

Can Multiculturalism Deliver Inclusion?

By Rashmi Luther
Berlin, Heinrich Boell Foundation
May 2, 2006

Introduction

I would like to begin by thanking Mekonnen Mesghena, (Department Head of Migration, Citizenship and Diversity, Heinrich Boell Foundation), the Canadian Embassy, and all of you for this opportunity to participate in a dialogue on issues of diversity and inclusion. These issues are growing in importance and relevance not only for nations such as Canada who have historically been identified as ‘settler nations’, but also for European and other nations. In the contemporary context, the urgency of these issues is heightened by the consequences of global economic restructuring which include the large movements and relocation of people across various national and regional borders. In light of these developments and resulting diversification of the make-up of nations, it is not surprising that European nations are looking to Canada and its ‘multiculturalism’ policy framework as a potential model. The model holds enormous appeal and reflects possibilities for the peaceful ‘co-existence’ of diverse groups of people (religion, ethnicity, culture, political beliefs, race and language among others) and for ‘inclusion’ where all can be “distinct but equal members of society” (Luther 2002:24).

This international interest in Canada’s multiculturalism framework does raise some interesting contradictions however. For instance, it is also curious that while the international community views Canada as a leader in this area, and as Canada ‘markets’ itself as such (to be more competitive in the global economy), on the home front, it is experiencing reduced public and financial support, especially for programs directed at more meaningful inclusion and participation. In other words, the ideal of multiculturalism is welcomed for it embraces beliefs in equality, fairness, acceptance, rights and belonging. However, its implementation in the form of practical strategies that question and alter the present distribution of power and privilege (the status quo) is resisted.

My reason for articulating this important contradiction is largely to underscore the point that challenge and resistance are intertwined and ongoing processes that should be expected and factored in to efforts toward building a diverse and inclusive society. As such, a firm and long-term commitment from the state is a vital pre-requisite, accompanied by adequate and continuing resources. In addition, the presence of an organized, active and politicized community sector is also critical, as my comments about the Canadian experience with multiculturalism will show. Indeed in many respects, a vibrant, engaged and informed community sector is vital for building inclusive societies and for supporting the ideals of democracy, be it representative or participatory.

Public policy options based on principles of ‘equity’ not ‘equality’ are another critical component of discourses and practices related to the concept of inclusion. As evidenced by Canadian experiences, it is also important to recognize that meaningful inclusion is impeded by equality based policies and measures founded on principles of ‘sameness’ or ‘equal’ treatment. It is asserted that, despite good intentions, such measures can undermine diversity by promoting uniformity and supporting assimilation into the status quo. Instead, it is suggested that conceptions of ‘diversity’ and ‘difference’ are better served by frameworks founded on notions of ‘equity’ as they better recognize the different historical contexts and experiences of different groups. In light of these differences, different policy and program responses are required for different groups, not a one size fits all or cookie-cutter approach. An ‘equity’ based approach is therefore recommended for its ability to better reflect and respect plurality and to embrace differences present among and within groups.

These comments and reflections are being made at this time based on critical analyses and experiences with Canadian multiculturalism since its inception. Indeed, October 8, 2006 will mark the 35th anniversary of Canada's multiculturalism policy and its tension-filled project to achieve unity with diversity. It must also be noted that since its inception in 1971, multiculturalism has come to symbolize Canadian identity, and is marketed as such in the international domain to increase Canada's competitive edge in the global economy. Such projections help contribute to beliefs that a peaceful coexistence of cultural, racial, linguistic and religious differences has been achieved. While this perception may be seen to have some merit in relative terms, it also tends to obscure the numerous tensions that have historically existed and misrepresents the experience of many ethnoracial and ethnocultural groups who are still deemed to be outsiders. Viewed as outsiders or as not really Canadian, they are still asked ‘Where are you from?’ even though they may have been born and raised in Canada.

