MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA:
SYMBOLIC BOUNDARIES AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DIFFERENCE

by

Ashley Fraser, BA Honours, Carleton University, 2005

A Major Research Paper
presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in the Program of
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2010

© Ashley Fraser 2010

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research paper.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this paper by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA:
SYMBOLIC BOUNDARIES AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DIFFERENCE

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how people are constructed into groups, and how these constructions are reinforced by the ideology of multiculturalism in Canada. I am primarily concerned with the metaphorical use of the border concept in the context of Multicultural Canada, and if and how the current ideology of multiculturalism reifies cultural distinctions and, in complex ways, contributes to divisiveness and disunity within Canada. The goal of Canada's Multicultural policy is integration via acceptance of difference. Yet, the principle or logic underlying the policy rests on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous. Thus, Canadian multiculturalism's undue emphasis on cultural differences means that such differences, whether superficial or substantive, are abstracted into meaningful difference through the metaphorical extension of border concepts. As such, through the racialization of cultural identities and the institutionalization of difference, multiculturalism has left unchanged the structural organization of power in the cultural and political landscape of Canada.

Key words:

borders; boundaries; multiculturalism; nationalism

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Between groups and individuals, there always have been boundaries and differences. However, one of the most important challenges that we face today is to understand how we create boundaries, and what are the consequences of such actions (Lamont and Fournier 1992:1). Due to the increasing flows of goods, people, and information as a result of globalization, the meaning of borders has to be reframed and rediscovered. The more borders are crossed, the more they are reproduced along other dimensions, ranging from the cultural to the symbolic. A border is traditionally defined as the line or frontier area separating political or national divisions or geographic regions. The border concept, in the most general sense, indicates the line that divides, defines, and/or distinguishes between two or more contiguous area. The meaning of borders is constantly changing. Today it is accepted that there are no natural borders, that borders are historical institutions. In other words, we now understand borders as relative and artefactual, rather than as something natural and taken for granted. As Balibar (2004:108) notes, "there have never existed, anywhere, 'natural borders.'" They are always constructed, products of social practice, and often the result of conflict. The border as we know it today was invented by the modern nation-state.

However, the term 'border' is used to describe not only spatial discontinuities involving nation-states but also, more metaphorically, a range of social and cultural discontinuities. Borders and boundaries have become a more general vocabulary of discontinuity and difference in society and culture. Yet, the metaphorical extension of the border image onto social and cultural identities has given rise to the possibility that discontinuities in the organization of human life are sharply defined. Moreover, it presupposes a certain notion of culture as a bounded, homogenous entity existing on either side of a figurative line. According to Epstein

(1992:233), such boundaries, defining and separating people into groups, communities, and many other classifications, act as constraints to equality.

In this spirit, and given the exploratory impulse of my research, my paper is concerned with the metaphorical use of the border concept in the context of Multicultural Canada, and will discuss if and how the current ideology of multiculturalism reifies cultural distinctions and, in complex ways, contributes to divisiveness and disunity within Canada. By focusing on multiculturalism in Canada as a "state-sanctioned, state organized ideological affair" (Bannerji 2000:27), I seek to address the following questions: What kind of 'culture' does Canadian multiculturalism embrace? And, Does multiculturalism in Canada draw on and reinforce racial exclusions and hierarchies of difference?

Intergroup relations is perhaps the most challenging domain of human behaviour (Moghaddam 2008:16). At the foundation of intergroup relations is the basic process of categorizing the world and identifying individuals as belonging to different groups (Moghaddam 2008:29). Moghaddam (2008:43) claims that any serious effort to change intergroup relations, and any progress toward better policies for managing diversity, must begin with a consideration of certain processes and assumptions associated with such categorization. In terms of differentiation, Moghaddam (2008:162) declares that it is not the objective meaning of an intergroup difference, but the meaning ascribed to a difference that shapes intergroup relations. If such is the case, the concern is how a difference proliferates into differences, but more importantly, how and why differences are created and sustained, and with what effects.

The stated goal of Canada's Multicultural policy is integration via acceptance of difference. According to a recent publication by the Government of Canada Policy Research Initiative (2008), "[i]n theory and intent, Canada's policies and legislation regarding ethno-

cultural diversity are tools for building inclusive citizenship, reducing barriers to social and economic participation of marginalized groups, and sharpening Canada's economic edge in face of globalization." However, it is important to explore how 'inclusion' and the seeming celebration of difference can also be expressions of power that may produce the opposite effect. In this sense, the metaphorical extension of the border concept onto social and cultural identities not only presupposes a certain notion of culture. Metaphorical borders, as the demarcation lines that separate us from them, serve to create, maintain, and legitimate inequality mainly because the ability to define and to manipulate such borders, and hence to stigmatize 'others,' lies in the hands of the powerful (Balibar 2004).

The policy of multiculturalism, particularly as developed in Canada, has a number of foundational assumptions about culture (Moghaddam 2008:150). According to Modood (2007:89):

> the positing of minority or immigrant cultures, which need to be respected, defended, publicly supported and so on, appeals to the view that cultures are discreet, frozen in time, impervious to external influences, homogenous and without internal dissent. Cultures are seen as a fact of nature so that people of certain (family, ethnic or geographical) origins are always to be defined by their origins and indeed are supposed to be behaviourally determined by them. In this critique it is said that group membership falsely implies the existence of some shared essential characteristics, an essence, and multiculturalism is portrayed as a picture of society as a 'mosaic' of several bounded, nameable, individually homogeneous and unmeltable minority uni-cultures which are pinned onto the backdrop of a similarly characterized majority uni-culture.

So, if the principle or logic underlying Canadian multiculturalism policy rests on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous or, in other words, if the theory of multiculturalism is rooted in notions of sharp cultural discontinuity, multiculturalism reifies cultural distinctions and has the potential to contribute to divisiveness and disunity within Canada.

As aforementioned, multicultural discourses invariably are based on a variety of beliefs and assertions about culture (Modood 2007:98). The focus of this paper is not on culture but on how difference is constituted by, and generative of, vehicles of power. Power is the organizing force of difference. Thus, the concern of this paper lies not in the fact that power exists, but in how it functions and to what effect. I will consider how aspects of the state, such as the multiculturalism policy, generate meanings and also how difference is produced, organized, and regulated, and what effect these meanings of difference have on social hierarchies. As Dhamoon (2009:11-12) notes, "[d]ifference cannot be reduced to culture, and difference always implicates power." In other words, difference is an instrument and an effect of power (Dhamoon 2009:12).

Baumann (1996) contends that reification, homogenization, and essentialism are a characteristic of official and political discourses of multiculturalism. It is also contended, by Modood (2007:92), that this reification, homogenization, and essentialism is part of a manipulative strategy on the part of some political agents. If such is the case, we should examine the cultural boundaries proliferated in multicultural discourse to determine whether, when, and how their functions are connected to maintaining inequality among different cultural groups. The power wielded by the state and the power exhibited by hegemonic groups in shaping state policies will have a major impact on whether minority groups are accorded the opportunity to become incorporated into a society or will – aided by ideologies of 'otherness' – be excluded from full inclusion (Touraine 1997; Walzer 1997)

In the next section, I introduce my methodological approach. My approach is both exploratory and theoretical, grounded in a larger post-structuralist framework, but is also grounded in the material reality of group marginalization. Then, in the Literature Review, I explore the historical and recent developments around the concept of boundaries in the social

sciences. I give particular attention to literature on social identity, ethnic and racial inequality, and national identities. In the sections that follow, I conceptually unpack and locate the terms to help support and build my main argument, that multiculturalism reifies cultural distinctions and has the potential to contribute to divisiveness and disunity within Canada. These sections discuss the history and development of the ideology and policy of multiculturalism in Canada, the historical project of Canadian nation-building, the construction of dominant forms of Canadian national identity, and how the 'dominant culture' in Canada determines the contemporary position of cultural minorities vis-à-vis the Canadian nation. In the concluding section, I explore if multiculturalism can be seen as a progression in reconceptualizing Canadian national identity, or if multiculturalism draws on and reinforces racial exclusions and hierarchies of difference.

METHODOLOGY

My methodological approach is exploratory. In the social sciences, exploratory research seeks to uncover how people get along in the setting under question, what meanings they give to their actions, and what issues concern them (Schutt 2004). Hence, the goal of exploratory research is to learn 'what is going on here?' and to investigate social phenomena without explicit expectations (Schutt 2004). Thus, exploratory research provides insights into, and comprehension of, an issue or situation. Specifically, I explore how people are constructed into groups, and how these constructions are reinforced by the ideology of multiculturalism in Canada.

My approach is also theoretical, grounded in a larger post-structuralist framework, but is also rooted in the material reality of those groups who have a marginalized existence in Canadian society. Post-structural theorists argue that boundaries are imposed by 'the other.' Under the influence of Derrida and Foucault, post-structuralists have highlighted how identity is defined relationally, and how it is shaped by power relations among groups.

By taking as a premise that symbolic boundaries are imposed by sociopolitical forces, and by shedding light on symbolic classifications which are generally organized around binary oppositions, I will explore the processes of boundary formation, maintenance, and mobilization in the Canadian multicultural context. The boundaries in this context are symbolic, but they are also political. I take a post-structuralist approach that, when applied to the Canadian context, will shed light on the role of multiculturalism as an ideological state apparatus, while conceptualizing the boundaries that divide individuals, groups, and collectivities as the product of domination and exploitation.

