

**A New Canadian Dynamism?**  
**From Multiculturalism and Diversity to History and Core Values**

**Raymond B. Blake, PhD**  
**University of Regina**

**Abstract**

This article examines how Canada's new citizenship study guide might be considered a fundamental shift in Canadian citizenship from one emphasising multiculturalism, rights, and diversity to one that encourages the integration of newcomers into Canadian society. It contends that the new approach to Canadian citizenship is part of a wider integrationist agenda sweeping much of Europe and settler-countries such as the United States and Australia. While the integrationist approach in the new citizenship study guide does not explicitly reject multiculturalism, rights and diversity, it promotes a greater commitment to a common set of core values rooted in Canada's history and heritage which might be described as a process of liberal assimilationism. The new agenda does not attempt to construct a religious, cultural or ethnically defined Canadian identity; it attempts to construct a shared citizenship within an increasingly diverse Canadian community.

Political assassinations are, fortunately, rare in Canada. There have been only two. The first was Irish-born Canadian Member of Parliament, Thomas D’Arcy McGee who, on the early morning of April 7, 1868, was shot dead by fellow Irishman Patrick James Whelan, a suspected member of the Fenian Brotherhood. The second occurred in 1970, when revolutionaries in the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) kidnapped and assassinated Pierre Laporte, the Minister of Labour, in their pursuit of an independent Quebec. So, when Canadian newspapers carried reports in late April, 2010, of a Facebook page calling for the assassination of Ujjal Dosanjh, a former premier of British Columbia and, at the time, a Member of Parliament, Canadians, were, not surprisingly, appalled.<sup>1</sup>

What had Dosanjh done to warrant a threat on his life? He had for years condemned extremism and violence within the Canadian Sikh community in its struggle for an independent Punjab region of India, where he and many other Canadians had been born. For his outspoken views, he was severely beaten in 1985 and later, while a member of the BC Legislature, his constituency office was vandalized and a Molotov cocktail left burning on his desk. Just two days before the death threat against him, Dosanjh had told the *Globe and Mail* that Canadian multiculturalism “has allowed extremism to take root in Sikh and other ethnic communities.” He blamed what he described as “politically correct” Canadians who encourage a polite brand of multiculturalism in the name of diversity for giving extremists the space to nurture old grudges brought from their homelands. Further, he contended, Canada has allowed the idea of multiculturalism to become so distorted that “anything anyone believes – no matter how ridiculous and outrageous it might be – is okay and acceptable in the name of diversity.” In the pursuit of multiculturalism and diversity, he lamented, Canada has failed to instil its core values on newcomers.<sup>2</sup>

The Dosanjh incident was not an isolated one. There have many others that have had Canadians wondering about the impact of multiculturalism. In Montreal, Hasidic Jewish leaders asked the YMCA to frost its windows to prevent young Hasid men from gazing upon women working out in the gym. Controversy has interrupted over girls wearing the hijab while playing organized soccer and Quebec has proposed a law to ban niqabs for those seeking public services; expectant fathers have been asked to leave pre-natal classes because women from certain ethnic groups object to their presence; pork has been removed from the menus of sugar-shacks in Quebec; religious schools have been torched and vandalized; violence between various ethnic groups on university campuses have become all too commonplace; and so-called honour killings of Muslim teenagers, such as the case of Aqsa Parvez, where her brother and father were convicted of her murder in June 2010 because she refused to abide by the family's strict traditional customs. The Government of Ontario raised the possibility of Shariah law, a faith-based system of arbitration, to remove the backlog from Canada's legal system and then dropped the plan in the face of concerted opposition. In the summer of 2006, 18 young Muslim men were arrested in Toronto for allegedly plotting terrorist acts; several were subsequently convicted on terrorism-related charges and given lengthy prison terms. A Canadian-born doctor and contestant on the hit TV show *Canadian Idol* was arrested for his role in an alleged Islamist terrorist plot. The most notorious incident was a controversial "code of living" passed by the local government of Hérouxville, a small town of 1,500 residents 160 kilometres northeast of Montreal. The code, which was clearly directed towards immigrants, prohibited, among other things, the stoning of women, female circumcision, and the carrying of any weapons – real or fake – to school.

What is going on in Canada, long celebrated as an example of effective multiculturalism? Canadian citizenship, which means a system of values, practices and institutional practices that citizens require to create and maintain the conditions that allow them to live together in relative harmony in an increasingly complex society (Dimitrov & Boyadjieva, 2009), has, all of a sudden, become contested terrain: questions are being raised about Canada's policy of official multiculturalism and the promotion of diversity. *Maclean's* response in October 2007 was to ask if Canada had suddenly become a nation of bigots.<sup>3</sup> The *Toronto Globe and Mail* editorialized that "Multiculturalism should be struck from the national vocabulary" and called upon Canada to "have the courage to build a successful society around the concept of citizenship."<sup>4</sup> Since 1971, when Canada adopted a policy of official multiculturalism, Canadians have been proud of the policy, but for much of that time multiculturalism has been largely an abstract concept. It was designed to meet the demands of historic ethnic (and usually white) communities such as Germans, Ukrainians, and Italians and not those of recent Muslim, African or South Asian origins. It was apparently easy for most Canadians to accept multiculturalism until they perceived it as a threat to what they considered the core values of their society. Canadians seem to have reached this point,<sup>5</sup> and are now asking how much of their own culture can newcomers keep after settling in Canada and how far must Canadians go to accommodate the diverse cultures of the newcomers. Questions have been raised about "reasonable accommodation," or, what are the levels of accommodations that must be provided for new immigrant communities and the potentially illiberal manifestations of multiculturalism.

Paradoxically, three-quarters of Canadians see diversity and multiculturalism as cornerstones of Canadian identity and are proud that Canada is a multicultural society; roughly the same percentage of Canadians agree that newcomers must become more like most Canadians (Jedwab 2005: 96). These questions take on greater urgency as surveys show that many Canadians believe that too many immigrants are not adopting Canadian values,<sup>6</sup> and recent polls have suggested that many Canadians believe there should be limits to “reasonable accommodation”. In Quebec, for instance, the issue attracted such public concern that in 2007 Premier Jean Charest appointed a *Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences* (Bouchard-Taylor Commission) to investigate the issue of reasonable accommodation and make recommendations “to ensure that accommodation practices conform to Quebec’s values as a pluralistic, democratic, egalitarian society.”<sup>7</sup> The Policy Research Initiative found in their focus groups that the government “should not promote cultural differences at the expense of shared values” (Kunz & Skyes 2007: 3). Will Kymlicka’s claim that “multiculturalists have won the day” might have been premature and even he now admits that his was a rash prediction; he had insisted that multiculturalism had become “an unalienable element of nation-building in Canada.”<sup>8</sup> Several countries, notably Australia, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands have all retreated from their multicultural policies. In Canada, there is now an accepted critique of the policy of multiculturalism and diversity.<sup>9</sup> Some have argued that Canada must strengthen social integration and reinforce the underlying sources of a shared citizenship.<sup>10</sup>