Thus, it is clear that multiculturalism remains a contested terrain, one that evokes passionate debates about ‘who’ we are and ‘what’ is the nature of Canada. Such debates also underscore the political nature of the concept underpinned by power relations that determine who is identified as an ethnic (or not), by whom, and why. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to critically examine its history, achievements and flaws in response to the question: can multiculturalism deliver inclusion?

At this juncture, it must be acknowledged that multiculturalism is in itself an enormously complex and multifaceted concept and that it is intimately interconnected with other equally complex issues such as shifting political and economic contexts (national, regional, international and local), nation-building projects, immigration policies and patterns, prevailing ideologies, class, race, gender and other intersections. Therefore, discussions about multiculturalism and inclusion must be framed within these broader contexts which differ from nation to nation. As such, the potential and scope of multiculturalism and inclusion will be informed by the particular historical dynamics of each nation.

Clarifying Concepts

I will begin by clarifying the key concepts of multiculturalism and inclusion for both are prime examples of terms that carry multiple and varied meanings. For instance, while we may all use the same terms, it is likely that we ascribe different meanings to those terms. As such, these differences in meaning can lead to considerable confusion and disagreement as their respective visions, goals, objectives, strategies and outcomes collide with one another.

Multiculturalism

The concept of multiculturalism is varyingly used as:

1. *A descriptor of society as culturally diverse*
2. *An ideology (affirms beliefs in equality and the appreciation of differences)*
3. *An 'official' Government policy*
4. *A political strategy used by diverse groups for legitimacy, power and claims-making around inclusion (Palmer Seiler 2002:6)*

As a Descriptor

Over the past thirty-five years, the term's relevance and applicability has grown considerably, aided by the global movement of people, and is now an appropriate descriptor of many contemporary nations, especially in Europe and the Americas.

As an Ideology

There is a growing ambivalence over multiculturalism as an ideology however, and while it still holds some appeal in relation to the social liberal sentiments of fairness, equality, human rights and justice, it is also being more vigorously contested in the post 9/11 environment of suspicion and fear associated with differences.

As an 'Official' Government Policy

With the ascendance of Neoliberalism and concerns about deficit reduction, a reduced state and cuts to social programs were instituted as a means of re-engineering economic prosperity based on individual competition and merit. In this cost cutting and state reducing environment, support for 'official' multiculturalism as a social program also declined in the belief that cultural preservation is a private matter, not one requiring state support or limited tax dollars. Some also believe that state resources are no longer required as the goals of a multicultural society have already been achieved and that all have equality of opportunity as individuals.

As a Political Strategy

Multiculturalism as a political strategy for claims making has had varying degrees of success over the years, especially regarding concerns of immigrants and refugees who are culturally and racially more 'visible'. Claims-making generally, and by these groups in particular, has been negatively impacted by declining public support and the development of new rationalizations for tolerating degrees of inequality and for accepting human rights violations under the guise of public safety and national unity. In addition, many of the previously available mechanisms and channels for making demands, negotiating claims and participating in policy deliberations have narrowed and/or closed over the past decade.

Inclusion

The concept of inclusion also has varied meanings and political underpinnings. They include:

1. *Recognition* (as part of the Canadian mosaic)
2. *Belonging* (as being Canadian)
3. *Access, opportunities, rewards and protections* (meaningful work, recognition of qualifications and experience, housing, bank loans, language training, employment training, culturally appropriate services i.e. health and social services, culturally inclusive educational curricula, unbiased police and legal services...)
4. *Representation and participation* in all institutional and governmental levels, including boards and commissions
5. Ability to *challenging systems* that perpetuate inequalities and exclusion based on race, culture, religion, gender, class, ability and so on through vibrant community organizations, advocacy and the development of viable alternatives

