headed nature of the nation, which may have 'ethnic' features as well as constructions based on modern constitutions. The latter should ensure equality, liberty and fraternity in legal terms and relate to questions of citizenship.

The assertion that ethnic conflicts in these Commonwealth contexts arise out of diasporas which have multiculturalised previously homogeneous societies is misplaced. In these three societies movements of immigrant groups for reasons of de-colonisation, war, economic, or political persecution or other forms of displacement have only recently enhanced the historical elements of social diversity. However, simplistic responses of populists to return to perceive ethnically pure pasts perpetuate the folly of tackling societal complexity through scapegoating and stereotyping of minorities or weaker groups.

1993 was declared the International Year for the World's Indigenous People and in many Commonwealth countries these groups form an integral part of society. They nevertheless constitute fourth world peoples in the way in which they are treated.[3] The traveller and gypsy peoples in Britain, Inuit and other native peoples in Canada and the Aborigines in Australia are all indicative of the largely excluded in these countries. Education systems cannot pretend to teach values of inclusion and belongingness unless major efforts are made to re-dress the denial of rights of most silenced peoples in the world.

1.2 Public Policies

Exclusions in socially and culturally diverse societies and nations can in turn breed mentalities of exclusivity. These have led to an ethnic Armageddon in many countries. States therefore ought to safeguard

citizenship rights of all groups to ensure not only an equitable resolution of conflicts but to establish prophylactic public and social policies which strengthen democratic ideas. Such national policies ought to bridge ethnic, religious, linguistic and racial differences and negate the rise of racism, narrow nationalism and xenophobia. Civil and political rights need to be validated in all culturally diverse environments to ensure that the civil state is strengthened. In socially diverse local and national contexts the increased tensions can lead to tribalisation and fragmentation of communities particularly if groups are not educated and re-skilled for new jobs. This, as Castells has written, could lead to the "globalisation of power flows and the tribalisation of local communities."[4] This phenomenon has become more overt and visible where the economies have collapsed. Since most of these messages and values are acquired through the media, public and education systems need to educate their citizens and young people to read media images and messages critically. This critical reading of images, however, needs to be accompanied by more relevant and meaningful representations and capacities of local economies to meet local needs.

The limited notions of ideas of a capitalist market require further discussion in these three countries to minimise inequalities and the growth of a large underclass in society. The development of inclusive public and social policies ought to ensure that all groups do not lose jobs due to the rapid technological changes in society brought about to increase private profits and rising levels of de-skilling and unemployment which have accompanied these changes. The clear and present danger of certain groups of immigrants, indigenous groups, refugees, and other marginalised groups being made increasingly vulnerable are exceedingly high. The rise of inter-group tensions in this context are likely to be very serious. The use of rhetorical religious and traditional values in the context of denuded national, social and welfare systems, merits further critical examination.

Inclusive democratic processes are far from being actualised.[5] There are a number of problematic and unresolved issues about ensuring equality and quality in education systems. Issues of equal access, equal opportunity and equality of outcomes are still not a feature of many societies. The harshness and inequalities created by the market economy are more manifest than equality and quality of social and educational provision and educational outcomes.

It is also important that in the highest levels of government all groups have a "voice" because without a powerfully secular and inclusive demos a reversion back to narrow identities and fragmentation of the polity becomes

a real danger. National elites ignore this issue to their peril. Education systems have so far not been effective in providing a voice to young people, or to the rural impoverished and marginalised communities in many parts of the Commonwealth.

1.3 Belongingness

The other issue which should be raised is that of belongingness of all groups. This however does present problems because certain dominant nationalities see these societies as "theirs" which are encroached upon by "others" who are subordinated or alien and not seen to belong. There are obviously specificities of different localities, communities, families and groups which provide a different colour, texture and hue to different parts of these countries. There are also differences of local politics, economies, histories as well as how these intersect and interact with national, regional and global contexts which constitute differences in different areas. But more fundamentally, to deal with the dislocations of domination, the marketisation of economies and globalisation require educational initiatives which re-orientate groups towards a newer understanding of inclusive notions of belongingness. Aspects of cooperation and concepts of mutuality which are integral to some cultures provide a basis for positive educational developments. Mere tolerance of cultural diversity is a pre-condition but not sufficient basis to provide stability and notions of belongingness need to be reinstated.

