Multiculturalism: Bridging Ethnicity, Culture, Religion And Race
Leo Driedger, Professor Emeritus in Sociology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

Abstract
Early studies focused on the relations between the dominant British and French charter groups, before Pierre Trudeau announced a policy of bilingualism and multiculturalism in 1971. A Royal Commission encouraged more research, where the focus of study turned from colonial to multicultural and multiethnic identity concerns, resulting in more open immigration policies. More immigrants of multiple races, religions, and cultures arrived, which required expansion of the largely white European heritage tent. By the eighties and nineties, demographic diversity, prejudice, discrimination, segregation accelerated, around problems of racism and the need for more equality and rights. While studies in the twentieth century were focused much on power and social class, research in the twenty-first century will need to explore cultures, diversity, conflict and cooperation.

Introduction
Before Trudeau’s 1971 announcement on bilingualism and multiculturalism, studies focused on British and French charter group relations, and assimilation of others to these dominant languages and cultures (Driedger, 2000). During the seventies and eighties multiculturalism got a boost from a royal commission, and much research focused on multiple identities and pluralism, which generated much research on cohesion, solidarity and conflict. Since the eighties, more demographic diversity led to increased work on race, racism, and the challenges of inequality, and human rights. We shall discuss these periods of research and debates in that order in this paper. Unfortunately, much has been left out, such as contributions by French sociologists, research on first nations, and much more.

Early Chicago sociologists, sometimes referred to as “The Chicago School”, did extensive research in cultural pluralism and ethnic relations. “Those particularly concerned with ethnic studies included Robert E. Park, W.I. Thomas, Louis Wirth,” and their students (Persons, 1987:33). Thomas and Park emphasized quite different assimilationist and pluralist contributions, and two of their students, Karl Dawson and Everett Hughes, who began Canadian sociological studies at McGill University in Montreal, also emphasized ethnic and race relations. Robert Park is well known for his race relations cycle which evolved as a sequence of stages from the initial social contact (which often resulted in conflict) to competition, accommodation,
and, finally, assimilation of ideas, cultures, or populations. In contrast, W.I Thomas and F. Znaniecki’s five volume *The Polish Peasant in America*, dealt with reorganization to maintain ethnic solidarity.

S.D. Clark (1975, 1976) has done helpful historical overviews of sociology in Canada where he expounds on students of the Chicago School, who did important work in ethnic and race relations, including C.A. Dawson and Everett Hughes who both came to Montreal to begin sociology in Canada at McGill University. Carl A. Dawson, a graduate of Chicago, came to McGill University in Montreal in 1922 to found the Department of Sociology (Clark, 1976:134-135). Dawson had studied with Park and began his ethnic research in Montreal, and later turned to research of ethnic groups on the western prairies (Persons, 1987:74). In Canada there were fears of cultural disunity, similar to fears in America, especially as large numbers of immigrants entered eastern cities and the West. The British, who were the majority in Canada at that time, pushed hard for restricting immigration to groups from Britain and the countries of northern Europe. Some students of Dawson’s began using metaphors such as “patchwork quilt” and “mosaic”, so McGill researchers were quite controversial, seen as being too sympathetic to pluralism and a diversity of immigrants (Persons, 1987; Shore, 1987:233).

It was to this Montreal setting that Everett Hughes came in 1927 to join Dawson at McGill after taking his Ph.D. at Chicago. While Dawson never learned French, Hughes did; the two divided their research, with Hughes studying Quebec, and Dawson studying the West. In his eleven years at McGill, Hughes quickly discovered that the Chicago theories did not fit well into the study of the French-Canadian experience. Hughes broke decisively with the Chicago ethnic assimilation doctrines, in publishing *French Canada in Transition*. Horace Miner, a student of Hughes at McGill, studied St Denis, a rural Quebec parish, as a village counterpart which was
not influenced by industry, and in 1949 Miner revisited St Denis and published changes he found (Guindon, 1988, Jateau, 1992:322-5). The studies of Hughes and Miner broke new ground in that they did not follow the Parkian race relations cycle, but rather followed the ethnographic methods of Robert Redfield (anthropologist at Chicago) and his study of villages in Mexico. Ethnic communities were studied in their own right, more akin to earlier Chicago interests of Thomas and Znaniecki and Polish communities. Miner’s historical community work has since been developed more fully by French scholars such as Rioux and Martin (1969, 1973), and Guindon (1988). E.K. Francis (1955) did a similar indepth study of Mennonites in Manitoba (1955), Donald Clairmont and Dennis Magill (1975) studied Africville, a Black community, Gerald Gold (1975) at Laval University studied St Pascal, a parish adjacent to St Denis, John Jackson (1975) studied French-English relations in Tecumseh, near Windsor, and, Robert Stebbins (1994) made the first metropolitan study of the French outside Quebec in Calgary.

While the earliest two sociologists at McGill continued the two major Chicago Parkian assimilationist (Dawson) and Thomas’s reorganization (Hughes) perspectives, we need to trace more chronologically, three major historical ethnic research developments and debates which followed in Canada. We begin with bilingualism before 1970, which had to do with concerns of the two largest British and French charter groups, as to which group would be dominant. Second, with multiculturalism which followed in the 1970s and 1980s, the tent was expanded to include others, and this launched research in diversity. Third, race, racism and rights in the 1980s and 1990s followed, because demographics changed to include other languages, cultures and races, where research focused more and more on equality without prejudice and racism.

I. Bilingualism: Settling Colonial Charter Concerns (pre 1970)
World War II had a major scattering effect, where thousands went abroad where they were exposed to many languages, cultures, races and peoples. The war also greatly expanded the industrial revolution and urbanization in Canada, because the allies had revved-up their workforce and economics in the herculean effort to win the war, which brought many rural immigrants to the city. Thus, two major migrations occurred with the coming of refugees and immigrants from Europe, and the move to the city, which changed the demography and shifted power to the cities. Two sociologists of British origin, John Porter and Anthony Richmond, began critical examination of these diverse peoples.

**Power: The Vertical Mosaic**

Prior to 1965, Blishen, Jones, Naegele and Porter (1961) had compiled a first collection of Canadian writings to be used in introductory sociology classes, because there were no Canadian texts, but these diverse individual studies needed a larger conceptual frame. It included studies of Hungarians, Doukhobors, Aboriginals, Ojibwa, French, English, foreign-born, but there was little guidance as to how these all fit into a larger whole. Earlier community studies by Dawson, Hughes, Miner, Francis, Innis, Elkin, Hawthorne, cried for conceptual Canadian integration.

John Porter’s sociological study, *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada* (1965) sets the stage which many others have developed since (Clement, 1974; Grabb, 1984; Curtis el al., 1988). Class and power were his major themes, and the importance of mobility and migration. Porter addresses “ethnicity and class” first (1965:60-103), giving ethnicity a central and prominent place. Located in Ottawa at Carleton University, Porter was especially aware of the British-French historical power axis. The two charter groups, each in
their respective British Ontario and French Quebec strongholds, were examined by Porter where he explored the power relationships and the social class differentials between the two founding charter peoples (Elliott and Fleras, 1992:77-86).