Inclusion

In many respects, meaningful inclusion involves the simultaneous presence of all of the components identified above. Whether and to what extent multiculturalism has encompassed and enabled these various components of inclusion in a sustained and meaningful way will be examined at the conclusion of this presentation. It must be noted however that, historically as well as in the contemporary context, it is inclusion in the form of challenges to dominant systems that continues to face the greatest resistance within host societies. This is because it poses the greatest threat to established 'traditions', norms and values by exposing and challenging systems of power and privilege on which they are founded. Consequently, challenges to prevailing orders are being increasingly re-framed as threats to peace, security and democracy, and used to justify restrictions and/or to impose a more stringent 'management' of diversity. Despite

these developments, it also bears remarking that times of turmoil and uncertainty also have the potential to open up exciting opportunities and spaces for creativity and the discovery of new and different alternatives that can be mutually enhancing.

Historical Context

Post WWII (1960s)

In the post WWII period of the 1950s and 1960s, Canada and other Northern industrial nations experienced considerable economic prosperity, enabling ideologies of liberalism and social democracy to gain greater popular political appeal. Increased awareness about and sensitivity toward issues of human rights, equality, fairness and social justice also developed in the aftermath of the War as did an expanded role for the Canadian state in the delivery of social programs. In the midst of all these developments, unlike many European nations, Canada as a settler nation, continued to struggle with national identity issues that involved tensions between the ‘two founding nations/races’ (British and French) with Quebecers resisting assimilation, as well as between the two founding nations and multicultural others. It is useful to keep in mind that through these narrow and self-serving constructions of national identity discourses, there is an erasure of Aboriginal and First Nations groups, reinforcing the myth of terra nullius. And, those whose origins are other than British or French get categorized and homogenized as multicultural ‘others’.

Increased Immigration from Europe

Much like other European nations, Canada too has historically controlled access to its national borders through its immigration policies. For instance, prior to the early 1970s, these policies favoured immigrants from Europe and Britain as permanent settlers as they were considered to be more culturally similar and better able to assimilate into the Canadian milieu. In contrast, the policies closely guarded entrants and their numbers from the South as well as their length of stay, what they could do in terms of work, where they could live, what services they could access, and so on. As a result of these policy preferences, the make-up of Canada on October 8, 1971, when the Multiculturalism Policy was proclaimed by Pierre Trudeau was considerably different than its make-up today. Therefore, it is critical to note that those articulating desires for cultural ‘recognition’ within the Canadian mosaic at that time were organized groups and communities whose origins/ancestry were primarily European (Palmer Seiler 2002).

With this comprehension, it is important to acknowledge that while all new immigrant/refugee groups face varying degrees of difficulty in their settlement and adaptation processes, this emphasis by organized groups at that time on inclusion as ‘cultural recognition’ could also reflect that, for them, remaining impediments to meaningful integration and acceptance into the Canadian milieu were relatively few. As a result, it is likely issues of access, opportunity, rewards and protection may not have been as crucial as they were for later groups who were more ‘visible’ in terms of culture, race and religion.

Multiculturalism Policy – “Unity in Diversity”

With this brief background, we can hopefully more readily appreciate that Canada’s multiculturalism policy is indeed a product of a particular historical context and that its articulation was both politically motivated as well as responsive to the demands of the organized and articulate European origin community groups at that time. These demands were for ‘recognition’ that their cultures also comprised the Canadian mosaic.

While the concept of multiculturalism was/is being promoted by the state and embraced by some ‘cultural’ or ‘ethnic’ groups, it was/is rejected by First Nations and Aboriginal groups who do not define themselves by these labels but politically differentiate themselves as distinct nations with inherent rights to self-government and self-determination. Additionally, while some ethnic communities praise the Multiculturalism Policy for giving recognition to the culturally diverse make-up of Canada, others continue to attack it for positioning this recognition within the boundaries of Canada’s linguistic duality which privileges the two founding nations. This positioning is seen as reinforcing division and creating hierarchies of “us” (the two founding nations) and “them” (the ethnics). Some also claim that the Policy is founded on a somewhat naïve assumption that support for cultural expression will somehow miraculously promote acceptance, belonging and inclusion, which in turn will produce harmonious co-existence.

