Jeanette den Toonder

Multiculturalism in Canada

Starting from the paradox that stresses the image of a welcoming multicultural Canada on the one hand, while revealing (inadvertent) racism on the other, this article offers a critical discussion of the values of Canadian multicultural society today. After a brief overview of historical developments in immigration policies, the ideology of the Multiculturalism Act expressed in the metaphor of the cultural mosaic will be discussed, including a reflection on the importance of citizenship. This analysis is followed by a discussion of critical perspectives, often denouncing multicultural policies, and to conclude new ways of managing today's complex diversity will be considered.

In October 2015, when the Liberal Party celebrated a historic victory and Justin Trudeau was elected prime minister for the first time, Canadians shared his positive, optimistic and hopeful vision for their country. After nearly ten years of Conservative government, they chose real change and in his victory speech Trudeau invoked the philosophy of former prime minister Wilfrid Laurier (in office from 1896-1911) by quoting his famous words: “sunny ways, my friends, sunny ways”.¹ Laurier used this imagery, borrowed from Aesop's fable telling the story of the sun and the wind holding a contest who could remove a traveller's coat, to appeal for a diplomatic and friendly political discourse rather than a hard-line approach.² In the fable, the warm rays of the sun are more effective than the wind's blowing. Trudeau's “sunny ways” involved embracing multiculturalism and striving for equal opportunities for all Canadians, expressed in his ethnically diverse cabinet including an equal number of men and women. This gender parity and the inclusion of

Indigenous members of parliament and Sikh politicians seem to mark his father's legacy, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, founder of Canada's multicultural society. Also the government's promise to welcome 25,000 Syrian refugees in 100 days³ when most of the Western world had become critical of migration, fostered the image of a welcoming multicultural Canada.

Four years later, however, the Liberal Party has been re-elected with only a small margin and in a much less jubilant atmosphere. Trudeau's new government is a minority one, and critics wonder if his brand will survive. In the fourth year of his first mandate in particular, he faced a considerable loss of image. Notably painful were the resignation of the Minister of Justice, Jody Wilson-Raybould, after having been pressured by the prime minister's office to avoid prosecuting SNC-Lavalin, a big construction company suspected of corruption, and the publication of photos and videos of Justin Trudeau wearing blackface make-up. The first scandal proved all the more distressing since the former justice minister was considered one of the most prominent Indigenous politicians when the Liberals came to power in 2015. One of the main priorities in the 2015 election campaign had been to renew the relationship between Indigenous peoples and Canada, but after this scandal and the minister's resignation, the government's commitment to reconciliation was called into question. In the North-American context, the figure of blackface is considered offensive and disrespectful, referring to a practice that gained popularity in the 19th century of white performers darkening their faces in order to dehumanize African people. This practice contributed to the increase of racial stereotypes and continued in the 20th century in Broadway shows and Hollywood movies.⁴ Even if blackface was more prominent in the U.S. than in Canada, it is at least unexpected that a prime minister darkened his face, neck and hands completely at a school gala where he was a teacher in 2000-2001. In his current function, Trudeau apologised, admitting that he should have known better at the time,⁵ but his credibility as a prime minister who embraces diversity suffered a heavy blow. The question was raised how, in his younger years, he could have been totally ignorant of the racist implications of his behavior, as well as of its effects. Such political aberrations justify a critical discussion of the values of Canadian multicultural society.

This article will engage in this discussion by considering the question how multicultural Canada really is. After a brief overview of historical developments in immigration policies, the ideology of the Multiculturalism Act expressed in the metaphor of the cultural mosaic will be discussed,

including a reflection on the importance of citizenship. By referring to the illusion of multiculturalism, an expression used by the author Neil Bissoondath to denounce multicultural policies, critical perspectives will be considered as well as new ways of managing today's complex diversity.