The sharing of spaces by the dominant and the subordinate, the urban and the rural, the rich and poor make the functioning of modern societies more complex. This complexity includes the unequal way in which material and social goods are produced and distributed. This production includes: political, economic, literary, cultural as well as the media output. The 'other' is no longer out there, but here, and as Chambers states: there is an intersection of "histories, memories and experiences".[6] It is important to develop an agenda for public educational and social policy and create spaces where states can negotiate the complexity of societies, both in rural areas and cities. Such an analysis should be inclusive of all groups who live in them. In establishing such a context the past and current exclusions can be put to rights. This, therefore, makes it possible to initiate a dialogue between the various groups who live in different societies. The possibility of interaction and intersection of the histories, cultures and languages enables the construction of a more realistic understanding of the pasts of these societies and better inform what may be their present, which may in

turn have implications for constructing a less biased, realistic and more meaningful future.

Communities are not only situated within their localities but have other identities both at national and supra-national levels. This lends an enormous range of heterogeneity to the society and its life. The complexity of all this activity defies a simplistic definition by either a dominant or a subaltern culture.[7] Education systems in most parts of the world have not come to terms with the educational implications of this reality.

Societies as such embody notions of belongingness as well as alienation. They have both features of a universalistic nature as well as particularisms and local differences. Yet non confederal local cultures can become parochial, patriarchal, communalist, insular, stagnant and authoritarian. Dominant or authoritarian values are by definition excluding and exclusive. Hence, confederal localisms ought to be based on developing best cultural values which transcend a locality and are by definition democratic and connective of communities. There are thick and textured layers of political, social and economic contexts which intersect with histories, cultures and languages. These states and conurbations within them, therefore, provide possibilities and prospects of an infinite nature and yet can also be insular and confining. The confederal nature of societies and communities requires that integrative thinking and structures should link up individual groups and localities. The challenge for the political and educational system is to develop a shared and common value system, in which inclusive rights and responsibilities will be developed as an outcome of the work of schools, social and political institutions.

The challenges which are posed to parliamentarians at local, national and regional levels are of critical importance in addressing these questions, which should ensure citizenship rights to all groups. Such a political initiative needs to establish broadly based educational policies, measures, strategies, actions and institutional changes. Without the development of these strategies sterile analysis of the negative aspects of education systems which promote inter-group conflict would continue. Positive policies, actions and their evaluation to counter inter-group conflicts and genuinely improve intercultural relations would be postponed.

2. Geopolitical location

Australia, Britain and Canada represent very complex aspects of multiculturalism which have features with some commonalities, as well as great differences.

One of the major binding links is the fact that Australia and Canada are fragments of Britain's Anglo-Celtic past which have been implanted in an alien terrain and have taken root. Obviously English Canada in the Northern Hemisphere has to come to grips with another European fragment, the more established semi-feudal French Canadian phenomena. This makes Canada a very different type of nation than Australia in the Southern Hemisphere. The proximity of Canada to the super-power with which it has an unequal relationship and a Free Trade Agreement makes it markedly different from Australia. Canada, as a northern neighbour of the United States, has both an Atlantic as well as a Pacific face, while Australia has Pacific and Indian Ocean interests. Compared to Canada it therefore is more firmly located as an Asian power.

All three are members of the Commonwealth, which since its earliest Dominion days has grown to be an organisation of extremely diverse nation states. However, Australia, Britain and Canada as the original members of the Commonwealth retain accretions and memories of the older, whiter and wealthier Dominion countries. The addition of the New Commonwealth members, not only into the Commonwealth, but also within the countries themselves, highlights the issues of wider inequalities and chauvinisms.

2.1 Notions of National Chauvinism

As a major colonial power, issues of national chauvinism and racism have a long history in the British Isles, as does the experience of living with diverse groups. Both these aspects of British society have been transported by the Anglo-Celtic fragment and transplanted in new soils where they have rooted differently.

In the period until World War II, sentiment against Chinese, South European and South Asians was extremely pronounced in both Australia and Canada. In Britain, racism is not a new phenomenon which surfaced after World War II when black soldiers began to settle here and the process of decolonisation brought citizens to come and live here in its wake. The

Irish, Celtic, Jewish and Travelling communities have historically experienced racism in the British Isles.