The main tenets of the Policy are being circulated to you to review at your leisure. This will enable you to develop your own analysis about its definition of the terms we have discussed and make some assessment about the level of the state’s commitment to the different aspects of ‘inclusion’ that we have explored. In your examination, you may observe that the state’s commitment to ‘inclusion’ seems to be largely concentrated in areas such as “recognition”, “preservation” and “sharing” of cultural diversity/heritage. However, you may also note that there is also an expressed commitment to the other more substantive aspects of ‘inclusion’ as depicted in sections (c), (e) and (f) which use the language of “equitable participation”, “elimination of barriers to participation”, “equal treatment”, “equal protection under the law”, and institutional inclusion.

Not surprisingly, there is tension between these two different groupings. For instance, the grouping that highlights ‘recognition’ tends to promote a more folkloric notion of cultural inclusion (saris, steel drums and samosas) and is founded on the belief that if we all just understood and appreciated one another’s cultural differences better we would all get along. This is known as the ‘mix and stir’ approach to multiculturalism and has been critiqued for viewing ‘culture’ as static and unidimensional, as well as for promoting stereotypes and generalizations about cultural groups.

In contrast, the ‘participation’ grouping tends to emphasize ‘inclusion’ through the removal of systemic barriers in the belief that all will then receive ‘equal treatment’. Strategies adopted to address systemic barriers include those that challenge existing and historic inequalities of race, culture, language and religion and how ‘difference’ has been

interpreted in ways that limit the participation of some groups while privileging others. In addition, they expose and critique how conditions of marginalization (racism and second-class status) are politically, economically, socially and culturally produced and reproduced in society. Such strategies are by their nature confrontational in challenging the status quo and requiring that society and its institutional organization and practices must also change to meet the reality of a diverse society.

While the above two groupings are in undeniable tension with one another, they none-the-less share the same underlying goal, i.e. integration. However, in the former 'mix and stir' approach, integration is more akin to assimilation as there are few challenges to society and its social organization to do little other than hold cultural celebrations. In the latter grouping however, integration is conceived as an ongoing process of challenge, adjustment and change, involving all of society and its members.

Policy's Relevance to Contemporary Context and Issues

Since the policy was proclaimed in 1971, the face and complexion of Canada has become undeniably more colourful due in part to changes in immigration and refugee policies combined with major upheavals such as geo-political reconfigurations, economic global restructuring, free trade, wars, disasters, and so on. Inclusion as 'recognition' therefore no longer suffices. Instead, there is a growing urgency that recognition and inclusion be reconceptualized as substantive not symbolic multiculturalism. Such a reconceptualization would focus on improved access, opportunities, tangible results, meaningful participation, as well as safeguards around human rights, non-discrimination, and positive discrimination measures to arrest the production of historic and systemic inequalities. It would also be reflected in policies and programs that promote 'equity' (differential treatment) i.e., education equity, employment equity, service equity as opposed to 'equality' (sameness).

Major Critiques

I would like to preface my discussion of some of the major critiques that surround Canada's Multiculturalism Policy by asserting that its intent is to provide an opportunity to learn from Canadian experiences and encourage debate. It is also hoped that a better appreciation of these critiques, presented from a variety of different perspectives, will facilitate dialogue and development of stronger frameworks that are informed by the experiences and insights of others.