History of immigration policies

Canada is a country of immigrants, as is the case for the entire American continent and most of the other countries labelled as the "New World". In 1867, the Constitution Act united the eastern territories of British North America, the francophone province of Québec and the anglophone provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Together they formed the Canadian Confederation and were no longer a colony of the United Kingdom, even if to this day the head of State remains the Queen of the United Kingdom, represented in Canada by the Governor General. Following Confederation, immigration was regarded essential for the development of the new nation. Economic growth was one of the conditions to survive as an independent nation, which could only be achieved through an expanding market depending on a growing population. Kelley and Trebilcock have argued that during the first thirty years of Confederation immigrants, "while relatively free to enter Canada, were viewed as a cheap source of labour"⁶ who had limited rights of citizenship. These scholars denounce the idea that liberal values inspired the open immigration attitude of the time; employers mainly called for an open policy in order to keep labour cheap. This open immigration policy was sharply criticised by Anglo-Canadian nationalists who were concerned with "the development of a homogenous society based on British values, traditions, and institutions".⁷ This attitude, in turn, disturbed the French Canadians, who feared that the linguistic and cultural balance of the Confederation would be upset. Despite growing controversy, governments at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries maintained economic growth as their objective, until the First World War saw a dramatic decline in immigrant admissions as a result of bad economic conditions.

Regarding the treatment of immigrants, the First World War internment camps were considered a dark chapter in Canadian history. Ryan Boyko's recent documentary *That Never Happened* (2017) tells the story of the so-called "enemy aliens", immigrants from enemy countries – Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey – who were interned as prisoners of war. The documentary

acknowledges that more than 8,500 of them were wrongfully imprisoned not because of their acts but because of where they came from. After the Great War, the exclusion of Asian immigrants in the 1920s illustrates growing demands for selectivity and restrictions. The Chinese Immigration Act of 1923, imposing a head tax on all immigrants from China, is a particular example of a policy determined by a racist agenda. The forced relocation of the Canadian population of Japanese descent during the Second World War further highlights discriminatory and ideological values that were still in place in the post-war period. The fact that the Canadian government turned away a ship carrying German Jewish passengers fleeing the Nazi regime in 1939 further illustrates the oppressive attitude of the Mackenzie King government towards non-preferred immigrants. He was Canada's political leader from the 1920s to the 1940s, and in his speech before parliament in May 1947 he stated that "the people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration in the character of our population".⁸ According to Troper, this statement "mirrored the national mood", as a result of which there was no "great wave of public pressure to open Canada's door to the world".¹⁰ It was agreed that northern and western Europeans would have priority.

It wasn't until the 1960s that a liberation of Canadian immigration policy occurred under the governments of John Diefenbaker and Lester Pearson. A white paper on immigration, released in 1966, "called for a complete overhaul of Canada's immigration law, regulations, and procedures, including a final purge of any last hint of racial or ethnic discrimination".¹¹ The introduction of the points system in 1967 established a selection according to criteria such as education, language competency in English and/or French, and labour market potential. As a result, ethnic and racial backgrounds were no longer taken into consideration and Canada's demographic structure diversified to the extent that Canada developed into one of the most diverse countries in the world.¹² In his study *Becoming Multicultural* (2012), Triadafilopoulos argues that several factors explain the change in regulations and the uniform political support for these changes. A flexible economy, encouraging a positive attitude towards immigrants, and a general disapproval of the old system were among these factors. The political discourse was also shaped by the fact that Canada regarded itself as a "tolerant oasis in a turbulent continent",¹³ presenting (English) Canadian identity as opposed to the intolerance and national chauvinism represented by other groups in society, such as opponents to the Civil Rights Movement in the U.S. and Quebec nationalists