Racist sentiments were expressed in all three countries, not only in immigration legislation which denied entry dating back to 1596 when the first Deportation Orders against Blackamoors were issued in Britain, followed by a Royal Proclamation issued against them in 1601. They were also subjected to insults, assaults, brawls, riots, arson, community violence and murder. There have also been measures to protect immigrants in these countries with varying levels of success. Obviously the nature of chauvinism changed from its religious orientations to racial exclusivity as nationalism came to the fore and nation states became established.

Hence, as distinct from Australia and Canada, the rejection and exclusion in Britain of groups like the Jews on religious grounds pre-dates their rejection on racial grounds. More importantly, when the DES in London in the 1982 School Curriculum states "Our society has become multicultural", one could have asked the DES what was it before?

2.2 The British Australian Case

By the very nature of imposing French and British identities on foreign Australian and Canadian soils, there was definition of the nation by the imposition of a European imagination and the rejection of the historically indigenous pasts and peoples of these countries.

In Australia the anti-Chinese agitation in the goldfields led to a series of restrictive laws. The antagonism towards foreign workers led to the repatriation of Pacific Islanders from Queensland and the enactment of the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901. This Act led to the implementation of a white Australia policy. Blacks and Asians were not the only target of immigration restrictions, since in 1916 Greeks and Maltese were also denied entry. In 1925 the legislation was applied more encompassingly since it denied entry to foreigners of any nationality, race, class or occupation. The use of the English language rule further led to the restriction of entry of non-British and non-English speaking immigrants until after World War II.

In Britain there was no statutory control of the influx of immigrants or aliens, although discriminatory interpretations of the Poor Laws and Laws of Settlement were used against the Irish. Between 1899 and 1902 there

was a popular reaction against the Jews and this was reflected in the enactment of the Aliens Act of 1905. This Act laid the foundations of elaborate anti-alien measures against those described and considered as "undesirable". It was amended not only to refuse entry, but to deport those who were considered inimical to the public good. The Law was used to deport Blacks after the 1919 riots and this deportation was somewhat similar to the Australian repatriation of the Pacific Islanders in 1906. During the inter-war years, both the Australian and British policies remained restrictive.

2.3 Australian Multiculturalism

After World War II Australian and British policies began to diverge. After 1945 Australia could not satisfy her labour needs from British immigration to Australia and this led to considerable change in the nature of the Australian population. The attempts to create British Australian identity through assimilation did not have the desired consequences. The new Australians not only kept their own cultures, languages and religions alive, and some maintained links with their countries of origin.

The post-war miracle created higher levels of education and affluence which enabled white Australians to accept diversity as a fact, and to consider the adoption of social policies which recognised this diversity. Pressures by organisations for expenditure to implement these policies was considerable and led to a more liberal view of the British Australian polity. In 1966 the White Australia policy was abolished and assimilation gave way to multiculturalism. Such policies were initially directed to the maintenance of immigrant cultures, considered to be part of the private domain. In their wake they raised questions of the public domain and the impact of the stress of culturalist perspectives and on the socio-economic inequalities as part of a multicultural policy. Both these strands were however under considerable strain from the dominant British Australian mainstream. The Indo-Chinese refugee issue led to the articulation of a new critique of multiculturalism in Australia, while the settlement of British citizens of Indian origin from East Africa in Britain had similar consequences.

2.4 The Anglo-Australian Reaction

The pattern of British immigration has also been dramatic and both the volume and sources of migration became diverse. In addition to high levels

of Irish immigration there was settlement from the old and New Commonwealth and other European countries. During this period anti-immigrant hostility against those coming from the Indian sub-continent, Africa and the Caribbean has been extremely acute. Each new Immigration Act has strengthened the exclusion of peoples from the New Commonwealth. Immigration legislation in fact has been used as a way of redefining the British Nationality Act of 1948, by denying entry to those who were previously eligible for free entry under citizenship rights. The rights of white patrials have been increased while those with non-patrial backgrounds have been made virtually stateless. The warm welcome extended to those who came on the SS Empire Windrush from the Caribbean in June 1948 has been vastly reversed and their presence has been equated, with a threat to law and order, with talk of repatriation still finding a powerful voice in Whitehall.

Since the Labour Government was responsible for implementing some of this restrictive legislation in Britain, it also saw the need at the public level to implement Race Relations Acts to protect the rights of Black citizens.

Adrian Graves's analysis of Enoch Powell's statements opposing high Asian immigration are indicators of critiques of multiculturalism. Stress on immigrant unassimilability and their presence as promoting tension and conflict and a threat to harmony and cohesiveness was at the core of his critique.