In contemporary societies the focus seems to have shifted to a heavier emphasis on integration and away from multiculturalism (Kymlicka 2003: 3). Some commentators have

argued that strong attachment to cultural identity groups leads to social conflict and harmful divisions with a nation-state (Banks 2004). European countries, such as France, have adopted illiberal policies to advance their integrationist agendas. Amid fears of home-grown terrorism and a threatening financial and economic crisis across Europe, German Chancellor Angela Merkel declared in late 2010 that Germany's attempt to build a multicultural society "has failed, utterly" and said the approach where divergent cultures and languages "are living side by side" should be abandoned.<sup>11</sup> The Netherlands, long considered a model for its recognition of cultural and ethnic diversity, has become a radical supporter of immigrant acculturation and now insist that newcomers accept "Dutch" values. One commentator on multiculturalism has lamented that "in so far as the term come up, multiculturalism is relegated to the dunghill of political history."<sup>12</sup> In Britain, former Prime Minister Tony Blair remarked that newcomers had "a duty to integrate" after Trevor Phillips, the Head of the Commission for Racial Equality and himself a Black Briton, warned that Britain was in danger of "sleepwalking towards segregation". The Labour Government attempted to move the UK beyond multiculturalism to create a greater sense of citizenship based on a set of common values of nationhood,<sup>13</sup> and Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron has attacked multiculturalism with even greater zeal. In early 2011, he called for the repudiation of official multicultural in favour of a policy of "muscular liberalism" which, he maintained, should enforce the values of equality, law and freedom of speech across all parts of society; he also said that English schools should teach the country's common culture.<sup>14</sup> In 1999, Australia adopted the term "Australian multiculturalism" which stressed the adjective, and emphasized the critical role of social cohesion and the allegiance and

responsibility of all newcomers to Australia. Support for ethnic diversity and multiculturalism in Australia remains strong but the national government promotes such policies within a commitment to national core values and allegiance (Jakubowicz 2005: 17-18). In Russia and other countries which have recently undergone significant political and social changes there have been rather draconian attempts to create and defend a national narrative as a means to counter the growing restiveness of various minority groups within the federation (Piattoeva 2010). In Canada, too, there has been an increasing demand since the mid-1990s for the restoration of citizenship education in the public educational system (Hughes & Sears 2008).

Citizenship education has shifted from attempting to foster global citizenship to one that focuses on the nation and the citizens' affinity to the nation-state which reinforces the reality (to the disappointment of theorists and advocates of global citizenship and global education<sup>15</sup>) that citizenship is a legal status conferred only by nation-states; the primary goal of citizenship education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to create citizens who can function effectively in the context of the nation state.<sup>16</sup> There are two main reasons for the change in attitude. First, many have come to believe that the rise of globalization and the presence of immigrant societies threaten the traditional bases of citizenship and identification within a nation-state which remains the primary site for citizenship despite the power of globalization. Second – and this is particularly evident in many Western democracies -- there has emerged a fear that multiculturalism breeds division and cultural alienation, even among immigrant-born children who are raised in western democracies. This fear or sense of crisis has become a particularly salient issue in the post-9/11 period and with the rise of radical Islamism groups such as Al-Qaeda which have created a

heightened sense of insecurity in North America and throughout much of Europe. Harvard political scientist Samuel Huntington heightened the level of debate with his controversial prediction that future world conflicts would be driven by culture rather than ideology; he warned of a “clash of civilizations” (Huntington 1993). As a result, some Western democracies are attempting to redefine notions of citizenship from multiculturalism to nationalism and from individualism to collectivism.

Canada’s new citizenship study guide, *Discover Canada: the Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship*, released in November 2009, is part of that wider integrationist agenda sweeping much of the West. The document represents a fundamental shift from an emphasis on multiculturalism, diversity, and individual rights based on diversity claims to integration and the adoption of a common set of core Canadian values that aims to promote greater social cohesion and prevent a potential breakdown in social order. Since the early 1980s, Canadian citizenship and Canada as a distinctive nation has been articulated in its particular rights tradition that recognizes linguistic and cultural rights within the framework of a civic nationalist policy. Multiculturalism and diversity-based rights have been essential elements in that national narrative, but critics of this approach have argued that the promotion of diversity often creates a set of cultural values that are not consistent with the essential values of western liberal democracies. Allan Gregg, one of Canada’s leading pollsters and political commentators, has described how multiculturalism went from a 20<sup>th</sup> century Canadian dream to a 21<sup>st</sup> century conundrum (Gregg 2006). While the integrationist approach adopted in Canada’s new citizenship study guide does not reject multiculturalism and diversity, it rests on the assumptions and philosophy that Canadian society – like societies everywhere – conceives of itself in a

particular manner and promotes a greater commitment to a common set of core values rooted in Canada's history and heritage.<sup>17</sup> This new attempt at nation-building strives to recapture Canada's historical traditions and symbols of collective national identity and to impose them on a diverse population in the hopes of creating a sense of shared Canadian citizenship. The new agenda is not restrictive as it does not attempt to construct a religious, cultural or ethnically defined national identity or a common culture but it might be seen as part of what Dina Kiwan has described as "a renationalization trend" which provides a "set of measures to promote the integration of newcomers and develop an inclusive understanding of national citizenship" (Kiwan 2005). The Conservative government of Stephen Harper embraces diversity and has aggressively courted Canada's ethnic and immigrant communities but, at the same time, it has attempted to construct a sense of belonging and attachment – a shared citizenship – even as it recognizes and embraces many distinct and diverse cultures and identities. Such an approach, which might be described as an inheritance of 19<sup>th</sup> century European nationalism, raises fundamental questions in a liberal state such as Canada that has celebrated what Charles Taylor has called the "politics of recognition" for more than a generation. Canada's new citizenship study guide contends that socio-political, cultural and economic advances and social harmony and cohesion can be best achieved when all citizens share a set of social norms and ideals.

Governments in Canada have long been concerned with how to achieve social harmony and cohesion among its diverse and multiethnic foundations. Initially, the state had hoped to eliminate diversity, particularly through state-funded public schools, and in 1940 the federal government created the Nationalities Branch in the Department of

National War Services to deal with a perceived crisis in citizenship. By 1946, with the first Canadian Citizenship Act, the Citizenship Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State regularly produced a series of materials designed to introduce immigrants to their new home. These publications included guides to the legal process of obtaining citizenship as well as booklets on the history, geography, politics and economy of Canada. In 1954-55 alone the Branch distributed over a million copies of its publications to volunteer organizations working with immigrants across Canada (Sears 1997). The first edition of the current citizenship study guide was prepared in 1977. It was extensively revised in 1995 when it became a formal 47-page citizenship study guide for prospective citizens who had to pass a written test (itself a means to tie citizenship to a shared national identity) to become a Canadian citizen.