Post-structuralism encompasses a wide variety of methods, assumptions and theoretical approaches in philosophy and social theory (Poster 1989). The approach, which is often used synonymously with deconstruction or post-modernism, is somewhat difficult to define or summarize. That being said, post-structuralism may be broadly understood as a reaction to structuralism, which argued that human culture can be understood by means of a structure that is distinct both from the organization of reality and those of ideas or the imagination (Poster 1989). Common themes in post-structuralism include the rejection of the self-sufficiency of the structures that structuralism posits, and an interrogation of the binary oppositions that constitute those structures (Poster 1989).

Post-structuralism recognizes the power of discourse to shape reality. To understand an object, a post-structuralist approach argues it is necessary to study both the object itself and the systems of knowledge that produced the object. According to Seidman (1996:195), post-structuralism contends "subjects are not the autonomous creators of themselves or their social worlds. Rather, subjects are embedded in a complex network of social relations. These relations in turn determine which subjects can appear where, and in what capacity. The subject is not something prior to politics or social structures, but is precisely constituted in and through specific sociopolitical arrangements." Thus, post-structuralism holds that a focus on the individual as an autonomous agent needs to be 'deconstructed,' contested, and troubled (Seidman 1996:195).

Post-structural theorists have highlighted the constructed and highly political nature of boundaries, borders and identities. As aforementioned, Jacques Derrida proved particularly influential in the creation of post-structuralism. In particular, Derrida's destabilization of endings and beginnings, and boundaries and divisions, led scholars to question a multiplicity of borders:

between outside and inside, self and 'other,' public and private, subject and object (Henderson 1995:2). Anssi Paasi is representative of a post-structuralist stance on borders. Paasi (1998) adheres to the notion that there is no central essence to borders, but that borders are sociocultural constructs constantly subject to change. He also develops the notion that regional spaces are created though a process of "institutionalization" involving boundaries, symbols and the institutions that maintain them (Paasi 1998). In many ways, this notion of region and boundary as a social construct is related to the idea of "imagined communities" as postulated by Benedict Anderson (1991).

In short, my research is exploratory as well as critical in the post-structural sense. In my approach, borders and boundaries are critically investigated as differentiators of socially constructed identities and meaning. Attention is paid to the social formation and manifestations of borders and identities, as well as the socially constructed and constitutive 'them' or 'others.' Such an approach, when applied to the Canadian context, will shed light on the role of multiculturalism as an ideological state apparatus, while conceptualizing the boundaries that divide individuals, groups, and collectivities as the product of domination and exploitation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Socially Constructed Lines of Difference

No critique of hegemonic relations, nor discussion of multiculturalism, can take place without examining concepts of ethnicity, race, and nationality. These concepts or categories are ideological formulations or social constructions. As such, there is enormous plasticity and variation with respect to the shape, role, and importance these concepts can take on (Moghaddam 2008:39). Adoption of a social constructionist view of such concepts will reveal the role played by power in the uses of multicultural discourse, especially as it rests on the notion of diversity in Canada. Likewise, these concepts should be studied from the Canadian perspective, as they are situated in particular contexts and are part of a particular discursive landscape.

For the most part, social scientists have come to a consensus that race is a social construct (Kivisto 2002:17). Insofar as a consensus has been achieved in repudiating this type of thought, it then becomes the case that biological differences cannot be seen as relevant to group identities except when such differences are socially defined to be significant (Kivisto 2002:17). Race is used in everyday language, and it is the task of sociology to make sense of how people define situations and to determine what the implications of those definitions are for social relations (Kivisto 2002:18). In terms of group identities, in situations where meaning is imposed on biological differences, racism or the racialization of ethnicity occurs.

Despite consensus on the socially constructed nature of race, the efforts to delineate the most appropriate way that ethnicity, race, and nationality ought to be viewed in relation to one another are characterized by contested debates (Banton 2001:185). And, according to Kivisto (2002:14), the most contested relationship is that between the concepts of ethnicity and race. Kivisto (2002:14) notes that three different potential relationships between ethnicity and race

have been posited. "The first position contends that ethnicity and race should be treated as being analytically distinct. The second is a modification of the first insofar as it wants to maintain a distinction, while at the same time conceding that in some circumstances ethnicity and race overlap. The third position disputes both of these stances, suggesting instead that ethnicity ought to be viewed as the overarching term, with race being seen as a subset of ethnicity" (Kivisto 2002:14).

Paul Gilroy (2000:1) has recently challenged the analytic distinction between ethnicity and race, by seeking to stake out an alternative approach that "considers patterns of conflict connected to the consolidation of cultural lines rather than color lines and is concerned, in particular, with the operations of power, which, thanks to ideas about 'race,' have become entangled with those [...] mistaken attempts to delineate and subdivide humankind." Hence, a shift from cultural difference to racial stigmatization. What this means today is that immigrants can be considered in terms of 'thresholds of tolerance' or 'capacities of reception and integration' that are arbitrarily established according to criteria of 'cultural distance' – that is, race in the sense the notion has taken on today (Balibar 2004:37).

Distinctions between people, groups, and things create boundaries that separate them both physically and symbolically (Epstein 1992:232). Many boundaries, especially guarded or closed ones, exist to protect inequalities, and to ensure that "the less than equal cannot enter or can do so only by paying proper deference" (Gans 1992:xiii). One of the most significant distinctions among boundaries is between visible and invisible ones, for the latter are sometimes harder to cross than visible ones (Gans 1992:xiv). Cultural distinctions, although hardly immutable, are often somewhat more fixed in their social construction, and the boundaries of inclusion/exclusion may thus be more effectively maintained (Hall 1992a:277). Hence, the

10

distinctions made between cultural groups mark the boundaries of both actual and conceptual segregation and enunciation.

In recent years, the idea of boundaries has come to play a key role in scholarship across the social sciences. The idea of boundaries has been associated with research on social and collective identity, racial and ethnic group positions, group rights, and immigration, to mention only some of the most visible examples (Lamont and Molnar 2002:167). Moreover, boundaries and its twin concept borders have been the object of a number of special issues in scholarly journals, edited volumes, and conferences (Lamont and Molnar 2002:167). This renewed interest builds on a well-established tradition, as boundaries are part of the classical conceptual tool-kit of social scientists (Lamont and Molnar 2002:167). For example, in The Elementary Forms of Religious Life, Durkheim (1965) defined the realm of the sacred in contrast to that of the profane. While Marx often depicted the proletariat as the negation of the capitalist class, The Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx 1963) is still read for its account of the dynamics between several class boundaries. As for Weber (1978), his analysis of ethnic and status groups continues to stand out as one of the most influential sections in Economy and Society.

According to Lamont and Molnar (2002), one general theme that runs through the literature on boundaries is the search for understanding the role of symbolic resources in creating, maintaining, contesting, or even dissolving institutionalized social differences. What is relevant to my discussion is the role played by conceptual distinctions in creating and maintaining institutionalized social differences such as racial inequality. In order to capture this process better, it is useful to introduce a distinction between symbolic and social boundaries.

Lamont and Molnar (2002:168) describe symbolic boundaries as conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space.

11

Accordingly, they are tools by which individuals and groups struggle over and come to agree upon definitions of reality (Lamont and Molnar 2002:168). Examining such boundaries allows us to capture the dynamic dimensions of social relations, as groups compete in the production, diffusion, and institutionalization of classifications. Symbolic boundaries separate people into groups and generate feelings of similarity and group membership (Epstein 1992:232), and are an essential medium through which people acquire status and monopolize resources (Lamont and Molnar 2002:168). Only when symbolic boundaries are widely agreed upon can they take on a constraining character and pattern social interaction in important ways (Lamont and Molnar 2002:168). Thus, when symbolic boundaries are widely agreed upon, they can translate into identifiable patterns of social exclusion or racial segregation.

Social boundaries are objectified forms of social differences manifested in unequal access to and unequal distribution of resources, both material and nonmaterial, and social opportunities (Lamont and Molnar 2002:168). However, Lamont and Molnar (2002:168) argue that symbolic and social boundaries should be viewed as equally real. The former exist at the intersubjective level whereas the latter manifest themselves as groupings of individuals (Lamont and Molnar 2002:168). A social construct is ontologically subjective in that its construction and continued existence is contingent upon social groups and their collective agreement, imposition, and acceptance of such a construct. As an example, the idea of race cannot sustain itself as a meaningful concept unless it is also supported by social actions that operationalize racism (Li 1998:116). Thus, for race to exist, it must be sustained by social practices that police and enforce its collective boundaries that distinguish 'us' from 'them.' Or, in other words, the production and reproduction of race as the basis for collective identities depends on the enforcement of racial boundaries that distinguish a subordinate racialized group from the dominant one. The

boundaries that mark 'the other' and 'otherness' are socially constructed lines of difference that determine who and what is 'normal' and dominant, and conversely who and what is 'abnormal' and consequently deemed 'inferior.'

Over the last twenty years, British and American social psychologists working on group categorization and identification have been studying the segmentation between 'us' and 'them.' In particular, social identity theory suggests that "[p]ressures to evaluate ones' own group positively through in-group/out-group comparison lead social groups to attempt to differentiate themselves from each other" (Tajfel and Turner 1985:16-17). According to Balibar (2004:60), differences between cultures are systematically interpreted as inequalities and inscribed as such. This process of differentiation aims "to maintain and achieve superiority over an out-group on some dimension" (Tajfel and Turner 1985:16-17).