Racism is either openly expressed or veiled, and the history of this conflict has a longer pedigree in Britain, though it certainly has a history as long as Australia was established as a British fragment. Blainey in Australia, and Powell in Britain, however, provide the voices for latent chauvinism and racism but ignore its causes in the body politic. They also ignore the complex issues of how the nation is defined and focus instead on immigrants as the cause of racism, rather than its victims.

While Blainey is different from Enoch Powell, their antipathy to multiculturalism would be seen as being inimical to 'mainstream Australia', 'old Australians', or of the British nation of kith and kin. The evocative image of the old widowed ladies, war widows, invokes very powerful images of those who are "us" and who belong. Those who have fought for these countries are loyal, are virtuous and vulnerable. It is notable that the focus is on women who are alone. They are threatened by those who are not like "us". These "others" are foreign immigrants of different nationalities

and races who, for Powell, create noise, confusion, break old ladies' windows, taunt, harass and do worse things. While for Blainey, they "spit everywhere and spread germs", cause greasy smoke and smells of goat meat in Australian cities and suburbs.[8]

Hence, distancing those who are citizens and belongers creates a notion of a consolidated nation of singular loyalty and identity being jeopardised by multiculturalism created by the diversity of these immigrant, foreign peoples. But for them our societies would not be multicultural, multilingual or multifaith. Is this popular and populist nationalism a true reflection of Britain or Australia threatened by the "River Tiber foaming with much blood"? Does it say anything to us about not only these two countries, but Canada as well? These issues have subsequently hardened with Pauline Hoyle's One Nation Party receiving electoral support recently in Queensland and western Australia (*The Observer*, 18.2.200 1) and the abolition of the Secretariat of Multiculturalism within the Prime Minister's office by the Conservative Coalition government. Hence, the resonances of Blainey' and Powell's imagination now have actual political and racist consequences.

3. Problems of Ethnicity

In all the three countries subsequent immigrants have been referred to as ethnic minorities or, as the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Canada stated, "other ethnic groups". While the logical position would be therefore to consider the British and the French in Canada as "ethnic groups" as well, this is, in fact, not normally the case. There are perhaps at the underlying levels a number of important definitional issues. For instance, would the English, Welsh and the Scots in Britain, or their counterparts in Canada, consider themselves as a nationality category coming from England, Scotland and Wales? Should this be the case, then is it appropriate to refer to Ukranians, Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians in Canada or Australia to be seen as ethnicities or as nationalities?

The Canadians and Australians have a long history of dealing with federal system with state and provincial governments. Britain has recently devolved power to the Welsh and Northern Irish Assemblies and a Parliament in Scotland. This raises complex issues about the inter relationships between Scotland, England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

More importantly it raises questions about "other" minorities in the devolved nations.

There are no clear definitions about ethnicities and nor are there indicators of how useful such a definitional framework would be. This can also be illustrated by referring to notions of multiculturalism. There are aspects of ethnicity which are intricately linked with culture. These are, however, not necessarily equitable. Since language and religion are considered to be markers of ethnicity, there are complex issues as far as, for instance, Punjabi ethnicity in Canada is concerned. Whilst the Punjabi language might hold Hindu, Sikh and Muslim Punjabis together, their religious identifications may be a barrier to acknowledging a notion of Punjabi ethnicity. The notions of an East Indian ethnicity in Canada are laughable because Indian nationality encompasses myriads of ethnic groups as does Nigeria. Indian Punjabis, like other smaller nationalities, may not only reject the larger nationalities from which they come, but adhere to their narrower national identities in Canada as well as Australia. The West Indians in Canada also constitute an extremely complex grouping of nationalities who may not only speak English, but also Creole, and other dialects, and who may be Protestants as well as Seventh Day Adventists. The Haitians may be French speakers and are likely to adhere to Catholicism while being different from white Quebecois. Likewise, in addition to ethnicised identities groups have either multiple or hybridised identities and ethnic markers may not be adequate markers of identity.

What is in fact a problem is the interplay between the state policies and identities about which there is little critical analysis. Similarly, the lack of reflectiveness over this socio-biological category allows for subordinated groups to be analysed under the "ethnic" label, whereas the dominant groups have no such socio-biological analytical categorisations placed on them.