in Canada. According to Triadafilopoulos, “the most striking manifestation of this re-engineering of Canadian identity was Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau’s introduction of an official policy of multiculturalism in 1971”.¹⁴ He presented his policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework, recognizing the fact that there are two official languages in Canada, but no official culture. Cultural recognition was based on shared citizenship, and Trudeau related national unity to personal identity; when “founded on confidence in one’s own individual identity”, national identity would be reflected in “a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions”.¹⁵ English Canada supported reforms and multiculturalism, because they viewed themselves as “progressive, modern, forward looking people”,¹⁶ willing to build a distinctive identity. Multiculturalism was entrenched in the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which became one of Pierre Trudeau’s most enduring legacies and a cornerstone of Canadian values. Trudeau’s successor, Brian Mulroney, leader of the Progressive Conservative government from 1984 until 1993, approved of Canada’s official multiculturalism policy in 1988 by passing the Multiculturalism Act. This made Canada the first country in the world to adopt a policy of multiculturalism.

Canada’s ethnocultural mosaic and the role of citizenship

In the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, the Multicultural Policy declares to “recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage”.¹⁷ The Act also states that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and that it promotes the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins. The freedom to preserve cultural heritage demonstrates that Canada is committed to a cultural mosaic in which a variety of communities of different ethnic backgrounds coexist. The metaphor of the mosaic is often opposed to that of the melting pot, the latter referring to a heterogeneous culture becoming more homogenous as a result of different elements that melt together with a common culture. In general, the melting pot image is considered to characterise U.S. culture, while the mosaic expresses the belief that Canada as a whole becomes stronger as a result of cultural diversity, brought in by immigrants from all over the world. Political philosopher Will Kymlicka and philosopher Charles Taylor have examined the societal

opportunities offered by cultural diversity in their highly acclaimed books *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995) and *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition* (1992).

Kymlicka argues that the challenge of multiculturalism is to accommodate ethnic differences. This notion of accommodation has become central in the many discussions on multiculturalism in Canada. Kymlicka proposes special measures to achieve this, which he distinguishes as polyethnic rights and special representation rights. The first category addresses the possibility of ethnic groups and religious minorities to “express their cultural particularity and pride without hampering their success in the economic and political institutions of the dominant society”.¹⁸ The second mechanism addresses the under-representation of minority groups in the political process. In order to reform this process, Kymlicka proposes to “make political parties more inclusive” or to reserve “a certain number of seats in the legislature [...] for the members of disadvantaged or marginalised groups”.¹⁹ Representation of all groups fosters the recognition of a diverse society, resulting in what literary critic Northrop Frye has defined as “the sense of one feeling of belonging attached to and complemented by another”.²⁰

The importance of one being complemented by another is illustrated by Taylor’s discussion of the dialogical nature of human identity: we create our identities in dialogue with others. By focussing on the discourse of recognition and identity, Taylor demonstrates that recognition is a vital human need based on self-discovery and self-affirmation in relation to others. In the public sphere, recognizing the self as well as the other is based on the appreciation of distinctness and is essential for reaching equality. “There are other cultures, and we have to live together more and more, both on a world scale and commingled in each individual society”,²¹ Taylor concludes. In his observations on Canadian culture, Frye offers a picture of such a commixture: “Canada has now become cosmopolitan to a degree that would have been incomprehensible fifty years ago. If Toronto is a world-class city, it is not because of its bids for the Olympics or builds follies like the Skydome, but because of the tolerated variety of the people in its streets”.²²

The above discussion demonstrates that multiculturalism includes much more than a “feel-good celebration of ethno-cultural diversity”.²³ In recent years, a strong focus on multicultural citizenship demonstrates that inclusion and equality, irrespective of national origin, is highly dependent on citizenship policy. In her study *Becoming a Citizen* (2006), Bloemraad argues that “the very act of citizenship acquisition [...] is a fundamental reaffirmation

of the volitional and liberal character of political membership in Canada [...]. Regardless of birth or background, newcomers *can* become members of the national community”.²⁴ By examining statistical data, Bloemraad explains that government policies, but also school dynamics and peer cultures affect the participation of immigrants in society. She argues that citizenship primarily matters as a form of recognition.