In *The Vertical Mosaic*, Porter describes Canada as a stratified mosaic with vast differentiations in social power. The British North America Act of 1867 gave the founding imperialist groups of Canada (the British and French) what has been termed by Porter as charter group status (Porter, 1965). The act legalized the claims of the two original European migrating groups for such historically established privileges as the perpetuation of their separate languages and cultures. Porter (1965) described the position to which ethnic groups are admitted and at which they are allowed to function in the power structure of a society as entrance status. For most ethnic groups in Canada, this position is characterized by low-status occupational roles and a subjection to the processes of assimilation laid down by the charter groups. The first peoples who were here when the Europeans came, were designated aboriginal status peoples, with some of whom treaties had been made. They were designated the lowest status.

Porter (1975:293-5) found ethnic occupational stratification in his study of the Canadian census and argued that ethnicity serves as a deterrent to social mobility. Porter’s vertical mosaic thesis has served as a provocative hypothesis, and numerous scholars have focused their attention on the relationship of ethnicity to social mobility (Blishen, 1970; Tepperman, 1975; Reitz, 1977; Cuneo and Curtis, 1975; Darroch, 1979; Brym and Fox, 1989). Clement’s study (1974) leaves little doubt that non-charter groups have not entered the positions of power extensively, and Blishen (1970) finds considerable evidence of the vertical mosaic. Many others, however, have been highly critical of the “mobility trap” hypothesis. Among them are Tepperman (1975:156), who concludes that the hypothesis is in many ways “patently false”, Darroch (1979:22) found it
“an exaggeration of any data available to date,” Brym and Brym (1989:17) found “no one-to-one correspondence between modernization and ethnic group cohesion,” and Isajiw, Sev’er and Driedger (1993, 1993) did find data which disproved the thesis. The literature on the interrelationship between class and ethnicity helps to distinguish two traditional theoretical positions: 1) that ethnicity, whatever its cultural origin, is a by-product of the social class structure and hence is, in some sense, reducible to class as Marxists assume; and 2) ethnicity may or may not be reducible to class, but that it is a drawback to social mobility as Porter assumed. Porter was right that imperial power was a major factor in the early development of Canada.

**Assimilation: Absorption of Immigrants**

A second major immigrant sociologist, a British immigrant himself, who received his training in Britain, was Anthony H. Richmond. While John Porter was mostly interested in the vertical Canadian mosaic debate, where the British and the French charter groups were the power elite, Richmond was interested in the absorption of post-war immigrants (entrance groups) in Canada into the north European dominant system. In his *Post-War Immigrants in Canada* published in 1967 (which appeared two years after Porter’s Mosaic), he states. “one of the cardinal assumptions of Canadian immigration policy...that British immigrants would be more readily absorbed than those from other countries.” It was based on the belief that the Canadian government encouraged British immigration, by providing fewer formalities and speedier procedures to acquire visas. Based on surveys of immigrants in Canada and Britain in 1961 and 1962-63, he found that the British immigrants were more ambivalent and less committed to Canada returning home more often, while others from other countries who had to struggle more, worked at integration harder, and become committed to Canada sooner.
Richmond, who taught at York University, was one of the first sociologists to do major immigrant research in Toronto, as the largest metropolis in Canada in 1971, because of the many immigrants which were streaming into that city. Richmond turned research attention from mostly imperial charter group emphasis, and included the role of lower status immigrant entrance groups. At York, they founded the Ethnic Research Programme at the Institute for Behavioural Research, of which he was the director. In 1967 he also published *Immigrants and Ethnic Groups in Metropolitan Toronto*, studying the various ethnic groups in Toronto, which had joined a largely British population. He studied characteristics of immigrants, their economic experience, their social integration, and the attitudinal reaction and response of the larger British population, as well as discrimination. Through surveys and use of the census he published *Ethnic Residential Segregation in Metropolitan Toronto* in 1972. These studies examined the British charter population in Toronto, as well as recent immigrants of other racial and religious origins, which made Toronto increasingly plural. At the same time, Richmond edited a volume of *Readings in Race and Ethnic Relations* in 1972, where he examined race, racism, religion, and stratification. By 1988, a natural sequel followed, titled *Immigration and Ethnic Conflict*. *Global Apartheid* (1994) continued his search for equality for refugees, in the new world order. Richmond’s works are strongly devoted to personal adjustments he himself experienced as a British immigrant, as well as the changes which occurred as Toronto, one of the most British dominated cities, became the largest and most ethnically plural metropolis in Canada. While Porter focused on the dominant imperial British and French charter elites, Richmond broadened research to include all ethnic adjustments, including recent immigrant entrance groups.

**The Quiet Revolution of a Contending Power**
For a hundred years after the 1837-38 rebellion the Quebecois retreated into a conservative rural ideology. However, after the Second World War and the leadership of Duplessis, there was what Rioux (1965) called springtime in Quebec, which began as a quiet revolution in search of greater freedom. By 1963 the crescendo of discontent had developed to the point that a special ten-person federal Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was established to hear these voices of change, and to assess to what extent other Canadians were willing to support greater change (Burnet, 1988:175-80). Let us hear how the commission saw the problem:

. . . There have been strains throughout the history of confederation... They have been driven to the conclusion that Canada, without being fully conscious of the fact, is passing through the greatest crisis in its history. . . . Although a provincial crisis at the outset, it has become a Canadian crisis, because of the size and importance of Quebec, and because it has inevitably set off a series of chain reactions elsewhere. . . . The state of affairs established in 1867, and never since seriously challenged, is now for the first time being rejected by the French Canadians in Quebec (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism [RCBB], 1965:13).

In the opinion of the commission, the dominating idea in its terms of reference was “equal partnership” between the two founding imperial peoples (Burnet, 1979). As the name of the commission implied, French Quebecois thought of equality between the founding peoples as a dual postulate, even though no mention was made in the constitution of such a partnership. The first preliminary report of the commission said that “these notions and expressions – ‘equal partnership’, ‘two founding groups’, ‘a compact’ – are traditional in French Canada. “Two Nations” is a more recent and vivid way of expressing this imperial desire for a recognition of the dual character of the country (RCBB, 1965:47). To many people, these expressions of dualism seemed a continuation of the age-old battle of the colonial British and French nation states, which could think in terms of dominance only, and of unitary imperial sovereignties. Did
the multi-ethnicity of Canada not matter? Why should the rights of the charter groups be corrected without hearings given to the rights of others as well? The debate began officially.

The seven-volume report of the commission generated an enormous amount of research that became a basis of demographic, ecological, economic, political, and social facts sparking a flurry of research on language, culture, ethnicity, and race (Burnet, 1988:175-80; Pendakur, 1990). Volume One clearly showed that, while the mother tongue of over half of all Canadians was English, almost one-third spoke French and a sizeable number had non-charter mother tongues. However, most of these francophones resided in Quebec, where the French dominated, while the rest of Canada was anglophone. The two languages represented two “national” solitudes that were separated regionally, politically, and socially. The declaration of Canada as a bilingual national first appeared in the Official Languages Act of 1969 (Crean and Rioux, 1983).