In discussing some of the major critiques that surround the Policy, it bears reiteration that it contains conceptions of multiculturalism, otherwise known as 'official' multiculturalism, that are simultaneously contradictory (Bannerji 2000). For instance, on the one hand it serves as a mechanism for making and negotiating different claims by groups and communities. However, on the other hand, it is also a mechanism that is controlled and managed from above and as such its priorities, directions and resources can be altered, withdrawn or eliminated based on political expediency. As well, while the Policy acknowledges that diversity is comprised of individual as well as

group/community/collective differences, in practice, it tends to favour and support frameworks that promote individual rights and choice. In addition, there is also a tension present between the desire to recognize cultural differences and the desire to recognize everyone as equals. While the tension remains, it has none-the-less been erroneously and unsuccessfully reconciled by adopting a 'colour-blind' and 'culture-blind' approach that emphasizes 'sameness' over difference in keeping with the tenets of liberalism (Fleras and Elliott 2002). This inevitably favours a one size fits all approach which fails to address historic and systemic inequities of colonialism, imperialism, racism, sexism, and so on.

Mainstream or Status Quo Critiques (Too Much!)

1. *Waste of taxpayers' money* – These critiques assert that the goals of multiculturalism have essentially been achieved as society is already culturally diverse. In so doing, they see multiculturalism as an end, not an ongoing and evolving process. They tend to regard desires for cultural preservation as private matters, not ones that warrant public support. These critiques have increased with the ascendance of Neoliberal ideologies.
2. *Threat to national unity* – Proponents of these critiques raise alarms that multiculturalism promotes balkanization of society and results in hyphenated identities (Seiler 2002, Rummens 2002). They argue that old world divisions are transplanted into new world societies and that this undermines the development of a cohesive national identity. These critiques favour policies of assimilation, making 'them' more like 'us'.
3. *Threat to national security* – Adherents of these views have grown in the post 9/11 world and reflect a fear of difference, with difference being regarded as a threat to peace, order, stability and national security. These critiques also support more restrictive and selective immigration and refugee policies to weed out potential terrorists.
4. *Fragments society* – These critiques oppose the elevation of differences between groups and argue instead that focus should be maintained on commonalities and shared values. These critiques support 'colour-blind', 'culture-blind' and 'sameness' approaches to diversity.

'Ethnic' Community Critiques (Too Little!)

1. *Pretend pluralism* – This critiques the Policy for giving only symbolic or tokenistic recognition to difference that is essentially rhetoric rather than substance. It argues therefore that the Policy gives a superficial nod to differences but does not sufficiently recognize corresponding rights and entitlements (Fleras 2002). This failure is critiqued for having produced a hierarchical ordering of cultures i.e., the 'two founding nations/races' and the 'ethnics'.

2. *Management of diversity using a colour-blind approach* – This critiques the comprehension of equality as ‘sameness’ and contends that this promotes strategies that emphasize issues of ‘access’ and ‘opportunity’ that often disregard the history of inequality experienced by different groups such as colonialism, imperialism, racism, sexism. Critics therefore prefer the term ‘equity’ for being more inclusive of these systemic components.
3. *Depoliticizes understanding of diversity* – These critics argue that ‘official’ multiculturalism tends to support assimilation, compliance, and inclusion within existing systems that produce and reproduce inequalities instead of sufficiently challenging and altering those systems (Fleras 2002). Therefore, critics assert that ‘official’ multiculturalism unwittingly draws diverse groups into this harmful cycle as participants.
4. *Discourages challenges to existing power and privilege structures, dominant norms and ‘traditions’ and systemic inequalities* – This critique contends that ‘official’ multiculturalism undermines, ostracizes and marginalizes those who challenge and oppose the prevalent systems of power and privilege by reducing state funding and de-legitimizing group or community related concerns.

Thus, as official government policy, multiculturalism has been critiqued by ‘ethnic’ communities for promising equality while remaining embedded in a framework of inequality.

Community Activism and Relative Impacts

Despite all the contentious debates, difficulties and imperfections associated with conceptions of multiculturalism, particularly as official government policy, community groups have been highly engaged in using the policy as an opportunity structure to further their respective interests and concerns. They have used it as an instrument to:

Organize themselves into cohesive bodies – These include ethno-specific organizations around culture, language, religion; service organizations around settlement and integration of newcomers; umbrella organizations for purposes of political advocacy and claims-making around substantive inclusion; and opposition to racial discrimination.