Among sociologists, Jenkins' (1996) work on collective identity complements that of social psychologists. He describes collective identity as constituted by a dialectic interplay of processes of internal and external definition. On the one hand, individuals must be able to differentiate themselves from 'others' by drawing on criteria of community and a sense of shared belonging within their subgroup (Jenkins 1996). On the other hand, this internal identification process must be recognized by outsiders for an objectified collective identity to emerge (Jenkins 1996). Ethnicity refers to social boundaries that are constructed on the basis of what are presumed to be shared genealogies, cultural features, and a shared geographic origin (Barth 1969). Balibar (2004:26) alleges ethnicity forms a "powerful model of identification," combining cultural characteristics with characteristics that are claimed to be racial.

Isajiw (1979:25) offers a particularly useful definition of an ethnic group, which he characterizes as "an involuntary group of people who share the same culture or the descendants

of such people who identify themselves and/or are identified by others as people belonging to the same involuntary group." There is an objective component to this definition in that an ethnic group is the result of the existence of various combinations of cultural markers. It also has a subjective quality in that it requires identification by members of the group and/or by others. This definition suggests that we need to examine the concept of racialized ethnicity, and address how conceptions of group boundaries are shaped and/or determined by institutionalized definitions of cultural membership as well as the institutionalization of classification systems, and ethnic and racial identity.

Boundaries have always been a central concern of studies of national communities (Lamont and Molnar 2002). Researchers who concentrate on territorial borders and boundaries as instrumental in the construction of difference usually examine processes of nation-building. A nationality group refers to a collectivity predicated on claims regarding a sense of peoplehood linked to a notion of a nation. Scholars such as Armstrong (1982) and Smith (1991) have examined the historic roots of the 'collective memories' and 'nostalgic myths' that underpin the sociocultural dynamics of contemporary national identities, pointing to cases with considerable continuity between past and future. In this sense, nationalism can be seen as the product of what Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) refer to as the 'invention of tradition,' emphasizing the conscious manipulation of myths, legends, and histories by nationalists who forge, in Benedict Anderson's (1991) words, 'imagined communities.'

Challenges to clearly defined and neatly bounded national identities come in the form of flows of people across national borders. Baubock (1998:8) is concerned with the ways in which immigrants introduce new forms of cultural diversity and a new source of anxiety in several societies. He argues that international migrants blur three kinds of boundaries: territorial borders

14

of states, political boundaries of citizenship, and cultural (symbolic) boundaries of national communities. Bennett et al. (1994) argue that new settler societies, like Canada, have had to undertake the process of nation formation urgently, visibly, and defensively. According to Mackey (2002:8), the state sanctioned proliferation of cultural difference, albeit limited to specific forms of allowable difference, seems to be the defining characteristic of Canadian national identity in the present time.

Multiculturalism is a concept whose meaning varies by context and by writer. It also depends on how we interpret multiculturalism. According to Kallen (2004:75), in the current Canadian context, the concept 'multiculturalism' is widely used in at least three senses: "(1) to refer to the 'social reality' of ethnic diversity; (2) to refer to the federal policy, designed to create national unity in ethnic diversity; and (3) to refer to the ideology of cultural pluralism (the Canadian mosaic) underlying the federal policy."

Canada is pluralistic in its ethnic composition. Hence, 'multicultural' can be used as an adjective to describe the demographic reality of Canadian society. In much of the literature, the term multiculturalism is often mentioned in relation to any society in which there is cultural diversity. For example, cities that have large ethnic minority populations tend to be referred to as 'multicultural' (Moghaddam 2008:148). Beyond this merely descriptive approach, some discussions of multiculturalism attempt to move toward a particular goal in terms of a preferred type or level of diversity (Moghaddam 2008:148). For example, an index of cultural diversity is now routinely used as part of assessment in higher education. In many educational institutions, achieving a 'culturally diverse' student body and faculty has become an explicitly stated goal (Moghaddam 2008:148).

Multiculturalism as an avowed goal, or an ideal adopted by society, has been approached in two main ways. The first involves government authorities and the majority group adopting a 'hands off' approach and allowing market forces to determine the critical mix in society (Moghaddam 2008:148). An alternative type of multiculturalism is planned multiculturalism, in which government authorities and the majority group directly intervene to support and strengthen cultural and linguistic diversity (Moghaddam 2008:149). The Canadian government was the first among Western democracies to officially adopt, in 1971, a policy of planned multiculturalism at the federal level (Fleras and Elliot 1992).

The idea that Canada is an ideal model for multiculturalism has been contested by a number of authors. Bissoondath (1994) and Gwyn (1995) put forth strong critiques of multiculturalism as a destructive ideology that enforces the ghettoization of those different from the mainstream. Both authors argue that multiculturalism promotes a sort of separatism among immigrants. Bissoondath (1994) argues that multiculturalism has led to "undeniable ghettoization" and Gwyn (1995) notes that the longer multiculturalism policy has been in place, "the higher the cultural walls have gone up inside Canada." Thus, rather than foster inclusiveness, Canadian multiculturalism relativizes culture and cultural difference.

Others argue that while the myth of the 'mosaic' flourishes in the rhetoric of public life, public policy in Canada continues to be governed by the concept of Anglo-conformity (Kallen 2004:75). Thus, multiculturalism, "regardless of the range of integrative and inclusionary expectations projected into it, remains limited by policy definition in its ability to do more than reinscribe racialized groups as cultural communities who are peripheral to the two founding nations" (Haque 2010:82).

Such theorists suggest that Canada's version of multiculturalism is one of the means by which the state keeps minority groups in a dependent position, entrenching their second-class status and, as such, managing their challenge to the dominant group (Li 2003; Bannerji 2000; Henry and Tator 2006; Kallen 2004). In other words, these theorists argue that the state uses multiculturalism to manage diversity and the claims made by 'other' groups in the nation, while maintaining the cultural hegemony of the dominant group. Kallen (2004) argues that multiculturalism effectively preserves Porter's (1965) 'vertical mosaic' of ethnic inequality by clearly entrenching second-class status to ethnocultural groups. As Bannerji (2000:147) argues, 'recognition' reflects the dominance of those who are in a position to validate difference and at the same time the subordination of 'others' who must make their case. As such, 'Canadian' becomes the norm from which ethnicized groups differentiate (Bannerji 2000).

The reviewed literature suggests that symbolic boundaries are often used to enforce, maintain, normalize, or rationalize social boundaries. The literature also suggests that, in terms of cultural membership, the notion of boundaries is crucial for analyzing how social actors construct groups as similar and different and how it shapes their understanding of their responsibilities toward such groups.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDING OF BORDERS, NATION / NATIONAL IDENTITY AND MULTICULTURALISM

Borders / Boundaries

A discussion and clarification of borders is needed insofar as it provides insight as to how Canadian multiculturalism policy, as an ideological state apparatus, constructs and ascribes identities through the metaphorical extension of border concepts. Canadian official multiculturalism represents its polity in cultural terms, and hence generates, organizes, and regulates such difference. As Dhamoon (2009:12) notes, difference is an instrument and an effect of power. The metaphorical extension of the border image onto social and cultural identities through the administrative apparatus of official multiculturalism not only defines and separates people into distinct groups, but also acts as constraints to equality as such a distinction sets apart the so-called immigrants of colour from the dominant 'Canadian culture.'

A border is traditionally defined as a distinct, physically marked perimeter encircling, or a boundary between, two nation-states. Accordingly, borders act as a line of separation between two groups, marking the end of one and the beginning of the other. Borders, however, do not refer only to the interface between two entities. Borders are the demarcation lines we use to separate ourselves from 'others.' As such, borders separate 'us' from 'them,' citizen from alien, member from 'other.'

National borders are thus the tools used to create a distinction between the in-group, namely the nation, and the out-group, those who belong to other communities and nations, the 'others.' As Balibar (2004:8) notes, "the democratic composition of people in the form of the nation led inevitably to systems of exclusion: the divide between 'majorities' and 'minorities' and, more profoundly still, between populations considered native and those considered foreign,

heterogeneous, who are racially or culturally stigmatized." According to Balibar (2004), nationalism demands a specific stigmatization of the foreigner. Balibar (2004:23) notes that the nation-state rests upon the formulation of a rule of exclusion, of visible or invisible borders, materialized in laws and practices. In this sense, exclusion – or at least unequal access to particular goods and rights depending on whether one is a national or a foreigner, or belongs to the community or not – is the very essence of the nation-form (Balibar 2004:23).

The historical insertion of people in the system of nation-states creates also a divide between majority and minority populations within the nation-state. Hence, there exist internal borders within nation-states that serve to divide the subordinate groups from the dominant ones. Thus, the distinction can also be on the basis of 'inferior' and 'superior' positionings within the nation-state, which create an 'us' and 'them' binary. Balibar (1991) uses the expression "constitution of a fictive ethnicity" to designate the characteristic nationalization of societies and peoples and thus of cultures, languages, and genealogies. According to Balibar (2004:8), this construction results in the "subjective interiorization of the idea of the border – the way individuals represent their place in the world to themselves [...] by tracing in their imaginations impenetrable borders between groups to which they belong or by subjectively appropriating borders assigned to them from on high, peacefully or otherwise." In short, drawing borders, whether literally or figuratively, divides up the earth and thus organizes the world's exploitation (Balibar 2004:7).

