

The Power in Multicultural Education: Examining the Discourses

by

Karen T. Sy de Jesus

B.A., University of the Philippines, 1982

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the

Curriculum and Instruction Program
Faculty of Education

© Karen T. Sy de Jesus 2012

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Spring 2012

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for "Fair Dealing." Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

Approval

Name: Karen T. Sy de Jesus
Degree: Master of Arts
Education
Title of Thesis: *The Power in Multicultural Education: Examining the Discourses*

Examining Committee:

Chair: Dr. Allan McKinnon
Chair
Associate Professor

Dr. Charles W. Bingham
Senior Supervisor
Associate/Professor

Dr. Ena Lee
Committee Member
Lecturer

Dr. Dolores van der Wey
External Examiner
Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University

Date Defended/Approved: 23 April 2012

Partial Copyright Licence



The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website (www.lib.sfu.ca) at <http://summit/sfu.ca> and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

revised Fall 2011

Abstract

Since its introduction in Canada over forty years ago, institutions have adopted the Multiculturalism Policy in different ways. Drawing on Foucault's analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge, I frame the Multiculturalism Policy and its discourses in his concept of bio-power and its mechanisms. By unpacking these discourses which have helped shape multicultural education in Canada, I focus on how the practices in multicultural education might play a role in perpetuating unequal relations of power rather than fostering equity and plurality. How does what we know shape how we constitute others and ourselves in a multicultural classroom? This study examines the relationship between knowledge and power in the dynamic of relations and explores the possibilities in our capacities to disrupt this relationship.

Keywords: multicultural education; multiculturalism; Foucault; knowledge; power; power relations

Dedication

To my mother, CLK, who was with me when I started but didn't stay long enough to be with me when I finished it.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my appreciation and say ...

thank you to Bing and Ena,

for your trust and support without which this work might not be completed;

thank you to all my professors at Simon Fraser University-

whose own passions for learning inspired me;

thank you to the Graduate Program Office Staff-

for all you do to help students succeed;

thank you to my motley gang of thought-wrestlers-

for all your questions and challenges that haunted me;

and most of all, thank you to my family-

for putting up with me while I do my “monster’s” degree.

Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Partial Copyright Licence.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
Introductory Quote.....	ix
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Framework for Analysis.....	10
2.1. Historical Evolution of Bio-power.....	13
2.2. Six Concepts of Bio-power.....	19
2.2.1. Objectification (and Subjectification).....	19
2.2.2. Grid of Intelligibility.....	20
2.2.3. Subjugation of Knowledges.....	22
2.2.4. Normalization.....	22
2.2.5. Divide and Rule (Disciplinary Partitioning and Hierarchical Regulation).....	25
2.2.6. Panopticism.....	27
2.3. Recovering the Subject – Choosing to “Make-live”.....	30
3. Multiculturalism and Bio-power in Canada.....	34
3.1. Multiculturalism in Canada.....	34
3.1.1. History.....	34
3.1.2. Minority Groups.....	38
3.1.2.1. Quebec nationalists.....	39
3.1.2.2. Aboriginal Peoples.....	41
3.1.2.3. Immigrants.....	46
3.1.3. Conceptualization and Debates.....	49
3.2. Multiculturalism: Some Intersecting Discourses.....	53
3.2.1. Colonialism and Multiculturalism.....	53
3.2.2. Why Culture?.....	59
3.2.3. New Racism and White Privilege.....	61
4. Multiculturalism and Bio-power in Education.....	68
4.1. Multiculturalism: History and Conceptualization in Education.....	69
4.1.1. Ministry Level.....	73
4.1.2. British Columbia Teachers’ Federation.....	76
4.2. Modes and Myths of Multicultural Education.....	77
4.2.1. Modes - Five Dimensions of Multicultural Education.....	78
4.2.1.1. Content Integration.....	78
4.2.1.2. Prejudice Reduction.....	79
4.2.1.3. Equity Pedagogy.....	80