*A Look at Canada*, used from 1995 to early 2010, identified four essential elements of Canada: official languages; multiculturalism; volunteerism; and sustainable development. It encouraged new citizens to become involved in their community, noting that Canadians had a long history of working together and helping each other through volunteerism. It referred specifically to the *Multiculturalism Act* and encouraged new citizens to maintain and share their cultural heritage, even though it pointed out that Canada had only two official languages. One of the most prominent features of Canadian citizenship, it suggested, was protecting the environment and pursuing sustainable development. It called upon citizens to compost, recycle, plant trees, and to be environmentally friendly by conserving energy and water and “by turning off lights and taps when they are not being used.” Most subjects addressed in the guide, such as Canada’s history and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, were given two pages.

Although the 1995 edition of Canada's study guide was widely criticized, there could be no doubt about its underlying theme. Revised under the Liberal government of Jean Chrétien, the 1995 study guide reflected the small-l liberal philosophy of civic nationalism that has provided the underpinnings of the Canadian nation-state for more than a generation.<sup>18</sup> The philosophy defined Canada as a civic nation that embraced the liberal ideals of multiculturalism, diversity, and individual rights, and it was part of the construction of a particular notion of Canadian citizenship that recognized, celebrated and promoted a multicultural and diverse Canada – a notion that was embraced as a progressive and enlightened development. There was little space in that philosophy for Canada's history and traditions; Canada was unique, small-l liberals argued, not because of its history and traditions, but because it had embraced under Pierre Trudeau the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which had ushered in a rights revolution where individual rights became the normative standard of a progressive, unified, and modern -- even postmodern -- Canada. In the view of Michael Ignatieff, one of the major public intellectuals who had written widely about the rights revolution, and political philosophers Will Kymlicka and Charles Taylor, rights were the basis of a civic nation and the provision of rights to all citizens was the one sure way for Canada to avoid the ethnic conflicts that have marred states such as Yugoslavia and Ireland. Kymlicka and Norman have noted emphatically that in Canada citizenship has been defined "almost entirely in terms of possession of rights" (Kymlicka and Norman 1994).

The Canadian nation-state has been re-constructed since the 1960s from one based on two ethnicities – French and English -- to a multinational and diverse community that shares and embraces the ideals of a liberal political order. The old nationalism based on

two dominant cultures was inevitably divisive and had led not only to the fragmentation of Canada but also to its possible disintegration into at least two separate entities (Nurse 2009: 31). Canada promoted civic nationalism where there was no single or dual ethnicity, only citizens who were bound together by their collective belief in the equality of all citizens through a set of shared rights (Ignatieff 1993: p. 6). New Canadians – and, indeed, all Canadians -- had to think about themselves, first and foremost, as rights-bearers, not as French, English or Aboriginal citizens of a national community. Recognizing cultural differences became a matter of rights.

With the emphasis on civic nationalism, individualism was given “agency” in the words of Michael Ignatieff. It was incumbent upon the state not only to protect the individual from policies imposed by a democratically elected, majoritarian government, but also to give agency to citizens which “means [they have] the ability as individuals to become self-actualizing – that is, the ability as individuals to define their own identity, aspirations, and activities for themselves, rather than having them imposed on them” (Nurse 1999: 32) This philosophy is reflected in the policy of official multiculturalism which promotes the notion of personal autonomy based on one’s cultural rights and it encourages the preservation of one’s cultural heritage; each individual looks out for her own interests alone. When this happens, the state loses its immediacy in the society as citizens carve out their own space as individuals and culture becomes an individual matter. The state then becomes important primarily for the protection of individual rights, and citizens look to the state to protect and facilitate these rights. The state does not wish to promote one culture or set of values over any other, and it privileges culture as a means of democratic participation. This type of rights philosophy created a new form of citizenship

and attachment to the nation-state as rights become the basis of the political community (Nurse 2009: 33-34). And, for scholars such as Ignatieff, Canada had emerged as a model state because it had been able to reconcile individual rights while promoting and embracing a multiethnic, multinational, and multilingual state. Ignatieff wrote in his *The Rights Revolution* that Canada's "rights culture is the core of our national identity as a people."<sup>19</sup>

For a generation or more, liberal individualism, civic nationalism, and the promotion of diversity in the pursuit of multiculturalism have been celebrated as the Canadian ideals.<sup>20</sup> Few can argue with the basic tenants of any philosophy that includes respect for diversity, basic equality rights, official bilingualism, equality of opportunity and other fundamental rights that all citizens cherish. Yet, many commentators regarded this guiding national philosophy as the end – nirvana had been reached -- rather than as the beginning of a new discourse about Canada and the national narrative. With official multiculturalism and the celebration of diversity-based rights, Canadians were often told that Canadian diversity was no longer a problem that had to be managed but a strength that made their country an example to the world. Even so, not all Canadians agreed with the new national narrative. Much of Quebec continued to insist that Canada is neither a collection of individuals nor a multicultural nation; it is two nations: one Francophone and the other Anglophone. Aboriginal and First Nation's peoples have not had their grievances neither recognized nor settled under the new paradigm. Some Canadians have insisted the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which brought in its train judicial activism and special rights for certain groups have served to undermine Canadian democracy.<sup>21</sup> Others have lamented that the new notions of citizenship have ignored Canada's traditions and its

history (Nurse 2009). One of the most pressing criticisms of the right's revolution is that it has failed to eliminate the social and political fragmentation within the country and construct what might be called a national community or a stronger sense of belonging to the nation. The political right has been particularly critical in this regard as it laments the breakdown of social cohesion and the weakening of traditional values: it sees the Canadian state in perpetual crisis divided by a collection of rival rights groups (gays versus straights, aboriginal people versus non-aboriginals, French-speakers versus English-speakers, immigrants versus native-born, rural versus urban) accentuated by the rejection of traditions and national history and a government that has failed to defend traditional institutions and values that they believe are necessary to provide stability and create a national community.<sup>22</sup> The focus on rights, some have argued, have lead to a clear imbalance between rights and responsibilities with a resultant "civic deficit" characterized by disputes by particular groups to defend their particular interests and by a lack of knowledge of democratic values, of civic responsibility, and of the responsibilities of citizenship.<sup>23</sup>

When Stephen Harper and the Conservative Party formed the government of Canada in 2006, they embraced the global trend in citizenship education and began a re-articulation of the Canadian national narrative. For more than a decade, some in Canada had been worried about the fragmentation of Canada and called for a greater emphasis in citizenship education on common Canadian values and "the values that unite us rather than divide us."<sup>24</sup> Even the fiscal crisis and two minority governments have not deterred Harper from sketching in outline form what kind of Canada he envisions, a process he continued after he won his first majority government in May 2011. He realizes that not all Canadians

share his small-c conservative philosophy that emphasizes lower taxes, prudent spending and fiscal responsibility, a commitment to free enterprise, free markets and free trade, and a law-and-order agenda, but he believes that he shares with Canadians a vision of establishing a national purpose for Canada. He wants to be transformative by asserting Canadian sovereignty, independence and confidence abroad and a sense of pan-Canadian citizenship at home loosely based on conservative values of loyalty, duty, tradition, social stability which are necessary for the preservation of individual rights and liberties and for the promotion of equity and justice. For him, Canadian nationalism and citizenship are also ways to unite Canadians.