Contrary to the nationalist principle reflected in the relation between citizenship and national attachment as presented by Bloemraad, Québec’s policy designated as interculturalism proposes “a collective project formed through citizens engaged in cross-cultural dialogue and interaction”.²⁵ This collective project, presented as a “co-constructive civic ideal” (433), requires guidelines that “will apply to all citizens, regardless of their cultural, social, ethnic, religious or evaluative affiliations”.²⁶ Other than multiculturalism’s promotion of diversity, Québec interculturalism stimulates a convergence towards a common society culture, in which the French language and culture of Québec are pivotal. From a historical point of view, the goal of integrating immigrants into francophone Québécois culture is self-evident. Since the Constitution Act of 1867, founded by the British colonial elite, French Canadians found themselves in a permanent minority position, reflected in limited linguistic concessions and denial of political recognition. In his historical overview of resistance in Québec, Beaudet discusses the intolerance towards the Francophone minority in the 19th and 20th centuries, which triggered the creation of Québec neo-nationalism and the rise of the separatist social democratic Parti Québécois in the 1970s. When Pierre Trudeau claimed to preserve Canadian unity by stimulating policies of bilingualism and multiculturalism, social resistance rose in Québec. This culminated in the 1980 referendum on Québec sovereignty, which was rejected by a small margin of 59% against separation and 41% in favour. Despite the separatists’ loss, Québec continued to demand its recognition as distinct society affirming their unique culture and civil law tradition. As a distinct society, Québec would gain more powers in regard to immigration. While the distinct society clause was never accepted, Québec intellectuals started developing interculturalism as a new model for the integration of immigrants. This model, branded in 2011, was endorsed by Justin Trudeau, who was a Liberal MP at the time: “for me (interculturalism) is more a word we chose to use in Québec that is acceptable when multiculturalism is beginning to be less so”.²⁷ Québec’s alternative to multiculturalism can be seen as a competing vision illustrating the declining support for the bedrock of the Canadian mosaic.

Critiques of multiculturalism

As early as 1994, Neil Bissoondath argued in his provocative essay *Selling Illusions* that multiculturalism does not serve the interests of immigrants. He was attacked by multiculturalism advocates, but insisted that, even if the country's multicultural policies were well intentioned, they encouraged the isolation and stereotyping of cultural groups. Ensuring that ethnic groups preserve their distinctiveness, highlights exoticism and differences rather than similarities uniting Canadians. According to this view, the cultural mosaic stimulates ghettoization rather than unity. The individual tiles are held together in a sheet, but remain separate from one another. The differences between the various tiles are tolerated, but this has not created acceptance. Multiculturalism "has preached tolerance rather than encouraging acceptance; and it is leading us into a divisiveness so entrenched that we face a future of multiple solitudes with no central notion to bind us".²⁸

The notion of multiple solitudes replaces that of two solitudes, a term used to characterise Canadian identity as separated between English and French Canada. As Von Heyking and Ray argue in their 2010 article on the problems of Canadian unity, Pierre Trudeau's introduction of multiculturalism saw its origin in "his battles against Québécois nationalists".²⁹ By presenting Canada as multicultural, it "would be composed of many nations, not just two".³⁰ As such, multiculturalism would overcome the two solitudes. By building on Bissoondath's criticism, Von Heyking and Ray argue that "there is nothing "multi" about multiculturalism. It is more a matter of "us" and "them", where "them" gets categorized into ethnic – rather, racial – categories foreign to them".³¹ The first category, "us", is represented by the hegemonic white, English speaking majority, while "them" refers to the multiple solitudes.

The opposition between a white hegemonic class on the one hand and ethnic or racialized "Others" on the other, was already examined by Canadian writer Bannerji in her book *The Dark Side of the Nation* (2010). In a critical exploration of Taylor's politics of recognition, Bannerji demonstrates that Taylor's theory is firmly based in liberal-communitarian tradition and that his understanding of cultural difference is only a superficial one. By wishing to "to retain an older European cultural identity in the face of what he considers to be a mass culture and exaggerated egalitarianism",³² Bannerji suggests that he intensifies actual inequalities, augmenting "the existing elite Anglo-European hegemony in Canada".³³ Both Taylor and Kymlicka are criticised for putting too much emphasis on theorization and for providing little support

for equality in practice, resulting in downgrading the immigrant “Other” to the status of second-class citizen.