Borders and boundaries, whether arbitrarily or artificially drawn, bear tremendous and concrete consequences, shaping the ways in which dominant and subordinate groups perceive difference, community, identity, and belonging. Sociocultural boundaries are invisible, yet they have very visible ramifications, creating and maintaining social, economic, and political

hierarchies. In short, the institution of the borders, and the idea of the border as an image for cultural juxtaposition, works as an "instrument of social segregation and unequal access to the means of existence" (Balibar 2004:117) namely because the groups involved are differently empowered in their ability to impose and transform such borders.

The concept of borders as a way of thinking about identity has emerged through the process of metaphorical extension. According to Ewing (1998:262), "[t]he salience of the border emerges from a confrontation between anthropology's old idea of bounded cultures with a recent focus on the flow of people, ideas, and goods across national borders." Several disciplines use culture as a basic concept, yet they mean different things by the same word (Gans 1992:vii). If there is one fundamental proposition on which sociologists of culture agree, it is that, far from forming a unique society, humanity is made up of social groups that are differentiated by their practices, beliefs, and institutions (Lamont and Fournier 1992:1). As Marcel Mauss (1969) wrote in his essay *On Civilization*, "[t]he domain of social life is essentially a domain of differences." Between groups, there always have been, and always will be, boundaries and differences. However, one of the most important challenges that we face today is understanding how we create boundaries and what are the social consequences of such actions (Lamont and Fournier 1992:1).

Three distinct approaches have been used by sociologists to conceptualize symbolic boundaries and their origins: while some locate them in people's heads or view them as the product of interactions between individuals, others argue that they are imposed by sociopolitical forces (Lamont and Fournier 1992:1). These approaches remind us of the three major dimensions of cultural life, namely, the cognitive, communicative, and political dimensions (Lamont and Fournier 1992:2).

Dichotomous distinctions play a particular role in social categorization (Epstein 1992:234). Facing us, we always find 'the other.' Such dichotomous thinking plays an important part in the definition of immigrants as 'others.' According to Gerson and Peiss (1985), boundaries mark the social territories of human relations, signaling who ought to be admitted and who excluded. Moreover, there are rules that guide and regulate traffic, and such rules instruct on the conditions under which boundaries may be crossed. The boundaries that order individuals, organizing them into categories, are persistent (Epstein 1992:233). Distinction is integrated in the social structure and institutionalized in the patterns and practices of our lives (Epstein 1992:232). Such distinctions have real-world implications. This is particularly the case when the interest of one category is maximized to the disadvantage of another (Epstein 1992:235).

Nation-Building and National Identity

Precisely because Canada is a settler society, difference needs to be analyzed in the historical context of nation and nation-building. The national identity of Canada is premised on the attempted eradication, assimilation, and suppression of indigenous knowledge and bodies, the appropriation of indigenous land and resources, practices of slavery and well as conquest and genocide, a historical tension between two colonial powers, and racialized and racist policies of immigration. If we assume that the Canadian nation has been and continues to be imagined through colonial ideas that function through ideas of racialized difference, then difference needs to be interpreted through a lens that can recognize the continuation of the past into the present. In other words, history and context matter to an understanding of culture and difference.

During the past 40 years, the story of Canada's nationhood has often been framed in terms of its policy and mythology of multiculturalism, a policy defined in official government

21

ideology as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian heritage and identity (Mackey 2002:2). However, prior to the adoption of multiculturalism as an official policy, the assumption of the dominant English ethnic collectivity was that immigrants would assimilate to the British institutional and cultural model, which included the English language and the Protestant religion (Kallen 2004:75).

This section is intended as a discussion of Canadian national identity and its construction. Specifically, this section examines the historical project of Canadian nation-building, and how the 'dominant culture' in Canada determines the contemporary position of cultural minorities vis-à-vis the Canadian nation. While this chapter examines the past, it is not intended as a history of Canada. The analysis offered here explores the construction of dominant forms of Canadian national identity in order to understand how discourses of multiculturalism function in terms of culture, difference, and power.

Borders and boundaries can be physical or abstract. Physical boundaries divide territories, spaces, and places, creating a basis for physical and even sociocultural separation between such territories, and for an imagined coherence within them. Making physical and sociocultural separation congruent, however, is based on illusions about homogeneity. For example, the nation-state relies on and feeds off the ideal of the perfect match between a clear-cut and uncontested territory, and a homogeneous nation. The state is a political and geopolitical entity, whereas the nation is a constructed cultural or ethnic entity. The concept of nation-state implies that its population constitutes a nation, united by a common or shared culture. Existing constitutions and laws embody the dominant cultural values of the nation, and the era in which they were constructed. These cultural values are based on the idea of a distinctive national community, with fixed boundaries to the outside world (Castles 2000).

One characteristic of the ideal nation-state, as it was characterized in the nineteenth century, was the conception that geographical and cultural boundaries should be synonymous (Anderson 1991; Gellner 1983). As territorial boundaries began to take a more institutionalized form, racial boundaries began to harden, both in Canada and globally (Mackey 2002:28). The hardening and sharpening of racial boundaries were consistent with so-called scientific ideas of race developing in the nineteenth century (Banton 1987; Stocking 1968). The sharpening of such boundaries and categories in Canada in the nineteenth century is described by Nestel (2006:130) as a boundary between 'whiteness' and 'otherness.' Here, we see how the term 'border' can be used to describe not only spatial discontinuities involving nations, but also, more metaphorically, alleged racial discontinuities.

Race is now understood as a socially constructed classification of human beings, based on historical and geographic context. Although there is nothing real or absolute about social constructions, reference to race as a social construct does not necessarily imply that race does not reflect anything real about the world. Phenomena must not be real to be real in consequence. In other words, race is "a powerful fabrication that impacts profoundly on social reality" (Fleras and Elliot 2003:32). Race, although socially constructed, becomes real for those who are at the receiving end of racist actions. Hence, borders come to life at the level of communication, through everyday experiences of individuals.

Race, as a social construction, is dependent on intersubjective perceptions. Thus, there is enormous plasticity and variation with respect to the shape, role, and importance a social construction can take on (Moghaddam 2008:39). If we adopt a social constructionist perspective to critique the category of 'race,' we see that its definition is dependent on the existence of other socially constructed ideals, such as that of the nation-state and Canadian national identity.

Likewise, the dominant ideology of a nation has an important influence on how a social construct is perceived. As Mackey (2002:3) articulates, "[i]t is only through problematizing dominant categories – which are often invisible and yet powerfully normative – that we can begin to understand how they are invented and reproduced." Thus, 'Canada' cannot be taken as a given. "It is a construction, a set of representations, embodying certain types of political and cultural communities and their operations" (Bannerji 2000:64). These communities are themselves constructed in agreement with certain ideas regarding skin colour, history, language, and other cultural signifiers – all of which may be subsumed under the ideological category 'white' (Bannerji 2000:64).

During the colonial period and in the early decades of nation-building, the dual process of creating Canadian identity and managing diverse populations involved complex and contradictory representations of internal and external 'others' (Mackey 2002:49). Yet despite their differences, Mackey (2002:49) contends that all versions of national identity mobilize internal differences and similarities, either through erasure, inclusion, or appropriation, in order to differentiate from external 'others.' Following the work of Edward Said (1995), all identities are constructions and, hence, must be constructed in relation to 'others.' Perceptions of the nation and national identity affect the ways in which non-nationals are framed, and vice versa. National identity is therefore constructed in relation to, and at the same time challenged by, the 'other.'

From early colonial times up to the Second World War, white Anglophone settlers in Canada mobilized representations of 'others' and managed non-British cultural groups as part of the project to create a nation and a national identity (Mackey 2002:23). National identity is often asserted through a process of exclusion, as feelings of belonging depend on being able to say

who does not belong. As Balibar (2004:8) notes, "the democratic composition of people in the form of the nation led inevitably to systems of exclusion: the divide between 'majorities' and 'minorities' and, more profoundly still, between populations considered native and those considered foreign, heterogeneous, who are racially or culturally stigmatized." Modes of inclusion and exclusion are, thus, imperative to the existence of the nation-state. As aforementioned, exclusion is "the very essence of the nation-form" (Balibar 2004:23). And, as Sharma (2005:10) notes, ideas of 'race' profoundly inform, and are likewise informed by, notions of national belonging and not-belonging.

David Goldberg, in his book *The Racial State* (2002), merges racial theory and state theory by asserting that race is integral to the emergence of the modern nation-state, and to its ongoing management. For Goldberg (2002), the constitution is mutual: race is constitutive of the modern-nation state, which in turn takes a leading role in the meaning and implication of race. Race becomes embedded into the character and ordering of the modern nation-state at its very inception, he argues, as a result of the desire to ensure a racially homogeneous national character. The most obvious deviation from the ideal of 'one nation, one state' is the presence of minorities, who are clearly not members of the majority nation. In other words, the border of the nation-state defines the national identity of the population within its perimeter and at the same time creates the anomaly of identities that do not correspond to the territorially based national identity.

Nationalism also depends upon mythological narratives (Mackey 2002:23), what Stuart Hall (1992b) calls "narratives of nationhood." These narratives work through a body of stories and myths with which people identify. Looking at history is essential to any nationalist mythology (Mackey 2002:24). The construction and maintenance of a Canadian national identity is due in part to the proliferation of national mythologies, or what Razack (2007:74) terms the

"national stories about a nation's origins and history." According to Razack (2007:74), national mythologies "enable citizens to think of themselves as part of a community, defining who belongs and who does not belong to the nation." A nation, as Anderson (1991) claims, is an imagined community, and nations are distinguished from each other by the stories that tell about themselves.