Soon Richard Joy (1972; 1992) proposed that there is a Bilingual Belt which stretches from Sault St Marie to Moncton, including the southern underbelly of the Quebec heartland, where large numbers of French-speakers reside adjacent to, and in continuity with, the “mother” core of French Quebec. Joy’s thesis was that the French language and culture have survived and will continue to do so in the Quebecois heartland because there is a sufficient demographic mass of six million French Canadians who have maintained their French language, and who are dominant politically in that provincial region, which supported a shift from unitary to dual thinking. However, once the unilingual and unicultural imperial European colonial nation-state was opened up to debate, others rushed in to make their claims.

The pressures of Commissioner Rudnyckyj (of Ukrainian heritage), who made a separate report on languages in Volume One, based on the outcry of more than one-fourth of the population (sometimes referred to as a third force), who were not charter Canadians, led the
commission to publish a fourth volume titled *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups* (1970), a study which at first they had not envisioned. This led to an expansion of the commission’s mandate to include examination of the cultural contributions of other ethnic groups. This partially contributed to the second part of Trudeau’s declaration in 1971 of a bilingual and multicultural Canada, and modified what had originally been a commission on bilingualism and biculturalism. Thus, the commission, which had been asked to explore bilingualism and biculturalism actually opened up a second debate on the possibility of a broader pluralism beyond former imperial charter group dominance (Burnet, 1979:43-58).

II. Multiculturalism: Expanding the Ethnic Tent (1970s-)

October 8, 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau rose in the House of Commons to announce that Canada would be a “Bilingual and Multicultural” country:

I am happy this morning to be able to reveal to the House that the government has accepted all those recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism as contained in Volume IV of its reports directed to federal departments and agencies. Honourable members will recall that the subject of this volume is “the contribution by other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution”. . . .

A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians. Such a policy should help to break down discriminatory attitudes and cultural jealousies, national unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one’s own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions. A vigorous policy of multiculturalism will help create this initial confidence. It can form the base of a society which is based on fair play for all. . . .

The government will support and encourage the various cultures and ethnic groups that give structure and vitality to our society. They will be encouraged to share their cultural expression and values with other Canadians and so contribute to a richer life for us all. . . .
In conclusion, I wish to emphasize the view of the government that a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework is basically the conscious support of individual freedom of choice. We are free to be ourselves. But this cannot be left to chance. It must be fostered and pursued actively. If freedom of choice is in danger for some ethnic groups, it is in danger for all. It is the policy of this government to eliminate any such danger and to “safeguard” this freedom.

A second debate had begun, based on multiculturalism. The Trudeau era began in 1968 and ended sixteen years later in 1984. During this time research in ethnic and race relations flowered, when a half dozen major events took place including 1) implementation of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission findings, 2) declaration of Canada as a bilingual and multicultural nation, 3) dealing with the FLQ crisis, 4) repatriating the Canadian constitution, 5) including a Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and 6) funding and supporting grants and research in ethnic and race relations. There was much support for new bilingual and multicultural policies as well as much organization and research to promote multiculturalism.

**Bilingualism: Sorting the Language Question**

The political genius of declaring bilingualism “twin Canadian goals”, requires elaboration. The English language was becoming increasingly dominant in Canada, even in business in Quebec, so declaring French equal in status with English, forced many changes in the nation. Whereas most nations have one official language, Canada now has two, which changed the monolingual, monocultural, colonial pattern of one dominant European way of life. While French language and life had remained isolated in rural Quebec, the educated, energetic “three wise men”, Trudeau, Marchand and Pelletier in Trudeau’s cabinet, were able to sell the official bilingual plan, so that provinces had to reassess their attitudes and support of the French language. New Brunswick also declared itself bilingual; Manitoba which began as officially
bilingual in 1870, had to again shore up its original roots; and Quebec passed its own Bill 101 supported by separatists in 1977, later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, because it was not in tune with the new bilingual trend. French only in Quebec, continued the European single imperial language assumptions, and Quebec separatists did not like the multicultural part of Trudeau’s declaration.

Lord Duncan’s early observation that he found two peoples warring in the bosom of a single state is not surprising (Axworthy and Trudeau, 1992:7-50); Denis, 1995:162). New France, created almost 400 years ago, was designated to be a French Quebecois nation, and the original demographic European origin in a distinct region along the St Lawrence was headed that way until the conquest. Quebeckers have worked to preserve this French nation whose French-language symbol system is in continuity with its long historical past. The studies by Miner and Hughes show both the earlier French Catholic parish system, which sustained the French through their years of conservatism, and the distinct French-English polarities during the time of more recent industrialization. A great deal of research has gone into this English-French power dialectic, trying to sort past imperial traditions with more recent multiethnic trends. (Breton et al., 1980; Bell and Tepperman, 1979).

Two federalist and separatist French-Canadian alternatives for survival were clearly spelled out by Quebeckers Pierre Trudeau and Rene Levesque in the 1960s. Trudeau’s (1962; 1968) federalist alternative (attempted again in the nineties by Jacques Parizeau) was to lead Quebec out of confederation to form a separate sovereign Quebec nation-state. Both called for the survival of the Quebecois as a distinct people, but their models for survival are quite different. Both men are examples of very able modern leaders spawned by Quebec, evidence of changes which have taken place there. Let us look at the federalist and the separatist alternatives
briefly. As professor of law at the University of Montreal, an important article in *Cite Libre* (1962) outlined Trudeau’s position on French nationalism and the need for a multinational state. He rejected the idea of a nation-state by opting for what he called “a more civilized goal of polyethnic pluralism. . . dreamed about by Lafontaine, realized under Cartier, perfected by Laurier, and humanized with Bourassa (Trudeau, 1962:58). Trudeau believed that the British North American (BNA) Act and the Constitutionists had indeed made a first step away from a nation-state toward a multinational option, and that this needed to be refined. Trudeau thought that Canada must look for an alternative to a unitary nationalist state because:

> A nationalist government is by nature intolerant, discriminatory, and, when all is said and done, totalitarian. A truly democratic government cannot be nationalist, because it must pursue the good of all its citizens, without prejudice to ethnic origin (Trudeau, 1962:63).

Later, in his volumes *Federalism and the French Canadians* (1968), and *Toward a Just Society* (1992), Trudeau more systematically argues the federalism case. This jurisdiction provides Quebec and others the opportunity to train their people and develop their regions. He outlines some necessary constitutional changes, including a Bill of Rights, and the deletion of some of the imperial phraseology, which was done later in the passing of the new Canadian constitution. Trudeau was always very critical of the separatist movement, which he called “the Wigwam Complex”, as a powerless petit-bourgeois minority left behind by the twentieth century.