In his research on the paradoxes of multiculturalism, Fleras discusses the systematic discrimination of ethnic and racialized minorities as a result of the “tyranny of sameness”³⁴ which, in his terms, means: “treating unequals equally = inequality”.³⁵ Everyone has the right to be treated equally, regardless of their differences, but in the Canadian context this has resulted in a depoliticization of diversity. Diversity being symbolic rather than political, the Eurocentric principles of a “racialized constitutional order”³⁶ are maintained. Diversity is reduced to folklore, and the mentality of colour-blindness denies race as an organising principle of society. Fleras thus observes that in “advancing the goals of Canada-building through inclusiveness, Canadian multiculturalism is anti-racist in theory, if not necessarily in reality and in practice”.³⁷

The pitfalls of Eurocentric liberalism are endorsed by Indigenous communities, who consider multiculturalism a colonial policy failing to consider their sovereignty. The liberal traditions of multiculturalism proposing formal equality “insufficiently recognize the *sui generis* of inherent rights of Aboriginal peoples which existed before colonization and continue still”.³⁸ By considering Indigenous peoples alongside ethnic minorities, multicultural policies fail to address the continuing inequalities between Indigenous and settler populations. MacDonald uses the term “colonial multiculturalism” which “privileges integration into the dominant English and French settler societies”.³⁹ In this process, Indigenous “languages, values, governance traditions, and other aspects of [...] ways of knowing and being”⁴⁰ have been neglected.

These various forms of criticism share the principle that multiculturalism is ultimately an instrument to legitimate and strengthen state power. The “unity in diversity” motto underlying Canada’s multiculturalism only allows for superficial diversity, and is denounced by critics as a myth of liberal equality dominated by Western European political ideas and settler values.

Beyond multiculturalism: alternative ways for the future

The critiques of Canadian multiculturalism discussed in this article offer an explanation for the political aberrations mentioned in the introduction. Official multiculturalism has its limitations and is based upon principles that favor symbolic diversity advocating tolerance rather than acceptance. As various scholars have shown, the underlying principles of multiculturalism

lead to normalization of white dominant culture and certain features of the colonial state continue to exist. By ignoring historical inequalities resulting from race and ethnic backgrounds, racial hierarchies are reinforced. Or, as Bannerji has phrased it: “due to its selective modes of ethnicization, multiculturalism is itself a vehicle for racialization”.⁴¹ This explains for example why a representative of the white elite whose father introduced the country to multiculturalism can appear at a private party with darkened face, neck and hands, being totally ignorant of the implications of his act.

The commitment to inclusiveness proposed by official multiculturalism, citizenship acquisition, the introduction of the points system that welcomes immigrants from a variety of backgrounds and promotion of the concept of respecting differences as well as encouraging equal participation are among the benefits of multiculturalism. If in many Western countries a negative attitude towards multiculturalism seems to prevail, diversity is still considered a strength in Canadian society. Critical voices have demonstrated however that official multiculturalism as a governance model is “experiencing an identity crisis of confidence”.⁴² It is therefore time to seriously reassess and renovate the old model and to “move on to the next phase”.⁴³

Different scenarios have been proposed for developing alternative ways to manage diversity. The Québec alternative of interculturalism has already been referred to. This model fosters a common culture integrating diversity, in which the French language is promoted and all inhabitants are encouraged to participate in civil and political life. Among its principles, the “recognition of ethno-cultural minorities in a pluralist environment”⁴⁴ is essential. Kymlicka and Banting have recently reconsidered multicultural policies, by arguing that these are not incompatible with civic integration.⁴⁵ These alternatives, however, are still based on the fundamental idea of liberal universalism and are therefore unlikely to produce real change.