In Canada, the national mythology is one of a white settler society. As a white settler nation, Dua (2000:57) argues, "the Canadian nationalist project was based on two dimensions: first, the marginalization of indigenous peoples in relation to the new nation-state, an historical process that was consolidated through the Indian Act; second, Canadian nation-builders faced the challenge of creating a sense of identity – an 'imagined community' – among newcomers." If we understand the workings of Canada's national mythology, we can understand how such a mythology works in forming identities.

Late nineteenth and early twentieth century Canadian nation-building was constituted on a discourse of race (Dua 2000:69). The imagining of the Canadian nation was racialized insofar as nation-builders defined Canada as 'a white man's nation' (Dua 2000:69). As Dua (2000:68) contends, "[t]his notion of Canada as a white man's nation succeeded in simultaneously marginalizing indigenous peoples from the nation-state and unifying European newcomers to Canada." This notion of Canada as 'a white man's nation' subsequently defined the relationship of non-white immigrants to the nation-state. During this time period, immigrants were socially constructed as threats to the nation-state. They were portrayed as having a different culture than members of the Canadian nation-state and as having a purposeful intent to import those cultural differences to Canada, thus diluting the content of national identity. Under the rubric of 'culture'

26

are such things as language, ethnicity, religion, gender roles, and beliefs about systems of education and justice.

It is clear that until the second half of the twentieth century, Canadian governments sought to ensure that Canada remained largely a white nation (James 1999:180). Throughout the formative years of Canadian nation-building, immigration policies favoured Britons and Northern Europeans (Mackey 2002:32). And, up until the Second World War, when most immigration ceased, Canada had a strict hierarchy of preferred racial groups for entry (Mackey 2002:33). By overtly distinguishing between persons of preferred and non-preferred races, immigration policies worked to racialize the nation until the late 1900s (Thobani 2000:36). As Dua (2000:60) notes, the question of whether or not such people should be allowed into Canada "was centrally tied to the racial politics of the nation-state; as the issue was a matter of dominance of the white race." In establishing preference in terms of race, Canada's immigration policies determine who can be classified as 'Canadian' (James 1999:184). Thus, the construction of Canada as a national space, with an attendant national identity, has been closely tied to conceptions of race. It can be argued that a white nation has been projected onto Canadian space and, to a certain extent, an identity of white dominance relies on "keeping racial Others firmly in place" (Razack 2007:75), that is, outside the boundaries of the nation.

However, the Canadian nation-state is forced to contend with the conflicting interests of preserving the 'whiteness' of the nation while simultaneously ensuring an adequate supply of labour (Thobani 2000:35). As Li (2003:15) notes, economic interests are always "carefully balanced by the state with ideological and political considerations in regard to maintaining the cultural and symbolic boundary of the nation." Immigration policy reflects the national priorities and interests of the country (Li 2003:15). Immigration policies thus provide the "gate-keeping

function in designating the types of people who are deemed to be desirable [...] as well as those who are considered unacceptable" (Li 2003:36).

According to Li (2004:191), such a version of immigrants also produces social expectations, which often reflect less on immigrants themselves but more on how race is constructed in Canadian society. Thus, immigration policy is more than simply a process of importing the labour needed for nation-building (Mackey 2002:32). It is an "expression of a political idea of who is, or could be, eligible to receive the entitlements of residence of citizenship" (Smith 1993:50). Immigration was essential for nation-building, yet also perceived as potentially dangerous if it threatened the development and maintenance of a national population and a national identity (Mackey 2002:32). Immigration is therefore a site that articulates a potential contradiction between the material needs of nation-building and the attempt to create an ideal imagined community (Mackey 2002:32).

As aforementioned, Benedict Anderson argues that nations are "imagined communities." The imagined community is a concept which purports that a nation is a community socially constructed, which is to say imagined by the people who perceive themselves as part of that group. Although it would be unreasonable to say that this particular 'invented tradition' (Hobsbawm 1983) is uncontested, the Canadian national mythology has gained great authority throughout the nation's history. It offers a 'narrative of nationhood,' and is one of the stories which is closely linked to the images, landscapes, scenarios, historical events, national symbols and rituals which, as Stuart Hall (1992a:293) argues, "stand for, or represent, the shared experiences, sorrows, and triumphs and disasters which give meaning to the nation."

It is important to stress that although I explore dominant identity I do not wish to present Canadian national identity as a bounded, static, essentialized culture defined by a list of

28

uncontested traits and characteristics. Rather, drawing on the work of such people as Raymond Williams and Edward Said, I describe aspects of the project of the creation and maintenance of a dominant culture over time. Raymond Williams (1980) provides a conceptualization of how dominant culture is constructed. Williams (1980:38) suggests that in any society, in any period, there is a central system of practices, meanings, and values which we can properly call dominant and effective. Such a dominant culture infuses multiple domains of everyday life. Its dominance is based, in part, on its ability to become common sense in everyday life. It is continually confirmed and relived in multiple dimensions of ordinary experience. Although a dominant culture infuses everyday life, its dominance is never complete or uncontested.

Rather, dominant culture is a selective worldview that is continually being challenged by alternative systems of meaning and belief. Its dominance lies in its ubiquity and its flexibility; its ability to be continually modified in order to deflect or incorporate challenges to its legitimacy (Furniss 1999:15). National identity is never a finished product. It is always in the process of being constructed and reconstructed. The collective identity of the population of the nation-state should be recognized as highly contested, dependent on power relations between groups, and dynamic in that its content changes over time. What becomes accepted as the hegemonic national identity is dependent on the power relations between the different collective identities that exist within a nation. Power relations between various groups influence what elements will be superimposed over the nation-state, in the form of a national identity.

Multiculturalism

Official multiculturalism emerged in Canada, in 1971, from the recommendations of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission. The Commission was struck as a confluence of

29

changes in post-war Canadian society. At this particular juncture in Canadian history, there was a need to rearticulate the existing formulations of national belonging. Through the inquiry process of a Royal Commission, national belonging was shifted from overt racial preferences onto the terrain of language and culture to produce the Official Languages Act and – as a response to recommendations of the Commission – the Multiculturalism Policy. Announced by Prime Minister Trudeau, the policy was called "Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework." The policy asserted that although Canada had two official languages "there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other" (Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada 1985:15). The aims of that policy were to "help minority groups preserve and share their language and culture, and to remove the cultural barriers they face" (Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada 1985:15).

As aforementioned, prior to the adoption of multiculturalism as an official policy, the assumption of the dominant English ethnic collectivity was that immigrants would assimilate to the British institutional and cultural model, which included the English language and the Protestant religion (Kallen 2004:75). The development of Canada's self-image as a cultural mosaic at first seems contradictory when compared with earlier immigration and cultural policies that centered on maintaining British cultural hegemony (Mackey 2002:50). However, some argue that the founding division and its exclusions are still in effect today. Bannerji (1996:105-6) argues that inhabitants of Canada other than the English and French are 'insider-outsiders.' They are considered outside what is commonly seen as the essential conflict of the nation between the English and the French. Yet they are symbolic insiders because the presence of multiculturalism. (Bannerji 1996:105-6).

Given Canada's early racist tendencies, the establishment of multiculturalism was a remarkable shift in public thinking. Although multiculturalism could be seen as vastly different from more overtly racist and assimilationist policies of the past, the institutionalization of difference draws on previously existing patterns which had emerged in colonial and earlier national projects (Mackey 2002:70). As Burnet (1981:29) explains, it was not until the early decades following World War II, with heightened concern about human rights and the resurgence of ethnicity throughout much of the globe, that the 'mosaic' rhetoric took on serious multicultural policy implications. The 1960s were a time for asserting the singular character of the human race. Yet, it was also a time for the celebration of difference. At the very same moment that the related ideas of humanism, human rights, and equal citizenship had reached a new ascendancy, claims of group difference became central to a new progressive politics (Modood 2007:1-2). This was the beginning of a politics of identity. One term that came to describe this politics was multiculturalism. Hence, the beginnings of the modern social psychology of group dynamics lie in the aftermath of World War II. After the world was engulfed in this terrible conflict, it was easy for people to see the importance of understanding the social forces that motivate and shape intergroup conflict as well as the attitudes that encourage it (Modood 2007:2).

The rise in multicultural consciousness in immigrant-receiving countries has come in large part because of changing demographics and the transformed profile of immigrant populations, from a largely white-only population to a mostly non-white population (Moghaddam 2008:149). The first countries to speak of themselves as having become multicultural societies were countries which have a long, historical experience of immigration and indeed which have been built up out of immigration, namely Canada, Australia and the

United States. In the decades that followed, some western European societies, especially Britain, the Netherlands and Sweden, began to follow suit. The recognition that a society had become multicultural was not simply about demographics. It was an understanding that a new set of challenges were being posed for which a new political agenda was necessary (Modood 2007:15).

Post-immigration multiculturalism, whereby the rise of multiculturalism is not so much by the emergence of a political movement but by a more fundamental movement of peoples, has its own distinctive concerns and sensibilities. In Canada, racism and the legacy of colonialism are central. Multiculturalism also has a more restricted meaning, especially in Canada. Here we are said to have become a multicultural society largely by default – with the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, and the fortuitous influx of new non-European immigrants in the 1970s. One problem, as some authors point out, is that multiculturalism implicitly constructs the idea of a core English-Canadian culture, and that other cultures become 'multicultural' in relation to that unmarked, yet dominant, Anglo-Canadian core culture (Mackey 2002:2).