While Trudeau stayed in power federally as prime minister of Canada for fourteen years to promote his federalism experiment, Rene Levesque promoted the separatist option during the seventies through the Parti Quebecois, as First Minister of the province of Quebec. A referendum was held in 1980, in which Quebeckers had to choose for or against sovereignty
association. The defeat of the referendum in Quebec in 1980 put the Quebec drive for separatism on hold (60% voted against separation), but only for a while.

**Demographics: Changes in Immigration Policies**

When the BNA Act was signed, more than 90 percent of the Canadian population was either British or French. By the 1970s the French maintained their one-third of the total through high birthrates when they were largely Catholic and rural. By the 1970s, other non-charter groups were nearing one-third of the population, and the charter peoples were headed toward one-half. Birthrates were a major factor in the developing Canadian demographic equation. Earlier, the British and French birth rates were fairly high, but as they became more industrial, urban, educated and better-to-do, birth rates went down. While isolated rural Catholic birth rates kept the Quebec population growing, as they moved to the cities and became middle class, these birth rates declined. Today French birth rates are well under the Canadian average. On the other hand, immigrants which used to be from northern Europe, where birth rates were also declining, changed to mostly high birth rate newcomers from the Third World, so increasingly types of immigrants became a factor. Soon Quebec demographers projected that as the French Quebec birth rates declined, their French population would also decline relative to Canada, from the traditional one third to one fourth or less, if nothing was done. This would have serious political repercussions, where Quebec would have increasingly less political influence in the national democratic arena. These demographic changes encouraged early scholars (Richmond, 1968, 1972; Kalbach, 1971, 1972; Henripin, 1974) to launch numerous demographic studies which traced population trends, upon which growth policies could be based.
Prior to the Depression, immigrants came largely from northern European countries. Most immigrants who arrived in Canada before 1961 were born in Europe. A basic shift in immigration patterns has taken place during the last fifty years. Since the changes to the Immigration Act in 1967, and crucial regulation and operational changes in the immigration department in 1978, immigration patterns based on the country of origin have changed substantially. In 1951 nine of the top ten immigrant source countries were Europeans. By 1984, six years after the new Immigration Act had been proclaimed, two Asian countries – Vietnam and Hong Kong – ranked first and second; Britain had dropped to fifth place, and seven of the ten leading countries of origin were in the Third World (Driedger, 1996:59). This continued into the nineties when Britain dropped to ninth. By 1993, the seven top donor countries were Asian and were sending visible minorities to Canada. Many immigrants from all over the world were now able to compete with Europeans in gaining entrance through the point system. More recent immigrants of other races, whose religions are primarily Buddhist, Muslim, or otherwise non-Christian, brought with them quite different languages and cultures, which is making the Canadian population more heterogeneous. Such extreme demographic change needed study and research.

In 1970, demographer and Chicago graduate Stanley Lieberson, born in Canada, who later became president of the American Sociological Association, published a major book titled *Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, which explored what he called the neglected problem of language and ethnic relations. He traced the demographic processes and institutional forces which effected bilingualism and mother-tongue maintenance, tracing the causes, of bilingualism, occupational demands, the impact of bilingualism, and implications of linguistic pluralism. Using the census and the latest dissimilarity measures, Lieberson demonstrated that language
maintenance, as well as religion, were important means of maintaining ethnic identity, and he opened up numerous other social factors for exploration that needed to be explored.

Anthony Richmond (1967, 1967, 1972, 1989, 1988, 1994) as well as Warren Kalbach (1970, 1971, 1979, 1981, 1984, 1990, 2000) became major demographers who continued the larger study of Canadian demography, but always kept ethnicity uppermost in their analysis and publication. While Kalbach and Richmond published several works together, Kalbach published with many others like McVey, Breton, Isajiw, Reitz, and lately especially with Richards/Kalbach. Indeed, for several decades Kalbach appeared regularly in many of the readers which were published, where he introduced the demographic dimensions of ethnicity for total social context.

**Developing Ethnic Theory and Literature**

Trudeau’s 1971 bilingual and multicultural policy was a symbol of expanding the tent. Community studies needed to be gathered together, and the sprawling seven volume Bilingual and Bicultural Commission report could hardly be used as texts in classrooms. Porter’s 1965 conceptual frame included ethnicity, but it could hardly be used as an ethnic relations text, and American texts which had to be adapted, assumed assimilation too much for Canadian purposes, as Hughes had found earlier. Sociology departments in Canada were scouring American departments for sociologists to hire, but they, too, were embedded with assimilationist assumptions. The stage was set for a major Canadian ethnic research launch.

It is interesting that some of the first original Canadian collections of edited ethnic works emerged in joint Sociology and Anthropology departments. This was the case for the 1961 Blishen, Jones, Naegele, Porter *Canadian Society* collection for use in introductory classes. In
1971 Jean Elliott published two volumes titled *Native Peoples* (1971), and *Immigrant Groups* (1971), published by Prentice Hall, to be used in cultural anthropology and ethnic relations courses, and which later went through multiple editions. Contributors to *Native Peoples* included well-known authors such as Frank Vallee, John and Irma Honigman, John Bennett and Harold Cardinal. Conceptually, Elliott framed the collections in majority-minority terms discussing the problems of prejudice and discrimination that this generated. Eskimos, Indians and Metis (note terminology used) ethnographic studies were collected as anthropologists like to do, much in line with earlier studies done by Dawson, Hughes and Francis. These were qualitative studies which added to the yet limited serious studies of many linguistic and cultural groups in Canada. *Immigrant Groups*, published in 1971 and edited by Elliott, included fifteen contributions by such early scholars as Frank Vallee, John Bennett, Robin Winks, John Jackson, Ronald Gillis and Stephen Richer. Included were five studies of religious minorities such as Hutterites, Mennonites, Jews; racial minorities which included Chinese and Blacks; and national minorities dealing with culture and regionalism. French, English, and Italian studies dominated. These works were largely qualitative studies, although some authors tried to use typologies gleaned from European and American studies. Both volumes were welcome contributions, for those who needed Canadian generated works for teaching in their classes, where students wanted, and deserved, more Canadian research. When the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association (CESA) was formed in 1971, it held a study conference every other year where scholars presented their ethnic papers. After some of these conferences, many of the best papers were edited and published as collections of readings. This included more than a dozen major collected works by Paul Migus (1975), Sev Isajiw (1975), Leo Driedger (1978), Jay Goldstein and Rita Bienvenue (1980), Jurgen Dahlie and Tessa Fernando (1981), Sev Isajiw (1997), Shiva Halli, Frank Trovato
and Leo Driedger (1990), Peter Li (1990, 1999), Shiva Halli and Leo Driedger (1999), Madeline Kalbach and Warren Kalbach (2000), Leo Driedger and Shiva Halli (2000), Carl James and Adrienne Shadd (2001) and many others. Some of these collected works were used in classes, especially before integrated texts arrived later. Holding conferences where developing ethnic scholars could present their papers, was a very functional way of discovering the many areas of the field, and dimensions of the problem, exposing hard work to scrutiny and debate. This generated much enthusiasm, and new recruits to the research cause. Integration of all these findings, and developing theories and major ethnic conceptual frames, was another matter. *Ethnicity in Canada: Theoretical Perspectives*, by Alan Anderson and James Frideres was such an attempt in 1981. They gathered together much research done in Canada into five categories of defining ethnicity, the place of ethnicity in a changing Canada, Canadian ethnic relations, minority responses and outcomes, and final policy implications. Now twenty years later, we see how hard it was to try to create a conceptual integration, and how difficult it still is today, after many more attempts. Numerous other integrated texts soon followed: Jeffery Reitz (1980), *Survival of Ethnic Groups*, Leo Driedger (1989), *The Ethnic Factor*, Edward Herberg (1989), *Ethnic Groups in Canada*, Augie Fleras and Jean Elliott (1992), *Multiculturalism in Canada*, Jean Elliott and Angie Fleras (1992, 1996, 1999), *Unequal Relations*, Carl James (1992, 1999) *Seeing Ourselves*, Leo Driedger (1996) *Multi-Ethnic Canada*, Sev Isajiw (1999), *Understanding Diversity*. Looking at the titles of more than twenty readers and texts, one can clearly see the change in emphases from multicultural identities, to increased diversity, inequality and rights, which is the next third debate which we shall turn to soon.