There are several aspects to Harper's national vision. One of the most important is a strong military and a forceful foreign policy; under Harper there has been a change in emphasis in foreign policy away from economic and human security issues to defence, sovereignty and national security (Bratt 2007). Canadians are encouraged to be proud of its military and proud of their contribution in Afghanistan where Canadian troops were engaged from 2001 to 2011. Another aspect is an unwavering commitment to asserting our sovereignty over the Arctic, a pledge re-affirmed in the June 2011 Speech from the Throne, where the government reiterated that Canada's North was "a cornerstone to its agenda." Harper also values and promotes the ethnic diversity and pluralism of Canada, but he insists immigration has always been essential to the national narrative and accommodating diversity has been central to Canada's history. Historically, newcomers have bonded together in a common quest for prosperity, freedom, democracy, human rights, rule of law, and opportunity. Each cultural community must, he maintains, "flourish in the mainstream of Canadian life" and only then is the full enjoyment of citizenship and

the building of a stronger, united Canada possible. Each individual must be first and foremost a citizen of Canada. Harper speaks frequently of a “common purpose” that comes from shared values of tolerance, compassion, community service and a devotion to pluralism – the essential ingredient for harmony in a modern, interconnected world.<sup>25</sup>

Patriotism is another important aspect of his national vision. In his address to the British Columbia legislature just prior to the Olympic Games in Vancouver in February 2010 he told Canadians that “patriotism should not make us feel the least bit shy or embarrassed ... [rather] Canada is worthy of our pride and our patriotism.”<sup>26</sup>

History is important to Harper’s vision. He believes that Canadians must know and appreciate their rich history. Moreover, history is instructive: through it, we can discover a better way to build the country. He has remarked on numerous occasions how important it is to recognize the historic wrongs done by Canada and its governments, such as the Chinese Head Tax which was imposed from 1885 to 1923, and the treatment of Aboriginal children in residential schools. He has repeatedly said “One of our greatest strengths as Canadians is that we learn from history, we are not enslaved by it.”<sup>27</sup> We must be “history’s benefactors instead of its prisoners.” Similarly, he maintains that symbols and institutions are equally important to Canada. He has emphasized the monarchy and the Queen as sovereign. He sees the Crown as one of the most enduring symbols of Canada’s unique identity, noting that it can be traced to both early French and British rule in North America. It was under the Crown that Canada emerged as one of the most prosperous and peaceful countries in the world.<sup>28</sup>

The Conservative government’s national vision is reflected in Canada’s new 62-page study guide released in November 2009. Rather than locating Canadian dynamism in

individualism, diversity, individual rights and multiculturalism, it attempts to find it in Canada's history and heritage and a set of core Canadian values for all citizens. The study guide presents a new way to narrate the Canadian experience. Jason Kenney, the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism and responsible for the new guide, commented on its release that "I think there's a growing sense that we need to have a deeper, thicker sense of our common citizenship and where we come from as Canadians."<sup>29</sup> Knowing Canada's history and heritage is not only relevant to citizenship, it is absolutely necessary. Moreover, it is understood, too, that when an immigrant becomes a citizen, Canada's history becomes her history, including both the positive and the controversial elements.<sup>30</sup> In other words, Canada's history and heritage, its liberal values and its symbols, and its important national institutions, such as Parliament and the Crown, are all essential for Canadian citizenship. As Kenny also noted, "There's a growing consensus that we need to recover a sense of civic memory, civic literacy about our democratic institutions and the history in which they are rooted."<sup>31</sup> Some would argue that Kenny and the Conservative Harper government are driven by the quest to create greater social cohesion in Canada which, in itself is rooted in a neoliberal philosophy that ignores inequalities and societal divisions based on race, class and gender.<sup>32</sup>

Not surprisingly, then, the new citizenship guide begins with a bold, confident statement that Canada is a product of its history and a strong identity based on liberal-democratic values. Canadians are described as strong and free, proud of their unique identity; they are a nation that believes in ordered liberty, enterprise, hard work, and fair play and they have made sacrifices to defend their way of life.<sup>33</sup> History serves as a "sturdy foundation on which Canadian society has been built,"<sup>34</sup> and it encourages

newcomers to “learn about Canada’s history, symbols, democratic institutions, geography, voting procedures, and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship” and to help “write the continuing story of Canada.”<sup>35</sup> Throughout the new study guide, it is understood that newcomers are expected to integrate into mainstream Canadian society; an important element of that integration comes from having a common basis of knowledge about Canadian symbols, values, history and institutions. One could argue that the basic goals of the new citizenship guide aligns with the new global consensus about citizenship education which Sears and Hughes contend is to create citizens “who are knowledgeable about contemporary society and the issues its faces: disposed to work towards the common good; supportive of pluralism; and [committed] to making their communities, nation and the world a better place” (Sears & Hughes 1996). It is important, in other words, for newcomers and other citizens to participate in the wider community and to develop a sense of attachment to the Canadian community. The goal is to achieve this without a return to the assimilationist past.

The “Rights and Responsibilities of Citizens” is the first item of substance in the new citizenship guide; it was placed at the end of the 1995 version. History and shared values are emphasized in this section. Prospective citizens are told that they have rights and responsibilities that “come from our history and reflect shared traditions, identity and values.” The Canadian legal system is derived from the country’s history, notably the common law of Great Britain and the civil code of France, the homeland of two of the founding peoples. Canada’s constitution is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law. The new study guide emphasizes the importance of religious traditions to Canadian society and the dignity and worth of the human person.<sup>36</sup>

The study guide outlines two important responsibilities for citizens: one, defending Canada and, two, accepting the equality of all citizens. Unlike the earlier citizenship guide which emphasized volunteerism and stewardship of the environment, the new version emphasizes the importance of defending Canada, even noting that military service is a good career choice as well as “a noble way to contribute to Canada.” It acknowledges the women and men who have sacrificed their lives in defence of the country. At the same time, it emphasized the fundamental equality under the law of women and men. While it praises Canada’s openness and tolerance, it reminds new citizens that “Canada’s openness and generosity do not extend to barbaric cultural practices that tolerate spousal abuse, “honour killings”, female genital mutilation or other gender-based violence. Those guilty of such crimes are severely punished under Canada’s criminal laws.”<sup>37</sup>