By proposing a model of “syncretic multiculturalism”, MacDonald offers a solution to the problem of continued colonial structures. This model creates a “balance between current institutional forms (European style parliamentary democracy) and Aboriginal understandings of the world and methods of collective governance, as a fundamental precursor to welcoming immigrants into Canada”.⁴⁶ The principals are based on the creation of a binational society, promoting a nation-to-nation relationship in which partnership replaces the dominant institutions. Binationalism promotes “power sharing in an ethos of “majority-to-majority partner-ship” rather than “majority-minority relations””.⁴⁷ A similarly radical vision is presented

by Fleras in a chapter entitled “Beyond Multiculturalism”, in which he proposes postmulticulturalism as the next phase. Postmulticulturalism renegotiates existing forms of multiculturalism, thus transforming the monocultural state into a transnational one. In this postmulticultural model, “multiple social universes”⁴⁸ co-exist in which “people renegotiate multiple differences”.⁴⁹ Contrary to the multicultural mosaic, ethnicity is only one element of a multidimensional identity. Differences do not only occur between communities, but also within groups. In a postnational Canada, the metaphor of the mosaic is replaced by “a complex matrix of wiggly lines and contested angles responding to the demands of multiple identities and competing sovereignties”.⁵⁰ If Fleras admits at the end of his chapter that “in truth, nobody really knows what a postmulticulturalism governance would look like”,⁵¹ the challenging question for the 21st century has become clear: how to manage complex diversity in such a way that society becomes really and inherently inclusive.

Notes

1. “Federal Election 2015: “Sunny Ways, Sunny Ways” Justin Trudeau celebrates victory,” *Global News*, October 19, 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yjk1P4wEK9c>.
2. As mentioned by Oscar Skelton in his *Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier* (Vol. 1, Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1921: 464-465), Laurier first used this metaphor in a speech he delivered in Morrisburg, Ontario, on October 8, 1895.
3. “Welcoming 25,000 Syrian refugees in 100 days,” Government of Canada, last modified October 17, 2019, <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/refugees/welcome-syrian-refugees/how.html>.
4. John Strausbaugh for example demonstrates the impact of blackface on American culture in his study *Black Like You: Blackface, Whiteface, Insult & Imitation in American Popular Culture*, New York, Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin, 2006.
5. “Justin Trudeau Wore Brownface at 2001 ‘Arabian Nights’ Party While He Taught at a Private School,” *Time*, last modified September 19, 2019, <https://time.com/5680759/justin-trudeau-brownface-photo/>.
6. Ninette Kelley and Michael J. Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic: A History of Canadian Immigration Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 13, EBSCOhost.
7. Kelley and Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic*, 13.
8. House of Commons Debates, May 1, 1947, 2644-2546.
9. Harold Troper, “Canada’s Immigration Policy since 1945,” *International Journal* 48, no. 2, Migrants & Refugees (Spring 1993): 255, Jstor.