**Launching New Survey Research**
The extensive research generated by the Royal Bilingual and Bicultural Commission, which worked during 1965-70, was heavily based on census data, which were very useful, but it became apparent that the census was of limited use in answering many questions that were raised. More research was needed. The highly visible commission demonstrated the need for government research funds, it also raised political urgency to do more research. This momentum stimulated researchers to do larger national ethnic surveys, and there was the political interest to fund it.

In 1976 psychologists John Berry, Rudolf Kalin and Donald Taylor came out with *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada*, sponsored by the Minister of State for Multiculturalism, which had been newly formed to promote multiculturalism. The study was concerned with the perceived desirability of cultural diversity in Canada, a clear turn from majority studies to study of other groups and identities. They acknowledged that their study was stimulated by Book IV of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. This was related to questions of 1) diversity and Canadian immigration policy, 2) how maintenance of diversity is important to individuals, and 3) how important diversity might be as a Canadian resource, all related to the 1971 multiculturalism policy the government had turned to (Berry, et al., 1976:1-2). Two important issues emerged: 1) do Canadians view diversity as a valuable resource, and 2) is confidence in one’s own identity a prerequisite? The government was now funding research on cultural pluralism and multiculturalism. Maintenance of many cultural groups with distinctive lifestyles cooperating within a large political frame seemed to be at issue. This had implications for population policy, immigration policy, cultural policy (Berry, et al, 1976:5-12). The national survey included a sample of 1849 individuals and they found that 1) there was a reasonably high level of tolerance for ethnic diversity, 2) race was shown to be an important
factor, and 3) there was considerable lack of knowledge about multiculturalism and government policy (Berry, et al., 1976:248).

While Book I of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission was devoted to *The Official Languages* (1967), there were many unofficial languages which needed study also. Book IV on *Other Ethnic Groups* (1970) had revealed more study of other non-official languages. K.G. O’Bryan, Jeffrey G. Reitz, and O.M. Kuplowska (1976) did a national survey of 2,433 Chinese, Dutch, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Scandinavian and Ukrainian non-official language knowledge and use titled *Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism* published in 1976. They also controlled for three generations to plot longitudinal trends in five major cities, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton, and Vancouver. They found that while a majority of first generation participants were fluent in their home languages, that many had lost it by the third generation, including the use of their languages. This also varied by ethnic group, with the Chinese maintaining their language more, and Scandinavians very little. Other factors such as ethnic identification and religious practice were included. Non-official language groups were very diverse where some were assimilating, while others were maintaining their non-official language identity much more. Later, J.G. Reitz published *The Survival of Ethnic Groups* (1980), using the same survey, elaborating on ethnic group survival, the history of ethnic group formation, comparing ethnic cohesion, lifecycles, economic position, social dynamics and social policy, which greatly expanded and enriched the social, economic and political context in which non-official languages were supported.

Reginald Bibby was mainly interested in religious beliefs and practice in Canada, and began surveys every five years in 1975. In addition to the religious factor in the support of minority survival, he also surveyed attitudes toward multiculturalism. Bibby (1987:161-4) found
in his three national surveys of Canada in 1975, 1980, and 1985 that more than half (57%) of all Canadians endorsed official bilingualism in 1985, a rise from 49% in 1975. He found that official bilingualism was accepted by most of the population in Quebec (19% in 1985), and that it was least accepted on the prairies (36% in 1985). Almost half of the people outside Quebec (46% in 1985) endorsed official bilingualism. In each of the regions, however, acceptance of bilingualism increased between 1975 and 1985. Bibby (1987:161) also found that a majority in Canada (56%) preferred an ethnic mosaic (multiculturalism), while only half as many (27%) preferred to see a Canadian melting pot (amalgamation or assimilation). This did not vary as much by regions. Multiculturalism was accepted by half or more of the population in all regions. These national surveys added much insight to national variations in multicultural diversity providing at least some indicators of ethnic identity.

**Escalation of Ethnic Identity Research**

While Trudeau was pronouncing Canada a multicultural nation in 1971, Alan B. Anderson (1972, 1977) was collecting 1000 interviews in 18 Saskatchewan bloc settlements of French and German Catholics, Hutterites, Scandinavian Lutherans, Mennonites, Doukhobors and Ukrainians. He studied the relative strength of ethno-cultural identities on the basis of church attendance, endogamy, ethnic language ability and use, ethnic food habits and making of crafts, and general identification with their ingroups. He found that while Hutterites scored 100 percent on most indicators, Scandinavians and Germans identified the least.

While Anderson was doing rural identity studies, Leo Driedger (1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978) was studying ethnic cultural identity of French, Jewish, German, Ukrainian, Polish, British and Scandinavian Winnipeggers, using samples of high school and university students. Using
six cultural identity factors, he developed attitudinal and behavioral ethnic identity scales. He also found that the extent of identification varied by multiple factors, where endogamy was most important to the Jews, but language most important to the French. Overall he found that the French and Jews scored highest on identity, while the Scandinavians lowest.

Sev Isajiw (1974, 1978, 1981, 1990) later developed definitions of ethnic identity, which in 1990 emerged in a special study of identity in Toronto. Raymond Breton, Sev Isajiw, Warren Kalbach and Jeffrey Reitz, all sociologists at the University of Toronto, got a major grant from SSHRC to make a major study of Ethnic Identity and Equality (1990). It was a major study of four areas including ethnic identity, residential segregation, ethnic inequality and ethnic politics. They used a random sample of 2,310 respondents of English, Irish, Scottish, German Ukrainian, Italian, Jewish, Portuguese, Chinese and West Indian Torontonians. Funds permitted the most extensive ethnic study, probing a variety of experiences in the largest city in Canada, plotting inequalities and the extent of their maintenance of identity, over three generations.