The largest section in the new citizenship guide is devoted to the history of Canada: 14 pages compared to two in the previous edition. The history section develops the theme that Canada has historically been a nation of newcomers; it rejects the notion promoted in the 1995 edition of the study guide that Canada’s multicultural and diverse population was a new and progressive dimension of Canada that had its origins in the 1970s. The new study guide creates a national narrative that see Canada’s historic communities as multicultural and diverse as well as more recent arrivals. It emphasized that all Canadians were newcomers at some point, even Canada’s Aboriginal peoples which is a significant departure from the 1995 edition which described Aboriginal Canadians as emerging in North America. The new study guides claims that Canada began with the migration of Aboriginal peoples in prehistoric times. Successive waves of immigrants, including the French, English, Irish, Ukrainian and settlers of other ethnic origins, made Canada a

pluralistic society long before the policy of official multiculturalism was introduced in 1971. French and English-speaking “Christian civilizations” were brought to Canada from Europe, and both groups flourished. The Quebecois nation in Quebec and English-speaking Canadians constitutes distinct groups that also include British, Welsh, Scottish, and Irish immigrants. It notes, too, that many other ethnic and religious groups have come to Canada over the past 200 years to live in the country but they do so as “proud Canadians.”<sup>38</sup> Immigration, diversity, and accommodation have, therefore, been essential aspects of the historical development of Canada and the national narrative. They have not limited prosperity but, in fact, contributed to the nation’s growth and development. Canada’s history has been one of a shared political identity that has recognized diversity as an important historical feature and considers it an asset for the future.

Multiculturalism and diversity, therefore, are presented as having a long history in Canada. They are also presented as unity in diversity, a concept that harkens back to at least the 1860s. George Etienne Cartier, the leading Quebec proponent of Confederation, declared that the strength of Canada came from its diversity. “In our own federation,” he said, “we should have Catholics and Protestant, French, English, Irish and Scotch, and each by his efforts and his success would increase the prosperity and glory of the new confederacy.”<sup>39</sup> The new guide also quotes Lord Tweedsmuir, governor-general of Canada from 1935 to 1940, who said immigrant groups “should retain their individuality and each make its contribution to the national character.” The emphasis, of course, is on the national character. All ethnic and religious groups make up a multicultural society but they share a common Canadian identity. The new citizenship guide does not repudiate

multiculturalism; rather, it attempts to establish diversity within the context of the country's common values.<sup>40</sup>

History also shows how the processes of accommodation and negotiation have marked Canada's development. The study guide presents the *Quebec Act of 1774*, for example, as an early example of recognizing and accommodating the differences in Canada's early pluralistic beginnings. It notes that Catholic and French-speaking citizens in Quebec were accommodated following the British Conquest when they were granted religious freedoms, including the right to hold political office -- a right denied Catholics in England. The history section also shows what happens when accommodation is dismissed. Lord Durham, who was sent to Canada as governor-general following the Rebellions of 1837-38 to report on the armed uprisings, recommended that French be extinguished in North America, but in doing so he "showed a complete lack of understanding of French Canadians, who sought to uphold the distinct identity of French Canada." Similarly, when Canada extended its boundaries westward to include Rupert's Land, there was no consultation with the Métis. The result was two rebellions in Western Canada. The study guide also acknowledges the Quiet Revolution and the two sovereignty referenda in Quebec and describes them as "part of the dynamic that continues to shape" Canada.

The history of contemporary Canada emphasizes the emergence of a progressive, prosperous, and independent nation that played a role on the international stage. Canada emerged as a sovereign and independent nation gradually, but played an important role in defending democracy and freedom around the world as it prospered at home. This section also celebrates the accomplishments of Canadians in the world of culture and technology. It also applauds Canada as a "flexible and open society" that believes in the equality of

men and women, and praises a series of social welfare measure that expanded social assistance programs, health care, unemployment insurance, and pensions and undid some of the wrongs of the previous generations, such as withholding the vote from Japanese-Canadians and Aboriginal peoples.

As a progressive and modern nation, Canada also confronted the darker periods of its history. One of the most notorious was the Indian residential schools which attempted to assimilate Aboriginal and First Nations children by placing them in government-sponsored schools where many of the children became the victims of physical and sexual abuse. The Government of Canada offered a formal apology in 2008 for its role in the abuse at the schools. It also apologized to Canadians of Chinese origin for the Head Tax placed on Chinese immigrants and to Japanese Canadians for their treatment during the Second World War. The Conservative government, as was noted above, believes that Canadians must learn from history and recognizing the past mistakes makes a stronger, more cohesive nation. Yet, this section makes it clear that the prosperity and diversity of Canada depends on all citizens working together to face challenges of the future. It informs new Canadians that by becoming a citizen they must make a contribution through “active participation” in the country.<sup>41</sup>

Newcomers are also told that Canadian symbols and institutions are important. In the previous edition, the discussion of Canada’s symbols was included within the two-page history section, but in the 2010 study guide they are given a separate section that runs to some four pages. The Canadian Armed Forces are presented as one of our few authentically national symbols and institutions and placed at the centre of Canadian identity. There is no attempt to present Canada as a nation of peacekeepers; rather, new

citizens are reminded that more than 110,000 Canadians have died in military service since 1914. When the guide introduces the Parliament Buildings with its Gothic Revival architecture as an important national symbol, it emphasizes the Peace Tower, which was completed in 1927 as a memorial to Canada's dead in the First World War. It also contains the Books of Remembrance that holds the names of all military personnel who have died serving Canada. The Order of Canada, Canada's highest civilian award received passing mention, but the Victoria Cross receives greater praise and is described as "the highest honour available to Canadians." The guide also notes that during the First World War Canadians fought valiantly and proudly as "part of the British Empire", adding the war "strengthened both national and imperial pride, particularly in English Canada."<sup>42</sup>

A number of traditional symbols are highlighted in the new citizenship guide, reinforcing the notion that traditions and heritage are important to Canada's identity. There are several references to Canada as a Christian society. It contends that the great majority of Canadians identify as Christians, and that, historically, faith communities have provided, in partnership with government, social welfare services and have contributed to harmony and mutual respect amongst Canada's citizenry. It is worth noting, too, that Prime Minister Harper ends many of his speeches with "God Bless Canada." The guide resurrects the word "Dominion", noting that poets and songwriters have hailed Canada as Great Dominion, even though the word has fallen into disuse. Dominion Day, the national holiday celebrating the birth of Canada, is mentioned even though it was changed to Canada Day in 1982.

The new citizenship guide also contains an expanded section on the Government of Canada. It describes Canada as a federal state and a parliamentary democracy, but it also

devotes considerable space to explaining Canada as a constitutional monarchy. The concept of Sovereign is emphasized, which is another departure from the previous guide. It explains the difference between the head of state – the Sovereign – and the head of government – the prime minister, who actually governs the country. The governor general, it is pointed out, represents the Sovereign in Canada and not only acts on the advice of the prime minister but is appointed by the Sovereign on the advice of the prime minister. There is little doubt that the prime minister is in charge, but the study guide acknowledges Canada’s connection to the Crown.