Historically, the dominant group in society imposed the boundaries of group membership by defining race in terms of biology. Because of the insistence that there exist meaningful biological differences, racism as an ideology was able to develop (Anderson and Frideres 1981:16). Thus, race is a social construct produced by the dominant group in society and their power to define. National identity, although continually contested, is informed by 'raced' notions of who does or does not belong.

Race, as a historically grounded social construction, is both dynamic and shifting as well as contradictory and ambiguous, but is always closely tied to power and privilege (Fleras and Elliot 2003:34). In this context, race matters not because groups of people are biologically divergent. Rather, it matters because the dominant group perceives 'others' to be racially distinct,

and relies on these perceptions to discriminate or differentiate (Fleras and Elliot 2003:28). Moreover, race matters because the dominant group's perception of 'the other' is internalized by those who experience such discrimination. According to Fleras and Elliot (2003:29), "[r]ace has little to do with genetics or biology, but everything to do with privilege." James (1999:268) agrees, and notes "[d]ifference is not what contributes to tension and conflict in diverse settings; rather, it is the value, understanding and interpretations of difference and how we, in turn, use these to inform our actions."

As Moghaddam (2008:162) notes, in the context of intergroup differentiation and distinctiveness, it is not the objective meaning of an intergroup difference but the meaning ascribed to a difference that shapes intergroup relations. This leads us to the notion of racism as power. According to Fleras (2001:84), racism is "about power, not pigmentation. It represents the power held by one group of individuals that has a controlling effect over another." Simply put, "[r]acism refers to the process of categorizing people on the basis of presumed physiological characteristics. On the basis of these physiological attributes, social and psychological attributes are causally correlated" (Anderson and Frideres 1981:14). According to Peter Li (1990:3), the ranking of racial groups along a scale of superiority and inferiority is the essence of racism. Or, in other words, the social construction of race produces a social hierarchy of races in Canadian society, manifested in Canadians' view of which groups are socially desirable or undesirable according to racial origin (Li 1998). The notion of racism as power goes beyond the definition of racism as a set of ideas or individual actions. Race is not dependent upon subjective beliefs, that is, beliefs held by an individual. Race depends on intersubjective beliefs and the meanings embedded within social practices that continually reproduce race. Basran (1983:11) agrees, and says racism is not a "random, unique or idiosyncratic behaviour on the part of individuals."

Rather, race is systematically developed, diffused, and used in order to meet the needs and interests of certain groups.

Historically, racial differences were considered to be rooted in biological variations. Today, these differences are increasingly expressed not in racial terms but in cultural terms. A shift in racism has occurred from notions of biological superiority, to exclusion based on cultural difference. Stratification in society now operates through an emphasis on cultural variation. What this means today, according to Balibar (2004:37), is that "immigrants, beginning with foreigners in irregular situations or who can easily be rendered illegal, are deprived of fundamental social rights [...] and can be expelled as a function of 'thresholds of tolerance' or 'capacities of reception and integration' that are arbitrarily established according to criteria of 'cultural distance' – that is, race in the sense the notion has taken on today." Such a position holds that racial divisions have no biological or scientific foundation but that populations continue to behave as if this was still the case, and that this racist conduct needs to be 'managed' by immigration policies, for example, in ways that respect the 'tolerance thresholds' of social groups, allowing them to maintain 'cultural distances.' In terms of multiculturalism, its tendency is to translate racial and/or ethnic differences as cultural diversity. Hence, the perceived downside to multiculturalism was that in the 1980s it replaced the emphasis on race and racism with an emphasis on cultural diversity (Gordon and Newfield 1996:3).

Multicultural policies rest on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous, that there are aggregates of people who essentially share a common culture, and interconnected differences that distinguish each such discrete culture from all others. According to Balibar (1991), claims and assertions of irreconcilable cultural differences between groups becomes a sort of neo-racism or "racism without race." Although there is a disavowal of racial and ethnic

exclusions in this re-articulation of national belonging, culture is mobilized to establish a new national formulation of multiculturalism in order incorporate subjects into the contemporary racialized hierarchy of belonging (Haque 2010:82).

MULTICULTURALISM: A PROGRESSION IN (RE)CONCEPTUALIZING THE NATION?

This chapter seeks to address the following question: Can multiculturalism be seen as a progression in reconceptualizing Canadian national identity or does multiculturalism draw on and reinforce racial exclusions and hierarchies of difference?

According to Tariq Modood (2007:18), "an important aspect of multiculturalism is that the story a country tells about itself to itself, the discourses, symbols and images in which national identity resides and through which people acquire and renew their sense of national belonging, have to be revisited and recast in order to reflect the current and future, and not just the past, ethnic composition of the country." It follows that, in order for multiculturalism to be implemented as state policy, all functions of the state must be reconceived for they are currently conceived within the ideas that the state represents national and cultural homogeneity (Parekh 2000). In Canada, multiculturalism from above has been pronounced by the state as a part of its administrative apparatus (Bannerji 2000:8), and is institutionalized as a key feature of the mythology of identity of the dominant white Anglophone majority (Mackey 2002:3).

If we consider multiculturalism as an ideological state apparatus, we can see it as a device for constructing and ascribing identities for those who are seen as legitimate and full citizens, and 'others' who are peripheral to this in many senses (Bannerji 2000:6). Canadian official multiculturalism represents its polity in cultural terms, setting apart the so-called immigrants of colour from the dominant 'Canadian culture' (Bannerji 2000:10). According to Bannerji (2000:10), this organization brings into clearer focus the primary national imagery of Canada, to echo Benedict Anderson (1991). It rests on posing 'Canadian culture' against 'multicultures' or,

in other words, marking the difference between a core cultural group and 'other' groups (Bannerji 2000:10).

Overall, the Multiculturalism Act is designed to foster inclusiveness. However, according to Stephen Castles (2000), there is a basic contradiction between the principle of multiculturalism and the principle of national belonging. As Castles (2000) states, the principle of multiculturalism demands the equal recognition and the inclusion of ethnic minorities into the community. Yet, the principle of national belonging demands 'their' exclusion. Castles (2000) notes the migrant has always been the 'other' of the nation. National identity is often asserted through a process of exclusion, as feelings of belonging depend on being able to say who does not belong. As Balibar (2004:8) notes, "the democratic composition of people in the form of the nation led inevitably to systems of exclusion: the divide between 'majorities' and 'minorities' and, more profoundly still, between populations considered native and those considered foreign, heterogeneous, who are racially or culturally stigmatized."

Thus, Castles (2000) questions how national distinctiveness can be maintained if the 'other' is part of society. In other words, admitting the 'other' into the national community appears as a threat to national cohesion and identity (Castles 2000). On the one hand rests the construction of migrants as 'other' and, as such, separate, separable, and isolable from a national people (Axel 2002). On the other hand, the migrant is also part and parcel of Canadian national identity, wherein cultural difference is abstracted into national equivalence (Axel 2002). In other words, the nation-state sees the cultural difference of migrants as a potential threat and, at the same time, desires to incorporate cultural differences into a multicultural vision of Canada. In the process of defining and categorizing culture, we run the risk of essentializing and reaffirming essentialist notions of difference. Paradoxically, although certain categories of immigrants

oftentimes evoke meanings of ethnic absolutism or cultural essentialism, and are seen as 'others' whose cultures threaten the culture and stability of the Canadian nation, their inclusion in a multicultural framework satisfies a certain vision of Canada as diverse and harmonious.

The discourse of multiculturalism can be conceptualized as a culmination of the ideological construction of Canada (Bannerji 2000:96). This places minorities, on whose actual lives the ideology is evoked, in a peculiar situation. On the one hand, by their sheer presence, minorities provide a central part of the distinct pluralist unity of Canadian nationhood; on the other hand, this centrality is dependent on their difference, which denotes the power of definition that Canadians have over 'others' (Bannerji 2000:96). Mackey (2002:17-18) notes that exploring the institutionalization of difference is useful in developing a strategy to understand the relationship between difference and power in Canada.

All major contemporary issues involve questions of power, social positioning, and identity. The complex interplay between these factors becomes especially apparent when one considers the example of immigrants. Studying society essentially means shedding light on symbolic classifications, which are generally organized around binary oppositions. Distinctions between people, groups, and things create the boundaries that separate them physically and symbolically. Among the most pervasive of distinctions are those made between cultures or cultural groups.

The important question, according to Mackey (2002:49) is not whether immigrants are erased in Canadian mythology, or even whether they are represented positively. The central issue is to examine who decides when and how immigrants are or are not represented, or are or are not managed, in the interests of the nation-building project (Mackey 2002:49). Breton (1988:39-40) suggests that the shift to multiculturalism represented an attempt to redefine the symbolic system

of Canada. Multiculturalism was developed as a mode of managing internal differences within the nation and, at the same time, created a form through which the nation could be imagined as distinct and differentiated from external 'others' (Mackey 2002:50). Rather than trying to erase difference and construct an imagined community based on assimilation to a singular notion of culture, the state attempted to institutionalize various forms of difference, thereby controlling access to power and simultaneously legitimating the power of the state (Mackey 2002:50).