Jean Burnet and Howard Palmer became the editors of a series of more than 15 historical ethnic volumes under the “Generations: A History of Canada’s People” heritage series published by McClelland and Stewart. The first *The Scottish in Canada* edited by Stanford Reid came out in 1976, followed by volumes on the Polish (1976), Portuguese (1976), Arabs (1980), Norwegians (1980), Chinese (1982), Ukrainians (1982), Hungarians (1982), Croatians (1982), South Asians (1985), Estonians (1985), Dutch (1988), and a summary volume titled *Coming Canadians* (1988) by Jean Burnet and Howard Palmer. These were social histories edited by a sociologist and a historian, and the studies outlined the settlement patterns, their economic, family, educational, religious and political institutions, as well as voluntary associations, the media, ethnic identity and multiculturalism. Some major ethnic groups like Germans, Irish, Aboriginales were not
included. The series added much additional research activity and awareness of multicultural the Canadian heritage. These identity studies focused on solidarity (Durkheim), and reorganization emphasized by W.I. Thomas.

**Development of Organizational Supports**

The Canadian Ethnic Studies Association (CESA) began in 1971 when the Inter-University Committee on Canadian Slavs (IUCCS) formed in 1965, was renamed and reconstituted (Migus, 1975:1). They had held study conferences in Banff (1965), Ottawa (1967), Toronto (1969), and Ottawa (1971), and they published the papers as collections of works. When the CESA was formed, the association included scholars and others from all ethnic backgrounds which became the major national ethnic studies association to the present day. Study conferences have been held every two years since, and most of the time the papers were published in book form. It is an important way to gather ethnic scholars from around Canada, and keep in touch with each other and the research they do.

The IUCCS, also began a Canadian Ethnic Studies bibliography in 1968, which by 1971 became the *Canadian Ethnic Studies* (CES) journal which is still published. A brief examination of CES volumes 1-32 shows the heavy focus on ethnic identities and multiculturalism. Research on race and inequalities began in the 1980s, which has steadily increased by 2002. CES is now in its thirty-fourth volume, and has become a major scholarly outlet for publishing ethnic research.

Before World War II the two charter groups in the east had dominated Canadian politics and economics for several hundred years. Montreal in Quebec, was the largest metropolitan centre, where the banking and transportation systems were located. However, by 1971, Toronto
for the first time became the largest metropolis. Slowly Toronto had become the urban centre of
industrial southern Ontario, and a magnet to which immigrants increasingly were drawn, because
of new jobs. Institutions increasingly began to leave Montreal because of separatist Quebecois
uncertainties and increased conflicts. Banking, corporate headquarters, communications
conglomerates began to converge on Toronto. Half the immigrants which arrived, came to
Ontario. Thus, Toronto, which had been an overgrown largely British town, became a plural
ethnically, racially and religiously heterogeneous centre of five million, with the largest “visible
minority” population. The total Canadian population growth was shifting westward, with the
centre of power moving from eastern Canada and the Maritimes.

In 1964, Raymond Breton, a French origin sociologist from the prairies (Saskatchewan),
who also studied at Chicago, published his seminal “Institutional Completeness of Ethnic
Communities. . .” in the prestigious American Journal of Sociology, which clearly steered
Canadian ethnic studies in a pluralist direction. It concentrated on “other” ethnic groups than the
two largest dominant charter groups. Breton, former editor of the Canadian Review of Sociology
and Anthropology, was a third major early sociologist in Canada, and the second in Toronto at
the University of Toronto, to spearhead ethnic research. Breton was good at collaborating with
others, and published Cultural Boundaries and the Cohesion of Canada (1980) with Jeffrey
Pierre Savard.

Ethnic Identity and Equality (1990), which Breton published with Toronto sociologists
Sev Isajiw, Warren Kalbach and Jeffrey Reitz was the magnus opus, which examined ethnic
identity, segregation, inequality and politics in Toronto, which continued Richmond’s ethnic
research in Toronto. With substantial grants from SSHRC, they could take samples of 2,300
residents including three generations of Toronto residents, representing English, British, German, Ukrainian, Italian, Portuguese, Jewish, West Indian, and Chinese Torontonians. This permitted study and comparisons of ethnicity, race, identity, inequality and residential segregation in the largest Canadian metropolis of Canada. Three generations permitted tracing loss of identity and assimilation, as no other study had done before. Isajiw focused on identity and solidarity, while Reitz focused on industrial change. Breton’s (1991) The Governance of Ethnic Communities followed up on the political processes. In 1994, Reitz and Breton published The Illusion of Difference, comparing Canadian and USA ethnicity, their third collaborative work.

By the 1971 census, Toronto had become the largest metropolitan center in Canada, fast changing from a largely British to the most multicultural racially diverse city. This provided much opportunity for research, so that it also attracted the largest number of ethnic scholars. Raymond Breton, Warren Kalbach, Jeffrey Reitz, Sev Isajiw were located at the University of Toronto, and Anthony Richmond, Jean Burnet, Frances Henry, Evelyn Kallen and Carl James at York University, working at their Institute for Behavioural Research. Robert Harney had spearheaded the Ontario Ethnic, Immigration and Pluralism Institute for the provincial government located in downtown Toronto. Ethnic research had clearly shifted from charter group concerns, to multicultural visions, which soon turned to a debate on race and equal rights which we turn to next.

III. Inequality: Race, Racism, Rights (1980s-1990s)

Will Kymlicka (1995:15) calls for multicultural citizenship and human rights, a third major debate which began in the 1980s.

The late twentieth century has been described as the age of migration. Massive numbers of people are moving across borders, making virtually every country more polyethnic in
composition. . . Many. . . see this new “politics of difference” as a threat to liberal democracy. . . I have tried to show that many (but not all) of the demands of ethnic and national groups are consistent with liberal principles of individual freedom and social justice. . .

Unfortunately, groups can be motivated by hatred and intolerance, not justice, so that the potential to abuse rights and powers, like in Rwanda and Yugoslavia, are always present. So it is important to stress limits where 1) minority rights should not allow one group to dominate others, and 2) should not enable a group to oppress its own members (Kymlicka, 1995:17). Thus, while multiculturalism has much potential for equality, it is an opportunity which can easily be misused by majorities and minorities. It is difficult to use new found freedoms to human advantage, while at the same time building the welfare of all in a democracy.

**Canadian Constitution and Charter of Rights**

After many meetings, and epic federal-provincial battles, much debate culminated in the proclamation of the Constitution Act in 1982, which officially separated Canada from the BNA Act and British colonialism (Reg Whitaker, 1988). It entrenched a Charter of Rights and Freedoms which declared Canada a bilingual nation, and included individual rights. While most of the charter outlines the rights of two charter groups, it does include individual rights, aboriginal rights, and the right to a multicultural heritage of other Canadians. The queen and nine premiers signed; unfortunately, Quebec did not. Quebeckers felt a strong sense of betrayal at the hands of Trudeau and Chretien. Bringing home the constitution 1) was culmination of a study by a major Royal Commission which opened up discussions on ethnic diversity, 2) the languages of two founding groups were again officially recognized, 3) individual rights and freedoms were entrenched, 4) aboriginal rights were included, and 5) multicultural heritages
were recognized. All this provided a fertile launch for research and policy-making of many peoples, which spawned a huge avalanche of study and research.