The reaction to the new citizenship study guide has been mixed. Some of its ardent supporters include a group of 26 distinguished academics, artists, and public intellectuals who were consulted on the final drafting of the document. The panel was canvassed individually for input and never met as a group, but the Canadian Press, using the *Access to Information Act*, found that many of the panel’s revisions were driven by “the politics of language, religion and ethnicity.” For instance, an original draft of the guide said that all of the Indian residential schools were run by churches, but, in fact, only some of them were. In the final draft all references to churches in this regard were dropped and responsibility for the abuse of Aboriginal children was left with the federal government. Similarly, some members of the panel opposed the inclusion of Julie Payette as the only Canadian astronaut in the first draft; in the final version, no names were given, not even Payette’s. The panel also noted the absence of 3,000 Black British who fled to Canada with the United Empire Loyalists following the American Revolution, and this fact was included in the final draft.<sup>43</sup>

Those that were consulted are not partisan Conservatives, but many of them, such as J.L. Granatstein, professor emeritus of history at York University and former director and CEO of the Canadian War Museum, and Rudyard Griffiths, the founder of the Dominion Institute, had long complained about the lack of Canadian history in the public school system and how its absence from the curriculum has weakened citizenship engagement and national unity in Canada.<sup>44</sup> They – and others -- have subsequently praised the citizenship guide for providing more historical context for the evolution and development of Canada than there was in previous editions. An editorial in the *Globe and Mail* agreed, praising the new citizenship study guide for fostering a greater sense of attachment to Canada.<sup>45</sup>

Much of the criticism of the study guide has focused on two areas: first, what it omitted and, second, what some critics are calling its conservative ideology. The guide makes little note of Canada's peacekeeping history and its role in crafting the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.<sup>46</sup> There is no mention of Alexander Mackenzie, the first European to cross the continent nor of the divisive conscription crises in the two world wars. It ignores several Liberal prime ministers that played prominent roles in Canada's history, such as Pierre Trudeau for his role in repatriating the Constitution in 1982, Lester Pearson for the adoption of the Canadian flag, and Mackenzie King as Canada's longest serving prime minister. Conservative politicians, such as Sir John A. Macdonald, George-Etienne Cartier and Robert Borden, however, are mentioned.<sup>47</sup> Some have complained that there are too many pictures of the rural and northern Canada and not enough of cities where most Canadians live. Similarly, others have said that to treat Ontario and Quebec as simply one of the five regions of Canada misrepresents the current

reality of the country. The New Democratic Party complained that more UNESCO World Heritage sites did not get greater attention, and the Bloc Québécois complained that Quebec did not receive enough special attention as a founding nation of Canada and was treated simply as a province just like the others.

The second criticism is that the citizenship guide demonstrates clear conservative leanings by emphasizing the military, the royal family, the word “dominion”, heroes and hockey at the expense of the culture and the environment and some of Canada’s better know artists. Historian Margaret Conrad reflected this view when she described the emphasis of the new study guide as a “kind of throwback to the 1950s ... a tough, manly country with military and sports heroes that are all men.” She said the new guide “represents a new kind of Canada, one that is less sympathetic with my personal sense of a progressive, forward-looking nation, but the new slant is no doubt in keeping with the sentiments of the current administration in Ottawa.” She expressed surprise that the environment, given two pages in the previous guide, disappeared in the new document. The emphasis on the Queen and the Canadian Forces also struck her as unusual.<sup>48</sup> Others have criticized that the new citizenship study guide for emphasizing Canada as a ‘constitutional monarchy’ when public opinion surveys show that support for the monarchy is at its lowest levels ever and a majority of Canadians believed that Canada should sever its ties to the Royal Family after the death of Queen Elizabeth.<sup>49</sup> To those critics, the guide is an ideological reconstruction of an earlier Canada that ignores the changes that have occurred in recent years that have remade Canada as a progressive forward-looking society. One columnist described the document as an “incremental step in

the re-branding of Canada into a conservative country, full of people more inclined to vote Conservative.”<sup>50</sup>

The controversy generated by the omission of most references to gay rights and homosexuality are used to support such claims. An early draft of the guide contained sections citing milestones in gay rights, including the decriminalization of homosexuality in 1969, the Charter’s prevention of discrimination based on sexual orientation, and the same-sex marriage law of 2005, but they were removed in the minister’s office. Neil Yeates, the deputy minister of citizenship, immigration and multiculturalism, recommended in early August 2009 that Mr. Kenney, who fought same-sex marriage when it was debated in Parliament, that “text boxes [in the guide] related to ... the decriminalization of homosexual sex/recognition of same-sex marriage” be re-inserted, but they were not. The reaction to the omission was quick and harsh. Liberal MP Scott Brison, one of the few gay politicians in the House of Commons, describes the Canadian citizenship guide “Conservative revisionist history of Canada”. The removal of most references to the topic of homosexuality and absence of any discussion of divorce and abortion serves to confirm for many that the citizenship guide is an ideological document.<sup>51</sup>

### **Conclusion: History, Identity and Citizenship**

Canada’s new citizenship study guide represents a new approach to citizenship. It is a shift from the promotion and celebration of diversity and identity politics to the integration of newcomers into Canadian society. As is the case in many Western democracies where there has been a move from a policy of multiculturalism (which implied some small measure of accommodation on the part of the recipient community) to

one of integration. The document responds to a growing concern in Canada about the lack of a common bond of citizenship, the weakening or absence of a national community, and the failure of newcomers to develop an attachment to the nation-state. *Discover Canada*, the new citizenship study guide, places less emphasis on multiculturalism rhetoric and the maintenance of immigrant culture and diversity; the emphasis is on a sense of belonging to Canada and the adherence to a set of shared Canadian values. Canadian citizenship has moved to the forefront and although Canada remains a multi-cultural nation, shaped by diverse peoples, multiculturalism has become a description of Canada's diversity rather than a set of state policies. The citizenship guide requires immigrants to acquire knowledge of their responsibilities as well as their rights as citizens and embrace a shared citizenship. As such, the guide represents what researchers are calling "integrative multiculturalism" which is a radical departure from the earlier goals of multiculturalism that celebrated and encouraged differences (Fleras 2001). Clearly, different historical times have resulted in a new emphasis in Canada's citizenship study guide, but whether this particular policy approach achieves the right balance will remain a matter of debate.

There is nothing particularly Canadian about the values being articulated in the citizenship study guide; they are the fundamental tenants of all liberal societies and the new notion is that they cannot be violated in the name of diversity.<sup>52</sup> The guide encourages newcomers to believe that Canada's values emerged because of its peculiar historical development and heritage. These values transcend the national territory and they prepare citizens to embrace human values such as respect for differences and the acceptance of others. Yet, newcomers are asked in the new citizenship study guide to learn about more than a national polity with a legislative and judicial system that promotes social justice and

equality and allows all citizens to participate equally in society; they are asked to learn about a particular “imagined community” of Canada. However, history is never neutral, and in most national stories, citizens are rarely gendered and ethnic and cultural diversity is usually portrayed as something new and a challenge to be managed. Canada’s new citizenship study guide clearly offers a particular view of Canada and its history. It uses the past to show how Canadians have worked together despite their diverse origins to build a strong, prosperous and free nation. This version of history provides an historical foundation for Canada’s newfound sense of confidence, both at home and abroad, and it encourages not just attachment to Canada but national pride and patriotism. This citizenship guide is another political document that represents a significant break with the past and because of that it will remain contested terrain even if it goes quite some distance to instill core Canadian values in its newest citizens and encourages newcomers to identify with Canadian values and Canada in general as Ujjal Dosanjh has suggested must happen. Under the new dynamism articulated by the Harper government and the new citizenship study guide, newcomer integration will be defined in their loyal to and identification of Canadian values and norms.