As far as Canada is concerned, there is an interesting question about what issues are raised for the public domain by a large ethnic and ethnicised lobby, and a federal government with few powers at the federal level. Does this represent a frozen vertical mosaic which has very little dynamism and interaction between cultural groups? Hence, rather than looking at the Chinese as an holistic ethnic group, there are, in fact, differences between the uptown Chinese who are from enterpreneurial and professional classes, and the downtown Chinese who are workers within encapsulated community businesses, and the badly-paid who work particularly hard long

hours. Their position in their ethnicised socio-economic structure is very low and different from the uptown Chinese who are far more mobile.

3.1 Multicultural Mosiac

Samuda states that while many Canadians have an image of being a tolerant, law-abiding nation dedicated to democracy and peace, this is only one side of the story.

Racist ideologies helped shape pre-war Canadian immigration policies. In promulgating a 'progressive' early twentieth-century policy for immigration, Clifford Sefton referred to biological qualities as the criteria for and against the entry of ethnic groups. On such a basis the government ascribes to peoples of Southern climates, especially blacks, the labels of climatic unsuitability for harsh Canadian winters.[9]

Likewise, the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were seen as being suitable for Ukrainians and between 1897 and 1914 2000,000 of them settled in Manitoba which contained 43% of the Ukranian population in Canada by 1914. The subsequent Ukrainian migrations of 70,000 between 1924-34 and 300,000 between 1947-55 contributed to the establishment of a powerful lobby of Ukrainians as a bilingual groups who demanded cultural, linguistic as well as political and economic rights.

The one thing which makes Canada different from Australia is that it has two distinct Charter groups who claim a privileged constitutional position and the status of founders of the nation. The most eloquent post-war response was made by John Diefenbaker, who was the conservative federal leader from 1957 to 1963. The "Prairie Lion" said:

> Freedom and equality for all Canadians, however humble their lot in life and whatever their racial origin. "One Canada, One Nation."

Diefenbaker fought all his life to defend the one Canadian nation into which the English Canadian, Quebecois, Acadian Indian or Meti would be blended. He stressed "We are all Canadians and are all equal." This equality is only notional because the indigenous Canadians are not even seen as being part of the Founding Nations of Canada, and are saddled with unequal treaties in which they have relinquished their territorial rights. The

violations of these treaties in relation to hunting and fishing rights, natural resources and the delivery of social policy provision, are well documented. The celebration of the 200th Bicentenary raised the same question for the Australian Aborigines in relation to the Australian nation state.

The superior rights of the English Canadian nation were entrenched after the 1867 Confederation. Pierre Elliot Trudeau broadened the discussion to include the "two founding races", the English and the French, and following the B & B Commission Report set up in 1963 by the Lester Pearson Government, implemented an Official Languages Act in 1969.

However, the Canadian nation is both historically as well as contemporaneously multicultural. There is a continual struggle for negotiating, re-negotiating the nature of the federation by the English, French, Inuit and indigenous groups. The most recent manifestation of this was the creation of the Nunavet nation last year. As Will Kymlicka writes:

> Canada, with its policy of 'multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' and its recognition of Aboriginal rights to self-government, is one of the few countries which has officially recognised and endorsed polyethnicity and multinationality.[10]

3.2 Bilingual Framework: Multicultural Context

In October 1971 Trudeau's federal policy of Muhiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework led to the appointment of a Minister of State for Multiculturalism in 1972. In this context it is interesting to quote Trudeau:

> It is possible that nationalism may still have a role to play in backward societies where the status quo is upheld by irrational and brutal forces. But in advanced societies nationalism will have to be discarded as a rustic and clumsy tool.[11]

In discussions about unity in diversity or policies of multiculturalism what is striking is the absence of discussion about the Inuit and native Canadian peoples. The Indians and Inuits in Canada are the obvious group who have paramount rights which have been ignored, although this heterogeneity of the Canadian nation and the indigenous peoples was stressed by Professor Berry in 1977. The French in the 16th and 17th centuries found about 300,000 native Canadians who spoke different languages. The French who settled in different places themselves became a differentiated community.

The Acadians of the Atlantic Provinces were different from the Quebecois because of the different dialects spoken and customs followed.

The Metis who resulted from French-Indian mixtures were also a distinct group. The British who followed the French are generally seen as a unitary group. In fact, they consisted of the English, Scottish and Welsh. The Scots themselves included the Lowlanders who were distinct from the Highlanders. While the Irish represent another community which, while English-speaking, has had a complex position within the Canadian polity. The Irish likewise brought a complex legacy to the Australian body politic and their influence makes for a markedly different Australia. Hence, the so-called host community, whether in Australia, Britain or Canada, is not monochrome.