The new Charter of Rights and Freedoms, outlines mostly (90%) the language and cultural rights of the two largest founding European charter groups, which shows how pervasive imperial colonialism is. But it does mention multicultural rights of others, and in the end (although last and begrudgingly) it includes aboriginals’ rights as well. It is focused on preservation of group heritages, designed for white Europeans who before the 1970s, represented 95% of the Canadian population. Changes in immigration policy in the 1970s had opened up to worldwide immigration so that by 1990, two decades later, the 5% non-white population had doubled to 10%, and projections are that that will double again to 20% by 2020. These demographic changes, noticeably changed the focus of ethnic and racial studies in Canada, from ingroup preservation to rights and equal treatment of all. Foci of research interest have moved from bilingualism to multiculturalism to equal rights of all.

**Studies of Aboriginals and First Nations**

Early mislabelling of the first peoples of Canada as “Indians”, illustrates the colonial mentality of white Europeans – they thought they were in India near the spices they desired. They also found “Eskimos” (meat eaters), when in fact they were Inuit (The People). White “Christians” in those days considered themselves industrial and superior, especially blessed by their monotheistic GOD. Status was a major factor, and newfound coloured peoples didn’t have it. These European colonial “palefaces” first settled in the east, and slowly possessed the “empty” land, turning lush hunting grounds into agricultural kingdoms, “rescuing” land and people for “better” purposes, destroying and polluting as they went. Early European censuses in
upper and lower Canada did not include the “heathen” and “food gathers”, because they lived in
the unorganized northwestern wilderness with whom they traded to promote the latest fur
fashions in “civilized” Europe.

It is not possible to treat the works on First Nations adequately here, but they must be
placed in context, to appreciate the complexity and range of the peoples of Canada that we are
dealing with. There were roughly one million Indian, Metis and Inuit Canadians of aboriginal
origin in 1991. Their national leaders (Georges Erasmus in 1990, and Ovide Mercredi in 1991),
strongly stated that the Aboriginals are the First Nations, not the British and French, and the
myth of the European bilingual and bicultural founding of Canada must be challenged (Boldt,
1993; Ponting, 1997). In 1991 the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was established to
hold hearings in more than a hundred communities across Canada, with the following aims: 1) to
forge a new relationship between aboriginals and non-aboriginals, 2) give more control to
aboriginals over their future, 3) help move them from subsistence to self-sufficiency, and 4)
promote physical, emotional, and spiritual healing after decades of mistreatment and neglect
Anthropology and Sociology department at University of British Columbia, was among the first
to study the rich and diverse aboriginal cultures in British Columbia, founding and developing
one of the best multi-million dollar museums on the University of British Columbia campus.
Hawthorne’s (1966, 1967) two volume, A Survey of Contemporary Indians of Canada, and the
early studies of Eskimos by Frank Vallee (1967, 1968), professor in the joint Sociology and
Anthropology department at Carleton University, as well as Jean Elliott’s Native Peoples (1971),
were among the earliest social science studies of aboriginals. The best known sociological study
editions. The first edition included contributions by four others, but integration happened more and more with each successive edition. *Indians of Canada* by John Price (1978, 1979) followed soon thereafter, which was a very well integrated social anthropological work. These studies clearly show that aboriginals before the Europeans came, were mostly food-gathering, oral societies, and profoundly diverse linguistically and culturally. They were a variety of societies which had not yet been exposed to monolingual, unitary dominant cultures and nation-states, which their white European colonialists tried to establish and perpetuate.

Important sources which should not be excluded are Mark Nagler’s (1970, 1975), and Edgar Dosman’s (1972) work on Indians in the city; Michael Asch’s (1984) aboriginal rights and the Canadian constitution; Menno Boldt and Anthony Long’s (1985) rights and justice edited work of 24 contributors; Boldt’s (1993) work on aboriginal rights to self government; Rick Ponting’s (1986) edited volume on Indian decolonization where eighteen writers contributed their work on economic community development; and Ponting’s (1997) work on aboriginal rights, claims, and Indian self government. By 1988 Alan McMillan published an integrated *Native Peoples and Cultures of Canada* text and a second edition in 1995; Olive Patricia Dickason (1992) published a huge 500 page volume, *Canada’s First Nations*, a history of the founding peoples from earliest times; and Augie Fleras and Jean Elliott (1992) published *The Nations Within*, comparing aboriginal-state relations in Canada, the U.S.A. and New Zealand.

The aboriginal field of research also developed like the others, first with smaller works, followed by edited collections of scholarly writing, and finally matured into three or more integrated texts by the 1990s.

**Research on Race, Rights, Freedoms**
In 1974, Anthropologists David Hughes and Evelyn Kallen published *The Anatomy of Racism: Canadian Dimensions*, which dealt with human evolution, the concept of race, systems of stratification and racism in Canada. Three years earlier in 1971, Robin Winks had published *Blacks in Canada*, and Anthony Richmond had two years earlier in 1972, published *Readings in Race and Ethnic Relations* (1972), which was a collection of readings, but it included only a few contributions on race in Canada. Anthropologist Frances Henry had also published *Forgotten Canadians: The Blacks of Nova Scotia* in 1973, part of a community series which dealt with Canada’s oldest Black settlement. This study of Nova Scotia Black communities was more similar to the community studies done by Dawson and Hughes.

Japanese sociologists Victor Ujimoto and Gordon Hirabayashi (1980) held conferences at the 1977 and 1978 Learned Societies’ meetings focusing on Asians in Canada, and these papers were among the first to deal more seriously with research on Canada’s racial minorities. They published some of these in *Visible Minorities and Multiculturalism: Asians in Canada* (1980), which included contributions dealing with Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese and Filipino Canadians. In 1983 Singh Bolaria and Peter Li (1983) did a collection of readings titled *Racial Oppression in Canada*, and a second edition appeared in 1988. The latest collection of readings on race has been compiled by Leo Driedger and Shiva Halli, titled *Race and Racism: Canada’s Challenge* (2000). Again, collections of readings are emerging to develop a field of studies until a single-authored attempt can be made. These studies began in the early 1970s, when about five percent of the Canadian population was non-white. Since then Trudeau’s charter of rights has increasingly been accepted, so that immigration policies opened up to include non-whites, and by 2000 visible minorities doubled to 10%.
In 1982 Evelyn Kallen was ready to do a volume on *Ethnicity and Human Rights in Canada* (1982), which came out as as second edition in 1995. In 1976 she and David Hughes had done *The Anatomy of Racism*, and in 1977 she had done a book on Jewish identity. Her 1995 work is the most recent attempt at conceptualizing human rights in countries of diversity, dealing with the vertical mosaic, social stratification, ethnic integration, minority protest movements, protection of minority rights, and the legal ramifications of these new developments.