---

#### References

- Banks, J.A., 2004, “Democratic Citizenship Education in Multicultural Societies,” in J.A. Banks, ed., *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass), 3-16.
- Bratt, Duane, 2007, “Mr. Harper Goes to War: Canada, Afghanistan, and the Return of “High Politics” in Canadian Foreign Policy,” Canadian Political Science Association Annual Conference: University of Saskatchewan, 31 May, [\[www.cpsa-acsp.ca\]](http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca).

---

Dimitrov, Georgi, and Pepka Boyadieva (2009) Citizenship education as an instrument for strengthening the state's supremacy: An apparent paradox? *Citizenship Studies*, 13 (2), pp. 153-169.

Fleras, A. and Jean Kunz, 2001, *Media and Minorities: Representing Diversity in a Multicultural Canada* (Toronto: Thompson Education Publishing).

Gregg, Allan, 2006, "Multiculturalism: A Twentieth-Century Dream became a Twenty-First Century conundrum," *The Walrus*, March.

Hughes, A.S. and A. Sears, 2008, "The Struggle for Citizenship Education in Canada: The Centre Cannot Hold," in J. Arthur, I. Davies, and C. Hahn, eds., *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy* (London: Sage).

Huntington, Samuel, 1993, "The Clash of Civilizations," *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3): 22-49

Jakubowicz, Andrew, 2005, "Multiculturalism in Australia: Apogee or Nadir?," *Canadian Diversity Canadienne* volume 4:1 (Winter), 17-18.

Ignatieff, Michael, 1993, *Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism* (Toronto: Penguin).

Jedwab, Jack, 2005, "Neither Finding Nor Losing our Way," *Canadian Diversity Canadienne* vol. 4:1 (Winter), 94-97.

Kiwan, Dina, 2005, "Human Rights and Citizenship: An Unjustifiable Conflation?" *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 39 (1), 37-50.

Kunz, Jean Lock and Stuart Skyes, 2007, *From Mosaic to Harmony: Multicultural Canada in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. (Ottawa: Policy Research Institute).

Kymlicka, Will, 2003, *Canadian Diversity Canadienne* volume 2:1 (Spring).

Kymlicka, Will and W. Norman, 1994, "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory," *Ethics* 104 (2) (1994), 352-81.

Nurse, Andrew, 2009, "A Necessary Precondition: Michael Ignatieff and the Dilemmas of Civic Nationalism," in Andrew Nurse and Raymond Blake, eds, *Beyond National Dreams: Essays on Canadian Citizenship and Nationalism* (Toronto: Fitzhenry Whiteside), 31.

Piattoeva, Nelli, 2010, "Perceptions of the Past and Education of Future Citizens in Contemporary Russia," in *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen. Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education*. eds., Alan Reid, Judith Gill, and Alan Sears (London: Routledge), pp. 128-142.

---

Sears, A., 1997, "Instruments of Policy: How the Federal State Influences Citizenship Education in Canada," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 29 (2), 1-21.

Sears, Alan and Andrew S. Hughes, 1996, "Citizenship education and current educational reform," *Canadian Journal of Education* 21 (2), 123-142.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> "RCMP investigates 'very serious' threats against Ujjal Dosanjh," *Globe and Mail*, April 23, 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Jane Armstrong, "Distorted' multiculturalism to blame for rise in Sikh extremism", *Globe and Mail*, April 21, 2010

<sup>3</sup> Martin Patriquin, "Canada: A nation of bigots?" *Macleans*, October 22, 2007

<sup>4</sup> *Globe and Mail*, Editorial, 8 October 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Will Kymlicka, "Marketing Canadian Pluralism in the International Arena," *International Journal* 59 (4) (Autumn 2004): 843-44; and Andrew Parkin and Matthew Mendelsohn, *A New Canada: An Identity Shaped by Diversity*. Montreal: Centre for Research and Information on Canada. CRIC Paper # 11. October 2003

<sup>6</sup> An Environics poll in 2006 found that 65 percent of Canadians agreed with the statement "Too many immigrants do not adopt Canadian values." See, Michael Adams, "John Tory: Well beyond the Bland," *Globe and Mail*, September 17, 2007

<sup>7</sup> Gérard Bouchard and Charles Taylor, *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation*. Final Report. Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences, 2008

<sup>8</sup> See, Will Kymlicka, *Finding our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada* (Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 1998) and Will Kymlicka, "The Uncertainty Futures of Multiculturalism," *Canadian Diversity Canadienne* volume 4:1 (winter 2005): 82-85

<sup>9</sup> Christian Joppke, "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy," *The British Journal of Sociology* vol. 55 2 (2004): 237-258. For the Canadian literature, see Reginald Bibby, *Mosaic Madness: Pluralism without a Cause* (1990); Neil Bissoondath, *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism* (1994); and Rudyard Griffiths, *Who We Are: A Citizen's Manifesto* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 2009). For a general review of this literature, see Lloyd Wong. "Multiculturalism and Ethnic

---

Pluralism in Sociology: An Analysis of the Fragmentation Position Discourse." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 40.1 (2008): 11-32.

<sup>10</sup> Keith Banting, Thomas J. Courchene and F. Leslie Seidle, eds., *Belonging? Diversity, Recognition and Shared Citizenship in Canada* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007), see especially the conclusion to the book.

<sup>11</sup> "Angela Merkel: German multiculturalism has 'utterly failed'", guardian.co.uk, 17 October 2010.

<http://tinyurl.com/2vbm79n>.

<sup>12</sup> D. Jacobs and A. Rae, "The End of the National Models? Integration Courses and Citizen Trajectories in Europe," *International Journal of Multicultural Studies* vol. 9 no. 2 2007: 264-83; quote is taken from Jeroen Doomernik, "The State of Multiculturalism in the Netherlands," *Canadian Diversity Canadienne* volume 4:1 (winter 2005): 35

<sup>13</sup> "Britain 'Sleepwalking to segregation,'" guardian.co.uk, 19 September 2005

<sup>14</sup> "Cameron: My War on Multiculturalism," *The Independent*, 5 February 2011.