Some of the changes resulted from different immigration policies. After 1962 the implementation of an ethnic-blind point system for immigration purposes using education, training, occupational demands, age and knowledge of French and English led to a change in immigration intake. This was a departure from the situation on 23 May 1914 when Komogata Maru with 376 East Indians was denied entry to land at Vancouver and turned back after two months of violence and riots. The number of immigrants in the 1960s and 1980s from Asia and the Caribbean has increased. As an indication of this change there were 400 ethnic organisations in Toronto in 1977. This change applies to all other major Canadian cities. Samuda sees this change in policies as a radical shift on the part of the Federal government, and a policy accepted by a large number of provinces.

As Samuda says:

> It represents a recognition of the cultural diversity of Canadian society and equality of status for the various ethnocultural groups. More importantly, 'multiculturalism' in Canada means the acceptance of cultural diversity and the abandonment (at least in official statutes and parlance) of Anglo conformity, bigotry, racism and ethnocentrism.

At one level the stress is still more on the merely symbolic ethnocultural lifestyle, and personal or private domain of the ethnic groups. A question here can be whether this should be the concern of the state and that focus

should be on development of inclusive and democratic public policies based on mutuality.

At another level, while the 'multicultural policies' evolved after pressure from European groups like the Ukrainians, they do represent an accretion of the old English Canadian dominion, the Bilingual national framework, as well as the extension of the two official language policies to include groups of non-European origin.

This continuation of the symbolic multiculturalism in fact raises more problems that it solves, not only because it intrudes into the private domain and lends it notional public credibility, but also because it does not tackle the larger questions of inequality within the public domain. All public institutions, systems, and social policy delivery mechanisms need to integrate an intercultural perspective. They also need to statutorily ensure that the inequalities arising from discrimination are eliminated and that the notion of a socially democratic and of a more equitable multicultural Canada are given a fillip.

3.3 Egalitarian Mosaic?

What in fact takes place is that the notions of a "Vertical Mosaic" are strengthened. As Porter pointed out the English and European Canadians are at the top of the mosaic. The Ukrainian, Italian and European immigrants are at the middle level. The French are in between, but perhaps are now moving up. The visibly different black and indigenous Canadians are at the bottom of the mosaic. It is only when the Vertical Mosaic of Porter becomes what Samuda calls an "egalitarian Mosaic" (p.108) that aspects of multiculturalism will have been actualised.

Could the ad hoc nature of policy implementation and the persistence of inequalities lead to the highlighting of certain anomalies which might have contributed to the demise of the Meech Lake Agreement and some of the subsequent initiatives?

The Report of the Special Committee on Visible minorities in Canadian Society, which reported in March 1984, gave its report the title of *Equality Now*. Whether the Report is to be implemented remains to be seen, but it considers issues of institutional racism as being important. Its recommendations include areas of social integration, employment, public policy, justice, media and education. Although the old problem of two

official languages and the broader cultural context have remained unresolved.

4. Intercultural Issues

Intercultural relations between different groups represent a very complex picture. At the national level, while Canada's Meech Lake raised issues of a fundamental nature for the Confederation, there was little understanding of the notion of black British as citizens and their relationships to the English, Welsh or Scottish nations. The English continue to use/conflate notions of England/Britain and English/British.

The changing relationship between Britain and Europe raises major questions for the British policy. Trudeau made a rather candid observation of the Meech Lake Accord in 1987 when he said:

> Those Canadians who fought for a single Canada, bilingual and multicultural, can say goodbye to their dream: we are henceforth to have two Canada's, each defined in terms of its languages is not as Canadian as it might seem.