Politicize their membership – Politicization strategies include information sharing; dissemination of critical analyses pertaining to different social and political issues; organization of conferences and workshops; and promotion of political participation.

Educate the broader community about their issues – This has been done through public presentations at meetings and focus groups, participation and presentation at mainstream conferences, building relations with local and national media, and participation in legislative hearings.

Legitimate their presence as political entities – In this capacity, the role and clout of ethnic communities as taxpayers, voters and consumers has been emphasized.

Advocate for more inclusive policies and programs – Broad-based advocacy has been directed at policy makers and institutional sectors in areas encompassing employment, housing, health and social services, education, policing and the media. As well, they have advocated for cross-cultural, anti-racism training and anti-oppression training programs, participated on ‘equity’ advisory committees, and supported the establishment of ‘equity’ positions as appropriate.

Participate in public policy deliberations – These have included participation on and presentations to legislative committees, royal commissions, special committees and policy focus groups, although primarily on matters related to issues of equity, immigration, refugees, multiculturalism, etc.

Increase representation on boards, commissions, and in government – This has included encouragement to run for electoral office and to seek appointments to various boards and commissions.

Without belittling any of these accomplishments, it would be irresponsible of me to leave you with the impression that these have produced miracles and that inclusion has been achieved. Indeed all is not well with the world and this would be a deceptive and erroneous conclusion as despite all these efforts and more, many newcomers and longer standing immigrant and refugee groups, especially those regarded as ‘visible minorities’ still face substantial barriers to integration. Sadly, many are still waiting for that promise of equality.

Unfortunately, racism is still a major factor that many confront in seeking housing, employment and education. Cultural insensitivities are still present in hospitals, social service agencies. Arabs, Blacks and Aboriginal people are still more likely to be regarded with suspicion by the police and apprehended. The media still reverts to old stereotypes about different groups. The credentials and experiences that newcomers bring are still not recognized as equivalent to those of Canadians. Therefore, while much has been done, the impact of these efforts has not always been lasting or sustained. (This, however, is a whole other discussion for another time.) It is however useful to point out at this time that what has been achieved to date has depended to a large extent on the convergence of the following factors: a) state commitment (moral and financial); b) public support; c) mechanisms and opportunity structures to influence public policy and decision-making processes; and d) the presence of well organized and coherent community voices.

The Contemporary Context

In the contemporary context, these factors have altered significantly and the convergence is no longer evident. For example, there is less tangible state commitment in terms of

financial resources. Public support for state expenditures on multiculturalism is also declining based on the belief that cultural preservation is a 'private' choice. This decline in public support is also a reflection of a backlash to 'equity' where measures directed at systemic barriers are being re-defined as 'reverse discrimination'. Such beliefs have been effective in reductions or withdrawal of state funding for ethnocultural/ethnoracial groups, especially those with an advocacy mandate. Advocacy related initiatives are also no longer supported by state funding. In addition, mechanisms for public input into policy deliberations have narrowed significantly and policy making itself has become more centralized, requiring limited public input organized as 'focus' groups that many see as being highly elitist structures. Policy input is also increasingly requiring the development of specialized skills and technical expertise in order to prepare research reports, conduct sophisticated studies, prepare complex policy documents, position papers, and so on. For many groups, compliance with these requirements is difficult to achieve, especially within their limited resources. While there are still some public consultation opportunities that remain, there is a growing critique that these are largely tokenistic as they are often after the fact, to share information and rarely to actually solicit meaningful input.

In light of these changing contexts, community voices have become more muted and some of the gains of the past few decades have also been eroded, such as cuts to funding for multiculturalism and equity programs and the elimination or reduction of institutional 'equity' positions and committee structures. These developments offer tangible evidence of the often fragile nature of multiculturalism and inclusion discourses, especially those that seek substantive and meaningful inclusion.