<http://tinyurl.com/6dbk3yz>

<sup>15</sup> On this point, see Kerry Kennedy, "Neo-Statism and Post-Globalisation as Contexts for New Times," in Alan Reid, Judith Gill, and Alan Sears, eds., *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen. Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education* (London: Routledge, 2010):222-229

<sup>16</sup> Reva Joshee and Tracey Derwing, "The Making of Citizenship Education for Adult Immigrants in Canada," *Journal of International Migration and Integration* vol. 6 no. 1 (winter 2005): 61-80; Ricky Van Oers, "From Liberal to Restrictive Citizenship Policies: The Case of the Netherlands," *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 2008 10 (1): 41-42; and Alan Sears, "Possibilities and Problems: Citizenship Education in a Multinational State: The Case of Canada," in Alan Reid, Judith Gill, and Alan Sears, eds., *Globalization, the Nation-State and the Citizen. Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education* (London: Routledge, 2010):191-208

<sup>17</sup> The Danish government increased the level of knowledge of Danish history, culture and heritage in its guide for immigrants and in 1989, the Australian government began to reclaim some of its British heritage as a way to define Australian values. (See, *National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*, Government of Australia, 1989).

---

<sup>18</sup> See, John Ralston Saul, *Reflections of a Siamese Twin: Canada at the End of the Twentieth Century* (Toronto: Viking, 1995) and *A Fair Country: Telling Truths about Canada* (Toronto: Viking Canada, 2008); Charles Taylor, *Reconciling Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Nationalism and Federalism* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993) and *The Malaise of Modernity* (Concord, ON: Anansi, 1991); Will Kymlicka, *Finding our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*, 1998); Michael Ignatieff, *Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism* (Toronto: Penguin, 1993) and *The Rights Revolution* (Concord, ON: Anansi, 2000); Joseph Heath, *The Efficient Society: Why Canada Is as Close to Utopia as It Gets* (Toronto: Penguin, 2002); and Ian Angus, *Identity and Justice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008

<sup>19</sup> Ignatieff, *The Rights Revolution*.

<sup>20</sup> In 1988, Canada implemented the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* which commits the Government of Canada to facilitating the full participation of all Canadians regardless of race or ethnicity into all aspects of Canadian society. The *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, introduced in 2002, emphasized the importance of what has become known as the "two-way street" approach to integrating immigrants and refugees in Canada. This approach means that while Canada accepts and promotes a diverse population, newcomers are expected to adapt to Canada and to Canadian norms. See, John Biles, et al., "Does Canada have a Multicultural Future," *Canadian Diversity Canadienne* volume 4:1 (winter 2005): 23

<sup>21</sup> Rainer Knopff and F.L. Morton, *The Charter Revolution and the Court Party* (Peterborough: Broadview, 2000); and William Gairdner, *The Trouble with Canada* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1990)

<sup>22</sup> Nurse, "A Necessary Precondition," 46, and Ignatieff, *The Rights Revolution*, 6; also quoted in Nurse, 38. Ignatieff was not worried about what at times must seem to the majority of Canadians a nation in perpetual political crisis. Conflict and political instability is the price for democracy, he wrote: "Who says democracy must run smooth?" he asks. "Democracy is rough and tumble; conflict is built into the process, but provided the conflict stops short of violence, it is better than bland or managed consensus." He points to the *Clarity Act* which establishes a set of rules for any future referendum in Quebec on separation from Canada as evidence of how conflict is managed within a civic nation, but others have pointed out that few nation-states adhere to the niceties of constitutional protocol when they break apart.

---

<sup>23</sup> For a fuller discussion of these points, see William Galston, *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues and Duties in the Liberal State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) and Civics Expert Group (Australia), *Whereas the People – Civics and Citizenship Education. Report*. Canberra: Australian Government Publication Service, 1994.

<sup>24</sup> See, *Canadian Citizenship: Sharing the Responsibility*, a report in 1993 from the Standing Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology in the Canada Senate, *Canadian Citizenship: A Sense of Belonging* (1998) a House of Commons Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration.

<sup>25</sup> Harper Speech, April 24, 2010 and November 20, 2008

<sup>26</sup> Harper Speech, February 11, 2010

<sup>27</sup> Harper Speech, February 7, 2010

<sup>28</sup> Harper Speech, November 2, 2009

<sup>29</sup> Quoted in Joe Friesen, “Ottawa to remodel Canada’s image,” *Globe and Mail*, November 10, 2009

<sup>30</sup> Dean Beeby, “Telling Edits of Citizenship Guide Reveal Politics,” *Western Star*, January 17, 2010

<sup>31</sup> “New citizenship guide big on military, small of arts,” CTV.ca News, November 12, 2009

<sup>32</sup> On this point, see Lauri Johnson and Reva Joshee, “Introduction: Cross-border dialogue and multicultural policy webs,” in Reva Joshee and Lauri Johnson, eds., *Multicultural Education Policies in Canada and the United States* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007), pp. 3-13

<sup>33</sup> Government of Canada, *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2009), 3

<sup>34</sup> Harper Speech, March 21, 2009

<sup>35</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* 3

<sup>36</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship*, 8

<sup>37</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* , 9.

<sup>38</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* 11-12.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted in Christopher Moore, *1867. How the Fathers Made a Deal* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1995), 233

<sup>40</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* 12-14. See, also, Sunil Rao,

“Multiculturalism ‘has its limits’: new study guides omits Komagata, *Sun Asian Focus*, November 19, 2009

- 
- <sup>41</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship*, 26-27
- <sup>42</sup> *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship*, 21, 40-41
- <sup>43</sup> Dean Beeby, "Telling Edits of Citizenship Guide Reveal Politics," *Western Star*, January 17, 2010
- <sup>44</sup> Adam Chapnick, "At last, an honest 'look at Canada'", *Ottawa Citizen*, November 13, 2009
- <sup>45</sup> *Globe and Mail*, November 12, 2009
- <sup>46</sup> Rebekah, "Discover Canada: A New Guide for Prospective Citizens," Citizens for Public Justice, November 13, 2009. [http://www.cpj.ca/en/profile/profile\\_name/Rebekah+Sears](http://www.cpj.ca/en/profile/profile_name/Rebekah+Sears)
- <sup>47</sup> Jane Taber, "Scott Brison decries 'Conservative revisionist history of Canada,'" *Globe and Mail*, March 3, 2010.
- <sup>48</sup> Joe Friesen and Bill Curry, *Globe and Mail*, March 2, 2010
- <sup>49</sup> <http://tinyurl.com/438cam3>. The Monarchist League of Canada, however, was ecstatic that the Monarch was given such a prominent symbolic presence in the citizenship guide. Randy Boswell, "Queen takes top role in new citizenship guide," *Times Colonist*, November 13, 2009
- <sup>50</sup> John Ivison, "Liberals get a lesson on branding," *National Post*, November 12, 2009
- <sup>51</sup> Dean Beeby, *Globe and Mail*, March 2, 3 and 4, 2010
- <sup>52</sup> On this point, see Christian Joppke, "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy," *The British Journal of Sociology* volume 55 2 (2004): 249-51