4.2.1.4.	Knowledge Construction	82
4.2.1.5.	Empowerment of School Culture and Social Structure.....	84
4.2.2.	Myths of Multicultural Education.....	86
4.2.2.1.	Multicultural Education is for the students from minority cultures.....	87
4.2.2.2.	Multicultural Education is against the West and will divide the nation.	88
4.2.2.3.	Multicultural Education deviates from the core curriculum and from focusing on academic standards.	91
4.2.2.4.	Multicultural Education is instrumental in the production of global citizens.....	93
5.	Bio-power and Multicultural Education	96
5.1.	Why Narratives: A Short Methodological Detour	97
5.2.	Narratives: Lived Experiences as Manifestations in Practice	103
5.2.1.	The Grid of Intelligibility and Divide and Rule Mechanisms in Prejudice Reduction.....	103
5.2.2.	Objectification and Panopticization Mechanisms in Equity Pedagogy	107
5.2.3.	Subjugation of Knowledge and Normalization Mechanisms in Content Integration	112
5.3.	Analysis of Narratives	117
5.3.1.	Implications on Education	117
5.3.1.1.	Objectification (and Subjectification)	119
5.3.1.2.	Grid of Intelligibility	119
5.3.1.3.	Subjugation of Knowledges	120
5.3.1.4.	Normalization.....	121
5.3.1.5.	Divide and Rule (Disciplinary Partitioning and Hierarchical Regulation).....	122
5.3.1.6.	Panopticization	123
5.3.2.	What Might It Look Like.....	125
6.	Making Meaning: Making a Difference	128
	References.....	137
	Appendices.....	157
Appendix A.	Canadian Multiculturalism Act	158
Appendix B.	Diversity in BC Schools: A Framework (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 8).....	168
Appendix C.	2011 Service Plan (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 15).....	169
Appendix D.	Better Schools for BC: A Plan for Quality Public Education (British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 2011, p. 14).....	170

Introductory Quote

...we must remind ourselves that the conditions in which the need for multicultural education arises are conditions of domination and subordination in which ideological distortions, lies, silences, and dense webs of deception dominate and structure public knowledge... (Curtis, 2001, p. 144)

1. Introduction

In 2011, Canada marked forty years since its adoption of multiculturalism as official state policy. Introduced in 1971, the Multiculturalism Policy passed in 1988 as the Canadian Multiculturalism Act R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)¹. Almost two generations of Canadians have grown up and have been affected by the initiatives of the Policy in different aspects of their lives, from employment to immigration and education. Canadian political philosopher Will Kymlicka (2007a) described the liberal policy as a means to address the diversity of the different ethnocultural groups in Canada, including national groups, minorities, immigrants and indigenous peoples. The focus of this study is to look into the discourses on multiculturalism and how they have shaped the conceptualization and the practices of multicultural education. What are the implications of the Multiculturalism Policy on its conceptualization in education? Specifically, what are the discourses surrounding multicultural education itself and what are their implications on educational practices? By framing the discourses on multiculturalism in Foucault's notion of power, I hope to shed light on the power relations at play and their implications on practices and learning experiences in schools. I will use Foucault's conceptualization of bio-power, a specific form of power, and its mechanisms to examine particular practices of multicultural education so that we may understand better the ways we exercise our power as participants in these practices. In so doing, I hope to explore the possibilities of exercising our power as individuals who are embedded within a web of educational relations.

In this study, I use Foucault's (1978) notion of power as the lens through which I will examine multiculturalism and some of its practices in education. Foucault analyzed

¹ Hereafter referred to as the Multiculturalism Policy. Appendix A is a copy of the document.

power by looking into how it is positively exercised to produce knowledge through discourses². His notion of power as located within the dynamic of relations implies both determined and determining possibilities in how we as individuals allow power to move within our relationships based on what we know. By linking power to knowledge, Foucault helps us understand the process of how we participate in what is known and articulated in multicultural education. Since multicultural education is based on the liberal social policy of multiculturalism in order to foster relations between individuals of different cultures, using Foucault's analysis of power and how it functions through the discourses on multiculturalism will shed light on our relations and our practices in school. By examining the discourses that surround multiculturalism and education, we might gain insight into how these discourses shape our participation in the system of power through the practices of multicultural education.