Multiculturalism thus remains a contested terrain within the ethnoracial and ethnocultural communities as well as in the broader Canadian public. Some herald it as a success and vigorously defend its preservation while others see it as an irritant that promotes divisions and thwarts the development of a cohesive national identity. As Neoliberal critiques of multiculturalism gain force, however, some who previously critiqued multiculturalism for its symbolism and lack of substance have had to grudgingly come to its defence. It must be pointed out though that their defence is not necessarily related to the Policy. Instead, it is in defence of a belief that the state has a crucial responsibility to actively intervene in the creation of a just society. Thus, despite all the critiques that surround it, multiculturalism is still attractive for its potential (albeit with required modifications) as a shared commitment between the state and its members to build a just, equitable and inclusive society.

Concluding Comments

We return now to a consideration of the opening question 'Can multiculturalism deliver inclusion?' Each of us would likely respond to this with some variation. My own response to this question is to say 'maybe' or 'it depends' because based on Canadian experiences, the answer we propose really depends upon how we define the terms i.e., in a symbolic or substantive way. If one defines it in a substantive sense then the potential of multiculturalism is readily evident. However, it can only be sustained through a long-

term commitment of political and public will, adequate and sustained resources, and vibrant communities as active partners.

3. (1) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada to

(a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;

(b) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada's future;

(c) promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to that participation;

(d) recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development;

(e) ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;

(f) encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character;

(g) promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;

(h) foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;

(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada; and

(j) advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada.

Selected Bibliography

Amit-Talai, Vered and Caroline Knowles (eds.). Re-Situating Identities: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity and Culture. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1996.

Bissoondath, Neil. Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1994.

Bannerji, Himani. The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press, 2000.

Breton, Raymond. The Governance of Ethnic Communities: Political Structures and Processes in Canada. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1991.

Carty, Linda and Dionne Brand. "“Visible Minority” Women: A Creation of the Canadian State,” in Bannerji Himani (ed.). Returning the Gaze: Essays on Racism, Feminism and Politics. Toronto: Sister Vision Press, 1993.

Fleras, Augie. “Multiculturalism as Critical Discourse: Contesting Modernity,” *Canadian Issues/Themes Canadiens*, Montreal: Association of Canadian Studies, February 2002.

Fleras, Augie and Jean Leonard Elliott. The Challenge of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada. Scarborough: Nelson Canada, 1992.

Gagnon, Alain G., Montserrat Guibernau and Francois Rocher (eds.). The Conditions of Diversity in Multinational Democracies. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy, 2003.

Halli, Shiva S. and Leo Dreidger (eds.). Immigrant Canada: Demographic, Economic, and Social Challenges. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

James, Carl E. Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Ethnicity, Race and Culture (third edition). Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing Inc., 2003.

Kymlicka, Will. Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Luther, Rashmi. “Multiculturalism, Advocacy Groups and Charitable Tax Status,” *Canadian Issues/Themes Canadiens*, Montreal: Association of Canadian Studies, February 2002.

McRoberts, Kenneth. Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Razack, Sherene H. Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002.

Rummens, Joanna Anneke. "Redefining The Canadian Demos: Towards a Trans-Cultural Citizenship Charter," *Canadian Issues/Themes Canadiens*, Montreal: Association of Canadian Studies, February 2002.

Satzewich, Vic. (ed.). Racism and Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies and Strategies of Resistance. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing Inc., 1998.

Seidle, F. Leslie (ed.). Equity and Community: the Charter, interest advocacy and representation. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1993.

Seiler, Tamara Palmer. "Thirty Years Later: Reflections on the Evolution and Future Prospects of Multiculturalism," *Canadian Issues/Themes Canadiens*, Montreal: Association of Canadian Studies, February 2002.

Ujimoto, Victor and Gordon Hirabayashi (eds.). Visible Minorities and Multiculturalism: Asians in Canada. Toronto: Butterworth and Company (Canada) Ltd., 1980.