10. Troper, "Canada's Immigration Policy since 1945," 255.
11. Troper, "Canada's Immigration Policy since 1945," 268.
12. "2001 Census Analysis Series: Canada's Ethnocultural Mosaic," *Statistics Canada*, Ottawa: Ministry of Industry, January 21, 2003, <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/English/census01/products/analytic/companion/etoimm/canada.cfm>; "Study: Canada's Visible Minority Population in 2017," Statistics Canada, Ottawa: Ministry of Industry, March 22, 2005, <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/050322/dq050322b-eng.htm>.
13. Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos, *Becoming Multicultural: Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013), 104, ProQuest Ebrary.
14. Triadafilopoulos, *Becoming Multicultural*, 104.
15. House of Commons Debates, 28th Parliament, 3rd session, October 8, 1971, 8580-81.
16. Triadafilopoulos, *Becoming Multicultural*, 105.
17. Canadian Multiculturalism Act, last modified December 13, 2019, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-18.7/page-1.html>.
18. Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 21, Oxford Scholarship online 2003.
19. Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship*, 21.
20. Northrop Frye, "The Cultural Development of Canada," In *Northrop Frye on Canada*, ed. by Jean O'Grady and David Staines (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 672, De Gruyter Online.
21. Charles Taylor and Amy Gutman, *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 72, De Gruyter Online.
22. Frye, "The Cultural Development of Canada," 672.
23. Will Kymlicka, *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future* (Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2012), 4, Researchgate.
24. Irene Bloemraad, *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 239. Author's italics.
25. Bruce Maxwell et al, "Interculturalism, Multiculturalism, and the state funding regulation of conservative religious schools," *Educational Theory* 62, no. 4 (2012): 433, Researchgate.
26. Maxwell et al, "Interculturalism, Multiculturalism, and the state funding regulation of conservative religious schools," 442.
27. Jonathan Montpetit quoting Justin Trudeau in the article "Quebec group pushes 'interculturalism' in place of multiculturalism", *The Globe and Mail*, March 7, 2011, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/quebec-group-pushes-interculturalism-in-place-of-multiculturalism/article569581/>.
28. Neil Bissoondath, *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1994), 4.
29. John von Heyking and Elise Ray, "Multiculturalism and Problems of Canadian Unity," in *Political Cultures and the Culture of Politics: A Transatlantic Perspective*, ed. Jürgen Gebhardt, 109-130. (Publication of the Bavaria-America Academy (Munich), vol. 9,

- Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH Heidelberg, 2010), 5, OPUS: Open Uleth Scholarship.
30. Von Heyking and Ray, "Multiculturalism and Problems of Canadian Unity," 5.
 31. Von Heyking and Ray, "Multiculturalism and Problems of Canadian Unity," 16.
 32. Himani Bannerji, *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender* (Toronto, Ont.: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2000), 128, EBSCOhost.
 33. Bannerji, *The Dark Side of the Nation*, 126.
 34. Augie Fleras, *Racisms in Multicultural Canada: Paradoxes, Politics, and Resistance* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2014), 169, EBSCOhost.
 35. Fleras, *Racisms in Multicultural Canada*, 169.
 36. Fleras, *Racisms in Multicultural Canada*, 170.
 37. Fleras, *Racisms in Multicultural Canada*, 169.
 38. David B. MacDonald, "Aboriginal Peoples and Multicultural Reform in Canada: Prospects for a New Bionational Society," *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 39, no. 1 (2014): 67, University of Alberta Libraries.
 39. MacDonald, "Aboriginal Peoples and Multicultural Reform in Canada," 67.
 40. MacDonald, "Aboriginal Peoples and Multicultural Reform in Canada," 82.
 41. Bannerji, *The Dark Side of the Nation*, 78.
 42. Augie Fleras, "Beyond Multiculturalism. Managing Complex Diversities in a Postmulticultural Canada," *In Revisiting Multiculturalism in Canada. Theories, Policies, and Debates*, ed. Shibao Guo and Lloyd Wong (Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Brill / Sense Publishers, 2015), 327, EBSCOhost.
 43. Fleras, "Beyond Multiculturalism," 325.
 44. Isabel Wences, "Quebec Interculturalism: A Version of Canadian Multiculturalism or a Model with an Institutional Structure?" *Convergencia, Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 23, no. 72 (2016): 136, SciELO México.
 45. They develop this idea in their 2012 paper "Is There Really a Backlash Against Multiculturalism Policies?," published by Queen's University.
 46. MacDonald, "Aboriginal Peoples and Multicultural Reform in Canada," 71.
 47. MacDonald, "Aboriginal Peoples and Multicultural Reform in Canada," 80.
 48. Fleras, "Beyond Multiculturalism," 320.
 49. Fleras, "Beyond Multiculturalism," 320.
 50. Fleras, "Beyond Multiculturalism," 328.
 51. Fleras, "Beyond Multiculturalism," 328.