Multiculturalism as an educational imperative has been implemented in schools for over two decades. What are some of the discourses surrounding multiculturalism? How have these discourses impacted multicultural education? What is the distance between multiculturalism as a "social ideal" and a "sociological fact" (Day, 2000, p. 6) in a society as diverse as ours? Political philosopher and sociologist Richard F. Day (2000) described multiculturalism as Canada's solution to its historical struggle to overcome its diversity. As a philosophy to engage with differences and as a policy for cultural integration in a settler society like Canada, multiculturalism is part of a strategy to plan and manage diversity and to build a nation wherein immigration is a fundamental foundation (Ley, 2007). Multicultural studies professor, Kogila Moodley (1995), contended that the Multiculturalism Policy was fraught with tension from multiple sides since its introduction. The Aboriginal peoples saw it as neutralizing their treaties and land claims, and trivializing their status as the founding peoples of Canada. The French Quebecois saw it as undermining their status as the co-charter group of Canada. They

² For this study, I will be using "discourse" to refer to statements made about something that bear effects on what we know and what we might do. "Discourse –the mere fact of speaking, of employing words, of using the words of others, words that the others understand and accept – this fact is itself a force" (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. xx)

also saw the Multiculturalism Policy as equating their distinct society to the various immigrant cultural minorities. Moodley stated that other European immigrant groups like the Ukrainians saw it as meaningless cultural preservation without accompanying linguistic preservation. Visible minority immigrants saw it as integration without opportunities for representation. Although seen as an election ploy to garner ethnic votes for the Liberal Party, its support by the Conservative Party in the 1979 election finalized its acceptance as official policy. When the Canadian Multiculturalism Act was passed in 1988, Canada became one of the first Western liberal democracies to “give multiculturalism full legal authority” (Moodley, 1995, p. 803). This legislation is further strengthened by its constitutional protection under Section 27 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Dhamoon, 2009; Ley, 2007).

However, urban political geographer Katharyne Mitchell (2004) described state sponsored multiculturalism as being “in retreat” (p. 641) and immigrant assimilation as “having lost its tarnished image and regaining its stature as [a] key conceptual and political tool” (p. 641) as Western democracies abandoned their liberal fantasies. Though the Multiculturalism Policy was formed to include all cultural groups into the national fabric, visible minority immigrants have become the central focus of recent debates because non-visible minority immigrants were able to integrate into the mainstream Canadian population (Ley, 2007). The word “immigrants” has come to refer to the new immigrants made up of visible minority groups from non-European nations whose influx was due to “race neutral” immigration policy changes in 1967 (see Chapter 3, p. 47 for more details). This “retreat” of multiculturalism grounds my rationale for this inquiry into the historical and current discourses surrounding multiculturalism and its effects on the practices of multicultural education.

This study is being undertaken in the light of recent events in Europe and the rise of the Extreme Right in the United States and elsewhere in the developed world. In the winter of 2010, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and British Prime Minister David Cameron declared the failure of multiculturalism in their respective countries. Attributing the failure of immigrant integration into the dominant society to the multicultural tenet of accommodating diversity, they urged immigrants to do their part to assimilate. In the United States, broader and stricter immigration reforms have been passed across several states to clamp down on illegal immigrants where anyone in public could be

asked to produce proper identification documents; failure to do so could result in deportation (Archibold, 2010; Fausset, 2011). The 2001 DREAM Act Bill that was designed to pave the way for illegal immigrants who were minors when they entered the United States to gain residency is still pending in the US Senate. In 2010, a far-right anti-immigration and protectionist political party, Australia First, was registered with the Australian Electoral Commission. These anti-immigrant sentiments are significant when viewed together with the recent banning of minarets, the typical structure of Mosques, in Switzerland, and the banning of wearing hijabs, or headscarves, publicly in France (Wilkes, Guppy & Farris, 2007).

In Canada, reactions to these multicultural tensions have been varied. Public rhetoric and institutional participation in the multicultural policy reflect ambivalence in Canadians' recognition and celebration of their diversity. On one hand, there is the triumphant pride of successful multiculturalism as evidenced by relatively untroubled coexistence amidst the diverse demographics of the major cities (Kymlicka, 2004). Describing pluralism as a "Canadian value", Kymlicka (ibid, p. 838) contended that it is not just a foreign policy item; he added that Canadian multiculturalism has been touted as "our 'amazing global human asset'" (p. 851). Social and cultural geographer David Ley (2007) contended that as a settler society with a long experience in nation-building through immigration, Canadian multiculturalism as a work in progress has achieved measurable success in integrating its immigrants. Citing Bloemraad's work on the importance of institutional and policy commitment on diversity to civic and political outcomes, Ley posited that Canada's commitment to civil liberties in terms of legislation on human rights, anti-racism and employment equity, in addition to services in integration and settlement and the redress for group discrimination in the past has granted Canada a reputation of an open and inclusive society.