**Immigration and Migration Research**

The point system established during the Trudeau years changed immigration to Canada from largely North European newcomers, to mostly “visible minorities”. By the 1990s, the
federal government needed more information to evaluate their immigration policy. It made available a total of $8,000,000, two million dollars each for research centres on immigration in Montreal, Toronto, Edmonton and Vancouver, under the larger Metropolis Project organization headed by Meyer Burstein. Large groups of both academic researchers at universities, and heads of various immigrant organizations joined at each of the four centres to hold conferences, provide funds for research, read papers and publish their works. The *Journal of International Migration and Integration* edited by Baha Abu-Laban and it came out with several issues by 2000, another avenue for publication of research on immigration, the most recent trend. The Metropolis Project Team has expanded internationally, where Metropolis conferences are held annually in various centres in Europe, Israel, U.S.A. and Canada. These are designed to develop research policy, bringing together researchers and persons working in the field.

“As the response to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism broadened to include residents of Canada who were neither British nor French, it became clear that it would no longer be prudent for government policy to ignore the wide range of other ethnic groups represented in the country. The 1971 federal governmental declaration of a policy of bilingualism within a multicultural framework, soon turned into a 1988 Multicultural Act which established the right of Canadians to identify with a cultural heritage” (Hiller, 1996:244). Multiculturalism now precludes assimilation of ethnic groups, and it also contrasted amalgamation, in which each ethnic group contributes something, but loses its identity as the people of the state find a totally new identity. “In contrast to the melting pot, Canada is. . . a pluralist society. . . where differences coexist in an atmosphere of mutual toleration” (Hiller, 1996:244). That will not be easy, but each will be modified, and identities will be maintained in a variety of ways.
Summary

The study of ethnic and race relations in Canada evolved into three major visions and debates after World War II. In the pre-seventies the imperial British and French charter peoples assumed monolingual/ monocultural states, and expected that others would assimilate and amalgamate losing their separate identities. Beginning in the 1970s, this was adjusted to official bilingual and multicultural visions. By the 1980s, ethnic and demographic diversity had expanded to include debates of equal rights for all, without prejudice or discrimination. National surveys of peoples, search for identities, development of supports such as organizations, journals, conferences, publications, textbooks, schools, and new measures to ensure equality for all needed study and action. What can we learn from the Canadian experience?

Power, class and status are clearly one of the first issues to examine. The colonial imperial powers (the British and French) settled the issue early by going to war, and the British won. That was a traditional earlier way of gaining dominance in Europe as well. However, recent realignments in the former Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have changed without war, and Yugoslavia is an example of both. Britain, France, Germany tried to settle the question of dominance in two world wars, with limited success, so can the three (like the British and French in Canada) explore joint cooperation and equal status, rather than a single mono form of power?

What language or languages will be used, especially in an information age where communication is crucial? In Canada, English and French was highly segmented regionally, so much effort was required to build equal status for both languages, and try to help the populations become bilingual, which has progressed very slowly. Europeans have an advantage in that they are much more multilingual, but how do you decide which languages will be official in the economic, political, educational and social areas?
Birth rates in North America and Europe are going down, where many countries are no longer replacing deaths, so immigration becomes a factor. As in the future, economic and political cooperation expands in Europe, how much control will there be between present states and migration, or will these countries look more like states in the United States, where populations follow economic opportunities more? In Canada Quebeckers migrate largely within Quebec, but the rest move quite freely from east to west. What about immigration policies which regulate immigrant flow from outside the European union? Are they only gastarbeiter or can they become immigrants with the hope of citizenship and equal rights? In Quebec 80 percent of the population is of French origin and as many speak French, so they want to perpetuate their Frenchness as an island in the North American anglo and English sea. So immigrants from French countries are encouraged to come. In the past this heavily Roman Catholic French Quebec population also sustained its growth by having large families. However, birth rates have plummeted to below the Canadian average, so they will increasingly have to depend on new immigrants to sustain their population.

In the past immigrants came to Canada largely from northern Europe which sustained European languages, the Christian religion, and the white caucasian race. Recently, skin pigmentation has increased, as more southern Europeans came, and increasingly Asians and Blacks have come from China, India and the Caribbean. Many of these are not white caucasians, they have increased from five to ten percent, and by 2020 are projected to make up 20 percent of Canada’s population. Europe still seems to be quite lily white, but this will most likely change as well, as more highly pigmented people from a diversity of cultures and religions are attracted by European economic success. Overpopulation pressures in the southern parts of the world increase where birth rates are much higher, so pressures to accept diversity will rise. In Canada,
Toronto was still very British in the 1960s, but it now has become the most plural metropolis with a range of diverse visible minorities.

As these non-European populations in Ontario and British Columbia increase, they as immigrants and new citizens, expect equal rights in a country which prides itself as open, and fair without prejudice and discrimination. Adjustments of the largely white population of European origins are huge, and increasingly new visible minorities find prejudice and discrimination, which interferes with equal opportunities. Thus, more and more potential for conflict emerges. Europe of course, will increasingly face similar challenges, and it will be interesting to see whether they will do better than Americans, who had to fight a civil war to sort the institution of slavery. In Canada we have not yet fought wars, but conflicts intensify in larger cities, although this has not yet turned into race riots (like in Los Angeles), but the test has hardly begun.

Trudeau’s declaration of Canada as bilingual and multicultural, resulted in an explosion of multicultural research, expanding the ethnic agenda. Literature and publications were developed, many national research surveys were launched, ethnic identity research escalated, organizations were organized to support diversity, so that multiculturalism was celebrated as a new vision, expanding the ethnic tent to more understanding of all. While in the seventies, white European heritage scholars studied their own ethnic identities and solidarity, by the eighties this shifted to racial “visible minorities”, whose population had doubled.

Two collections of writings, Ethnicity and Culture in Canada, edited by John Berry and J.A. Laponce (1994), and the Encyclopedia of Canada’s Peoples, edited by P.R. Magocsi (1999), are good examples of how far multicultural research in Canada has come. Ethnicity is likely to be to the twenty-first century what class was to the twentieth. It was assumed that ethnicity
would be weakened by industrialization, but globalization has weakened the nation-state, the poor in the overpopulated South are increasingly migrating North, continuing the need for “meaningful” communities in urban countries, mixing within borders different races, religions, languages and customs (Berry and Laponse, 1994). Clash of cultures create new problems where everyone is ethnic in multiethnic settings. “An on-line search of the computerized UBC card catalogue indicates that out of 398 books entered since 1978 with either ‘multiethnic’ or ‘multicultural’ in their titles, multicultural accounted for 90 percent of the total” (Berry and Laponse, 1994). This “Third Force” is largest and growing, where “mono” has changed to “bi”, and all are heading toward “multi”. The twins of diversity and conflict will be exciting research in the next century, as the hundreds of entries in the Encyclopedia of Canada’s Peoples well illustrate (Magocsi, 1999).
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