Although multiculturalism could be seen as vastly different from more overtly racist and assimilationist policies of earlier governments, the institutionalization of difference draws on previously existing patterns which had emerged in colonial and earlier national projects (Mackey 2002:70). The key issue here is that despite the proliferation of cultural difference, the power to define, limit, and 'tolerate' difference still lies in the hands of the dominant (Mackey 2002:70). As Balibar (2004:118) claims, borders, as the demarcation lines that separate 'us' from 'them,' serve to create, maintain, and legitimate inequality namely because the power to define and manipulate borders and to stigmatize the 'other' lies in the hands of the powerful.

Nation-states are demarcated from one another by international borders. According to Balibar (2004:8), "the historical insertion of populations and peoples in the system of nation-states [...] affects from the inside the representation of these peoples, their consciousness of their 'identity.'" Ibrahim (2005:170) contends "the notion of 'us' implies homogenous values, traditions, and beliefs within a society. However, rather than uniformity, a society is comprised of a mixture of different groups and values that are constantly changing with time." Benhabib (2004) agrees that the constitution of 'we, the people' and the boundaries between 'us' and 'them' are not static and given. Rather, they are continually negotiated and contested. As Benhabib (2004:211) argues, "the constitution of 'we, the people' is a [...] fluid, contentious,

39

contested, and dynamic process." National identity is never a finished product. It is always in the process of being constructed and reconstructed. The collective identity of the population of the nation-state should be recognized as highly contested, dependent on power relations between groups, and dynamic in that its content changes over time. National identity, no matter how hegemonic it has become, requires constant reinvention and reproduction, even amongst long established nation-states. What becomes accepted as the hegemonic national identity is dependent on the power relations between the different collective identities that exist within a nation. Power relations between groups of varying race, gender, and class influence what elements will be superimposed over the nation-state in the form of a national identity. In other words, the 'nation' is never as homogeneous as nationalists proclaim.

Duncan (2000:80) argues that Canada is trying to foster a strong sense of national identity in the face of globalization, an identity that more and more is grounded in the multicultural nature of its population. Institutions of the state constantly enact policies to intervene in the production of identity and culture (Mackey 2002:13). Immigration and multiculturalism policies are prime examples of this. In Canada, there is a fundamental unease with how difference is construed and constructed by the state, how 'otherness' in relation to Canada is projected and objectified. In Canada, the nation is purported not to be managed through constructing cultural homogeneity and erasing difference. Rather, in Canada, cultural 'others' – and Canada's supposed tolerance – become central pillars of the ideology of nationhood (Mackey 2002:16). While cultural difference and pluralism may be highlighted, they are also managed internally so as to reproduce the structuring of differences around a dominant culture (Mackey 2002:16). Multiculturalism itself establishes Anglo-Canadian culture as the core culture while tolerating and hierarchically arranging 'others' around it as 'multiculture' (Bannerji 2000:78).

40

Official multiculturalism was designed to be the cornerstone of a new symbolic order of Canada. Although there is a disavowal of racial and ethnic exclusions in this re-articulation of Canadian national belonging, Haque (2010:82) argues that culture is mobilized to establish a new national formulation of multiculturalism in order incorporate subjects into the contemporary racialized hierarchy of belonging. If, as Gordon and Newfield (1996:3) claim, multiculturalism replaced the emphasis on race and racism with an emphasis on cultural diversity, and if the tendency of multiculturalism is to translate racial and/or ethnic differences as cultural diversity, then Balibar's (1991) idea holds true: that claims and assertions of irreconcilable cultural differences between groups becomes a sort of neo-racism or "racism without race." Thus, stratification in Canadian society now operates through an emphasis on cultural variation with the multiculturalism policy, as an ideological state apparatus, constructing and ascribing cultural identities through the metaphorical extension of border concepts.

CONCLUSION

Multiculturalism was developed as a mode of managing internal differences within the nation (Mackey 2002:50). There exist two ongoing debates about the best policies for managing culturally diverse societies. On the one hand, there are policies supportive of assimilation, involving the melting away of difference between different groups toward a society in which intergroup similarity is maximized and differences minimized (Moghaddam 2008:15). On the other hand, there are policies supportive of multiculturalism, involving the strengthening and highlighting of intergroup differences (Moghaddam 2008:15). According to Moghaddam (2008:15), "[a]ssimilation leads to decreased diversity; multiculturalism leads to the maintenance of, or even increases in, diversity."

Multiculturalism, as a policy for managing ethnic and cultural diversity, is a state initiated enterprise in Canada, with a legal and a governing apparatus consisting of legislation and official policies. Bannerji (2000:27) describes multiculturalism in Canada as a "state-sanctioned, state organized ideological affair." This ideology has become the primary designator of Canadian society.

When the federal government adopted multiculturalism as an official policy in 1971, the focus was primarily on the needs and interests of established European immigrants and their descendants. The policy was adopted within a bilingual framework, and was designed to recognize the ethnically plural nature of Canadian society. Moreover, the policy was designed to encourage pride in linguistic and cultural heritage while facilitating the full integration of immigrants and their descendants in the country. Although Canada's policy of multiculturalism is aimed at promoting social cohesion by recognizing distinct groups within society, and

allowing those groups to celebrate and maintain their cultures or cultural identities, it does not do this well or sufficiently. Rather, it perpetuates inequalities.

Nearly 40 years later, Canada's reputation as the birthplace of official state multiculturalism is widely acknowledged. Today, the policy has shifted its focus toward inclusive citizenship in the face of increasing ethnocultural diversity. The official ideology of multiculturalism has, according to government rhetoric, become much more rights-oriented, with the focus being inclusive citizenship. On the surface, at least, multicultural policy has evolved since its inception in the early 1970s. Yet, the framework or idea of the 'mosaic' has remained remarkably consistent. The idea of a Canadian mosaic of cultures is a theme still prevalent today, if only in the rhetoric of public life or at the level of public consciousness.

Today, Canada is often described as a cultural mosaic and, in the Canadian mosaic, it is said all the hyphenated cultures – French-Canadian, Native-Canadian, and multicultural-Canadian – are celebrated (Mackey 2002:2). The notion of a cultural mosaic is intended to contrast with other models of integration or assimilation, such as the American melting pot. However, to speak of a 'cultural mosaic' may be to accentuate discontinuity and to underline, or even exaggerate, perceived or constructed difference.

Anthropologically speaking, culture is a concept that refers to the ways in which people, individually and collectively, understand, organize, and respond to the environment around them. Since culture is mostly a way to describe human behaviour, it would follow that there are discrete groups of people that correspond to each culture. But, like the nation and national identity, culture and cultural identity are not static. Rather, both culture and cultural identity are dynamic and always in process. Their nature is complex, ambiguous, contradictory, and shifting depending on time and place. James (1999:21) reminds us that "culture cannot be conceptualized

43

in terms of unified systems of meanings, but rather as conflicting, contradictory, ambiguous, dynamic, and full of contending discourses, all of which are mediated by power. Paying attention to power relations, therefore, is critical to our understanding of culture." Not only is culture complex, contradictory, ambiguous, and dynamic, it is also fraught with tensions as it is shaped and re-shaped in response to the power relations between groups. In this sense, notions of culture are informed by unequal power relations that exist in societies.

Multiculturalism speaks to the ways in which culture and cultural identities are understood, used, referenced, and articulated by individuals and the society as a whole. The way in which individuals are represented in society, as well as the way individuals represent their place in society to themselves, is mediated by unequal relations of power. In a diverse society such as Canada, a distinction can be made between the group that holds the dominant position through its numbers, early settlement, and control over the main political institutions, and minority groups. Such political institutions embody the dominant cultural values of the nation-state. Yet, the nation and national identity are always in flux, as are the images of who is to be included as a member. Oftentimes, immigrants and minority groups are portrayed in overly generalized, reifying, statistical categories that obscure the diversity and shifting nature of social identities and cultural loyalties (Barber 2003:45). Barber (2003:45) goes on to say that such categorization is presumptive, as it relies upon constructed similarities and ideas of fixed, stable identities amongst newcomers and other Canadians.

Stuart Hall (1996) notes that identity is an open, complex, unfinished game that is always under construction. In the process of defining and categorizing culture, we run the risk of essentializing and reaffirming essentialist notions of difference. Paradoxically, although certain categories of immigrants are seen as 'others' whose cultures threaten the culture and stability of

the Canadian nation, their inclusion in a multicultural framework satisfies a certain vision of Canada as diverse and harmonious. The contemporary border is imbued with both concrete and metaphorical significance. Borders, as the demarcation lines that separate 'us' from 'them,' serve to create, maintain, and legitimate inequality namely because the power to define and manipulate borders and to stigmatize the 'other' lies in the hands of the powerful.

According to Barber (2003:46), "Canadian/ness suggests a multiplicity of attachments and practices." Yet, the metaphorical extension of the border concept as a way to think about identities has given rise to the possibility that discontinuities in the organization of human life can be sharply defined. Moreover, it presupposes a certain notion of culture as a bounded, homogeneous entity existing on either side of a figurative line.