On the other hand, there are also alarmist calls to curtail the influx of immigrants lest Canada suffer the same fate as Germany and England, especially crucial during this time of economic downturn (Harris, 2001; Wilkes, Guppy & Farris, 2007). There is similar rhetoric about the failure of Multiculturalism Policy in that it had resulted in national "fragmentation in the face of economic globalization and growing cultural diversity" (Sears & Hyslop-Margison, 2007, p. 20) and had "weakened the social cohesion" (Huntington as cited in Soroka et al., 2007, p. 562) of Canada. Lentin and

Titley (2011) further described the rejection of multiculturalism as the projection of neoliberal anxieties on the social realities of a lived multicultural. Moreover, there are critics of multiculturalism who have decried its failure to address continuing economic, social and political structures of inequity (Bannerji, 2000; Dion & Kawakami, 1996; Grant, 1999; Harvey, Siu & Reil, 1999). Critical theorists in multiculturalism like May and Sleeter (2010) argued that without interrogating the structures and relations of power, no transformation takes place; instead, the mechanisms for the reproduction of inequity remain, and may even be reinforced. Rhetoric like these reflects Aveling's (2006) observation that multiculturalism has always aroused anxiety about national identities.

This anxiety is further complicated by the assumption of the reality of the multicultural dream as manifested by the statement of Prime Minister Harper at the 2009 G20 Summit in Pittsburgh: "We are one of the most stable regimes in history....We also have no history of colonialism" (Reuters, 2009). What does such a statement imply about the ongoing tension of the government with the French Quebecois and the Aboriginal peoples? Canada is technically still under a constitutional limbo since Quebec has not signed onto the 1982 Constitution. The treaty rights and land claims of the Aboriginal peoples are still being negotiated today as legacies of their colonization. What are the mechanisms that underlie this contradictory rhetoric? How do we really know who we are as a multicultural nation? Have four decades of multiculturalism failed when we discover that discrimination in Canada has not abated, but instead has proliferated into other forms of discrimination (Satzewich, 2011; Tator et al., 2006)? Why have ethnic enclaves (neighbourhoods consisting of at least 30% of a particular visible minority group) increased from six neighbourhoods in 1981 to 254 neighbourhoods in 2001 (Hou & Picot as cited in Wu, 2010)? This bears further implications when we see ethnic enclaves not as an issue of self-segregation but as an issue of societal intolerance (Ley, 2010). Why do we speak of the benefits of multicultural diversity yet eschew any initiative to change the status quo of our monocultural institutions? Citing Jedwab's 2006 study on the public sentiment regarding multiculturalism, Ley (2010) stated that nearly two-thirds of Canadians see multiculturalism as a positive contribution to societal integration. Yet non-European and Aboriginal groups remain the most vulnerable members of the society in terms of employment, education, and housing (Bedard, 2000; Grant, 1999; Mata & Pendakur, 2010; Teixeira, 2012).

Has multiculturalism failed? Have the decades of multicultural education practices failed to foster a plural and equitable society? What are the implications of these competing discourses about multiculturalism on practices in multicultural education? Specifically, I problematize the relationship between the various discourses on multiculturalism and multicultural education and how this relationship can produce the following contradictions in practice:

- How might multicultural celebrations create more cultural distance rather than bridge it?
- How may the English as a Second Language (ESL) program, the great tool for integration under the multicultural initiative, constitute a new group of Other³?
- How may the addition of multicultural content to the school curriculum become a reduction in knowledge and a barrier to meaningful learning?