This observation of Trudeau is evidenced by the strengthening of the earlier racist, populist and anti-orientalist feelings in British Columbia (W. Peter Ward 1990) The electoral rise of Stockwell Day's Canadian Alliance with 66 members and Bloc Quebecois's 37 members in the Federal Parliament evidences the hardening of binary and oppositional forces in English and French speaking peoples (Macleans 4.12.2000, pp.18-21). The replacement of Diefenbaker's one nation and sometimes Red Tory Conservatism at the federal level by the regionalised "commonsense revolutionaries" like Mike Harris in Ontario and County Alliance in western Canada are potentially diverse because of their populism.[12]

In all the three countries, the rather elusive but dominant position of the English remains anomolous and diffuse. Since they are not seen to be ethnic, they remain the definers and articulators of the context and framework of the nation state. Yet, at the underlying level, the underclass of the dominant peoples represents a real threat to interculturalism as well as the rise of racism because of the way in which they have been disenfranchised and feel powerless. They constitute (as well as the marginalised peoples like the Indians and Inuits in Canada, the Aborigines in Australia and the Scots and Welsh in Britain) a real threat to notions of

multicultural societies. A genuine interculturalism does mean an engagement with the issues and problems presented for the silenced majorities from dominant communities as well as marginalised nationalities and groups in class-ridden societies. This is necessary to build a genuine social democratic consensus, which would in turn contribute to the development of a pluralistic consciousness. The rejection of the Meech Lake Accord not only by the indigenous Canadians but also by the marginalised provinces (Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland) was a marker to the effect that privileged positions, even for English Canadians are not seen as being beneficial to their interests when they are marginalised. Hence, alliances between oppressed Aborigines and poor whites in Australia, Inuits and Indians with poorer Canadians, as well as the poorer English, the Blacks and the Welsh and Scots can shift the basis for polities in this field in the future.

A failure of such confederal communities can mean groups become insular and demand separatist recognition as communities with siege mentalities which are reactive and rely on essentialist identities of religion, language or locality as markers of their identity.

The Inuit peoples in Canada are also trying to establish the Nunavut nation using their traditional values and languages.[13] However, it is important that this does not become a Bantustan and that good inclusive Canadian values and good Inuit values do not become mutually exclusive. The Nunavut nation may however be able to arrest the decline of Inuit values and become a model for other peoples like the aboriginies in Australia. Australian governments' uncooperative attitude to the UN investigative committees on its policies towards aboriginies[14] demonstrates the exclusionary policies of a Commonwealth government. This stance rings hollow especially when the government invokes a defence of human rights in East Timor. Aboriginal values and rights need to be seen as part and parcel of an inclusive Australian value system.

The countries represents a broad range of experiences on issues of values at the individual as well as the group levels. These situations present possibilities of redressing past and current exclusions and developing more inclusive national identities and values through the educational process.

Intercultural educational measures which include good interculturally educated teachers, as well as multilingual policies which attempt to improve intercultural relations and non-centric curriculum are part and

parcel of creating inclusive democratic polities which are stable and peaceable. Such public policies ought to establish trust and mutuality amongst all constituent groups in a society.[15]

Endnotes

[1] E. Balibar, and I. Wallerstein. (1991), *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, London: Verso.

[2] T. Goldberg. (1993), *Racist Culture*, Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell's, pp.236.6.

[3] F. Wilmer. (1993), *The indigenous voice in World Politics*, Newbury Park, California: Sage. See, A. Sanders. (1987), *The Powerless People*, London Basingstoke: Macmillan. It examines the siutation of Amerindians in Guyana.

[4] M. Castells (1989), *The Informational City*, Oxford: Blackwell's, p.350.

[5] J. Dunn. (1993), *Democracy: The Unfinished Journey 508 BC to AD 1993*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[6] I. Chambers. (1994), *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*, London: Routledge, p.6.

[7] R. Guha and G.C. Spivak. (1988), *Selected Subaltern Studies*, New York: Oxford University Press: R. Guha, (1997), *Dominance without Hegemony*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press. See also, B. Davidson. (1978), *Africa in Modern History: The Search for a New Society*, Harmondsworth: Penguin. G. Haydon. (1980), *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania*, London: Heinemann.

[8] Graves, p.14-15.

[9] R. Samuda, pp.1034.

[10] W. Kymlicka. *(1995), Multicultural Citizens*, Oxford: OUP, p.22.

[11] Trudeau, 1965.

[12] See Ian Taylor "Out of the Backwoods" *Times Literary Supplement*, 29.12.2000, pp.12-13).

[13] See *The Guardian*, London 22.3.1999.

[14] *The Financial Times*, (Editorial): London 3 1.8.2000. For a broader discussion of these issues, see E. Barkan (2000) *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co., pp.232-349.

[15] J.H. Carens. (2000), *Culture Citizenship and Community*, Oxford: OUP.

Fuente: British Association for Canadian Studies (BACS)

http://www.canadian-studies.net/lccs/LJCS/Vol_17/Gundara.pdf