The goal of Canada's Multicultural policy is integration via acceptance of difference. Yet, if the principle or logic underlying such policy rests on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous, multiculturalism reifies cultural distinctions and has the potential to contribute to divisiveness and disunity within Canada. The assumption, here, is that because there are irreconcilable differences between cultures, multiculturalism is divisive. Boundaries are arbitrary, even if we are reluctant to acknowledge them as such (Lamont and Fournier 1992:4). Once the arbitrariness of boundaries is recognized, our challenge is to displace and transgress such boundaries and to develop a multidimensional conception of culture (Lamont and Fournier 1992:4). The undue emphasis on cultural differences means that the cultures of new immigrants are not given the same value as Canadian culture and values (Li 2004:192). These differences, whether superficial or substantive, are abstracted into meaningful difference through the metaphorical extension of border concepts. As such, through the racialization of cultural

identities and the institutionalization of difference, multiculturalism has left unchanged the structural organization of power in the cultural and political landscape of Canada.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition. London: Verso.

Anderson, A. and J. Frideres. 1981. *Ethnicity in Canada: Theoretical Perspectives*. Toronto: Butterworths.

Armstrong, J. A. 1982. *Nations Before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Axel, B. K. 2002. "National Interruption: Diaspora Theory and Multiculturalism in the UK." *Cultural Dynamics*, 14(3):235-256.

Balibar, E. 2004. *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. English Edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Balibar, E. 1991. "Is There a 'Neo-Racism?'" In E. Balibar and I. Wallerstein (eds.), *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. New York: Verso.

Bannerji, H. 2000. *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars; Press Inc.

Bannerji, H. 1996. "On the Dark Side of the Nation: Politics of Multiculturalism in Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 31(3):103-28.

Banton, M. 2001. "Progress in Ethnic and Racial Studies." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24(2):173 194.

Banton, M. 1987. *Racial Theories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barber, P. G. 2003. "Citizenship and Attachment Across Borders? A Transnational and Anthropological Research Agenda." *Canadian Diversity* 2(1):45-51.

Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Basran, G. S. 1983. "Canadian Immigration Policy and Theories of Racism." In P. Li and B. Singh Bolaria (eds.), *Racial Minorities in Multicultural Canada*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Baubock, R. 1998. "The crossing and blurring of boundaries in international migration challenges for social and political theory." In R. Baubock and J. Rundell (eds.), *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*. Brookfield: Ashgate.

Baumann, G. 1996. *Contesting Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benhabib, S. 2004. *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, T., G. Turner and M. Volkerling. 1994. "Introduction: Post-Colonial Formations." *Culture and Policy*, 6(1):http://www.gu.edu.au/gwis/akccmp/6_1_Introduction.html#intro

Berger, P. L. and T. Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bissoondath. N. 1994. *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin.

Breton, R. 1988. "The Evolution of the Canadian Multicultural Society: The Significance of Government Intervention." In A. J. Fry and C. Forceville (eds.), *Canada: Canadian Mosaic. Essays on Multiculturalism*. Amsterdam: Free University Press.

Burnet, J. 1981. "The Social and Historical Context of Ethnic Relations." In R. C. Gardner and R. Kalin (eds.), *A Canadian Social Psychology of Ethnic Relations*. Agincourt: Methuen.

Castles, S. 2000. *Ethnicity and Globalization: From Migrant Worker to Transnational Citizen*. London: Sage.

Day, R. 2000. *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dhamoon, R. 2009. *Identity/Difference Politics: How Difference Is Produced, and Why it Matters*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dua, E. 2000. "'The Hindu Women's Question': Canadian Nation Building and the Social Construction of Gender for South Asian-Canadian Women." In A. Calliste and G. J. Sefa Dei (eds.), *Anti-Racist Feminism: Critical Race and Gender Studies*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Dua, E., N. Razack and J. N. Warner. 2005. "Race, Racism, and Empire: Reflections on Canada." *Social Justice* 32(4):1-10.

Duncan, H. 2000. "The Public Policy Role of Citizenship in a Globalized World." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 1(1):79-80.

Durkheim, E. 1965. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. New York: Free Press

Epstein, C. F. 1992. "Tinkerbells and Pinups: The Construction and Reconstruction of Gender Boundaries at Work." In M. Lamont and M. Fournier (eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ewing, K. P. 1998. "Crossing Borders and Transgressing Boundaries: Metaphors for Negotiating Multiple Identities." *Ethos* 26(2):262-267.

Fleras, A. 2001. *Social Problems in Canada: Conditions, Constructions, and Challenges*. Third Edition. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Fleras, A. and J. L. Elliot. 2003. *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada*. Fourth Edition. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Fleras, A. and J. L. Elliot. 1992. *Multiculturalism in Canada: The Challenges of Diversity*. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.

Furniss, E. 1999. *The Burden of History*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Gans, H. J. 1992. "Preface." In M. Lamont and M. Fournier (eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalisms*. London: Cornell University Press.

Gerson, J and K. Peiss. 1985. "Boundaries, Negotiation and Consciousness: Reconceptualizing Gender Relations." *Social Problems* 32:317-331.

Gilroy, P. 2000. *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Goldberg, D. 2002. *The Racial State*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Gordon, A. and C. Newfield. 1996. *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Government of Canada Policy Research Initiative. 2008. *Multicultural Canada in the 21st Century: Harnessing Opportunities and Managing Pressures*. http://www.policyresearch.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=rp_mult_bkg

Gwyn, R. 1995. *Nationalism Without Walls: The Unbearable Lightness of being Canadian*. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart.

Hall, S. 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

Hall, S. 1992a. "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power." In S. Hall and B. Gieben (eds.), *Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press in Association with the Open University.

Hall, S. 1992b. "The Question of Cultural Identity." In S. Hall, D. Held and T. McGrew (eds.), *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity Press in Association with the Open University.

Haque, E. 2010. "Homegrown, Muslim and Other: Tolerance, Secularism and the Limits of Multiculturalism." *Social Identities* 16(1):79-101.

Henderson, M. 1995. *Borders, Boundaries, and Frames: Cultural Criticism and Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Henry, F. and C. Tator. 2006. *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Nelson.

Hobsbawm, E. 1983. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions." In E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, E. and T. Ranger (eds.). 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ibrahim, M. 2005. "The Securitization of Migration: A Racial Discourse." *International Migration* 43(5):163-186.

Isajiw, W. 1979. *Definitions of Ethnicity. Occasional Papers in Ethnic and Immigration Studies*. Toronto: The Multicultural History Society of Ontario.

James, C. E. 1999. *Seeing Ourselves: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Culture*. Second Edition. Toronto: Thomson Education Publishing, Inc.

Jenkins, R. 1996. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Kallen, E. 2004. "Multiculturalism: Ideology, Policy and Reality." In E. Cameron (ed.), *Multiculturalism and Immigration in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Kivisto, P. 2002. *Multiculturalism in a Global Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Lamont, M. and V. Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167-195.

Lamont, M. and M. Fournier. 1992. "Introduction." In M. Lamont and M. Fournier (eds.), *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Li, P. 2004. "The Social Construction of Immigrants." In E. Cameron (ed.), *Multiculturalism and Immigration in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Li, P. 2003. *Destination Canada: Immigration Debates and Issues*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Li, P. 1998. "The Market Value and Social Value of Race." In V. Satzewich (ed.), *Racism and Social Inequality in Canada: Concepts, Controversies and Strategies of Resistance*. Toronto: Thomson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Li, P. 1990. "Race and Ethnicity." In P. Li (ed.), *Race and Ethic Relations in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lowry, M. 2002. "Creating Human Insecurity: The National Security Focus in Canada's Immigration System. *Refuge* 21(1):28-40.

Mauss, M. 1969. "La Civilisation: Elements et formes." *Oeuvres* 2:456-479. Paris: Minuit.

Mackey, E. 2002. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Marx, K. 1963. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*. New York: Int. Publ.

Modood, T. 2007. *Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Moghaddam, F. M. 2008. *Multiculturalism and Intergroup Relations: Psychological Implications for Democracy in Global Context*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada. 1985. *Education: Cultural Pluralism in Canada*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Nestel, S. 2006. *Obstructed Labour: Race and Gender in the Re-Emergence of Midwifery*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Paasi, A. 1998. "Boundaries as Social Processes: Territoriality in the World of Flows." *Geopolitics* 3:69-88.

Parekh, B. 2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Porter, J. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Poster, M. 1989. *Critical Theory and Poststructuralism: In Search of a Context*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Razack, S. 2007. "When Place Becomes Race." In T. Das Gupta et al (eds.), *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Rosenblum, K. and T-M. Travis (eds.). 2008. *The Meaning of Difference: American Constructions of Race, Sex and Gender, Social Class, Sexual Orientation, and Disability*. Fifth Edition. New York and Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Said, E. 1995. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Schutt, R. J. 2004. *Investigating the Social World: The Process and Practice of Research*. California: Pine Forge Press.

Seidman, S. 1996. *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Sharma, N. 2005. "Canadian Nationalism and the Making of a Global Apartheid." *Women & Environments International Magazine* 68/69:9-12.

Smith, A. 1991. *National Identity*. London: Penguin.

Smith, S. 1993. "Immigration and Nation-Building in Canada and the United Kingdom." In P. Jackson and J. Penrose (eds.), *Constructions of Race, Place and Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stocking, G. W. Jr. 1968. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. New York: The Free Press.

Tajfel, H. and J.C. Turner. 1985. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." In S. Worchel and W.G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Thobani, S. 2000. "Closing Ranks: Racism and Sexism in Canada's Immigration Policy." *Race & Class* 42(1):35-55.

Touraine, A. 1997. *What is Democracy?* Boulder: Westview.

Walzer, M. 1997. *On Toleration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society* (Volume 1). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Williams, R. 1980. *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays*. London: Verso.