Given the controversies and contradictions above, the form of my argument for this study will not be a position for or against multiculturalism where its debates and abstractions have obscured rather than engaged with the philosophical question of engaging with differences. Rather, I argue that by framing the discourses on multiculturalism and multicultural education within Foucault's notion of bio-power, we are provided with a historico-political framework to help us understand the intertwining relationship between knowledge, power and relations and how this relationship shapes institutional practices. Because of the role of schools as the primary institution for knowledge production, organization and regulation (Calliste & Dei, 2000), this historico-political analysis will reveal the way this web of discourses on multiculturalism shape our conception of and practices in multicultural education. In describing how bio-power has

³ An Other is a product of the otherization process that ascribes characteristics to people where it does not allow for the agency of people to be a factor in their identity construction. It does not permit the negotiation of identity between people, but imposes crude, often reductive identities on others (Holliday, Hyde, & Kullman as cited in Lee, 2008, p. 92).

functioned as the organizing paradigm in liberal Western societies since the eighteenth century, I will also argue that some practices in multicultural education have maintained, if not exacerbated the divisions within Canada through the mechanisms of bio-power. Using Foucault's framework of the logic and mechanisms of bio-power, I will also explore how multiculturalism as manifested in some school practices "functions as a principle of exclusion, and segregation and ultimately, as a way of normalizing society" (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 61). Foucault has provided the language and conceptual tools to connect my experiences to historical, cultural, and economic systems of power and privilege that inform the discourses surrounding multiculturalism and education. Through narratives of lived experiences, I will examine some of the specific practices in multicultural education and how, instead of protecting persons "against any discrimination and against any incitement to discrimination" (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, p. 2), they have unwittingly perpetuated and reproduced the discourses that have maintained inequitable power relations. To understand the contradictions and tensions, I will look into the main questions of this thesis as listed below:

1. What are the discourses that have shaped multiculturalism and multicultural education? How have the mechanisms of bio-power manifested in these discourses?

2. How have these discourses shaped the practices of multicultural education? What are these "truths" that inform these practices? How have the mechanisms of bio-power functioned in these practices?

3. What are the effects of the mechanisms of bio-power on the practices of multicultural education? Is there any way to change these effects?

Through the problematization of these questions, I will identify the ways discourses shape what we know and shape our relations in the classrooms so that we may discover new ways of relating through new ways of knowing. Education, after all, is about relations, whether they are dominating or emancipating. Education might also be where we might close the gap between our sociological reality and the social ideal as a multicultural society. By interpreting Foucault's notion of power and its mechanisms, I will explore possibilities on how we might constitute ourselves as individuals, as

students, as parents, as teachers, or as a multicultural nation at this time and space in history.

In the next chapter, I introduce Foucault's notion of bio-power and his analysis of how power functions in institutions and the role of knowledge in shaping societal relations. Next, I enumerate the mechanisms of bio-power so that we may understand how they function in the discourse on multiculturalism and multicultural education today. The chapter ends with my interpretation of the ways in which Foucault's framework helps us see how we participate in the relations of power as they are manifested in multicultural education.

Chapter 3 opens with a brief history of multiculturalism in Canada. Then, I discuss the three groups (Quebec Nationalists, Aboriginal peoples, Immigrants) of many that make up Canada's diversity through the lenses of bio-power. Next, I introduce three additional discourses (Colonialism, Culture, and New Racism/White Privilege) that intersect with the ongoing discourses on multiculturalism and how the mechanisms of bio-power function through them and thereby shape practices in multicultural education.

In Chapter 4, I focus on multicultural education, its history, and its conceptualization in Canada in order that we might understand its logic for implementation. Then, I discuss two additional discourses pertaining to multicultural education: the dimensions (modes) of multicultural education of a lead researcher in the field, James A. Banks, and the discourses (myths) that surround multicultural education. Although both discourses influence the practices of multicultural education today, I analyze them through the lenses of bio-power so that we may see how what we know shapes what we do.

In Chapter 5, I present the rationale for the use of narratives to illustrate the manifestations of bio-power in the practices of multicultural education. This is followed by three narratives, which reflect my journey of discovery into how the mechanisms of bio-power work in some practices of multicultural education and how these practices reproduce unequal relations of power. I end with an analysis of the implications for education and my re-imagination of multicultural education as a tool to help narrow the gap between multiculturalism as a social ideal and as a sociological fact.

Chapter 6 closes this study with what I have learned and what it has meant for me to see multicultural education through the lenses of Foucault's notion of power. What might I have included to enrich this study? What might I do next with what I have learned?

2. Framework for Analysis

Michel Foucault was a twentieth-century French philosopher whose work on the analysis of eighteenth-century institutions offers a valuable resource with which we might understand those institutions that still exist in many modern liberal democracies today. By examining his analysis of criminality and sexuality in eighteenth-century France, we are provided with a framework to understand the role of knowledge in power relations and how institutions function to maintain those relations. It was a period when France underwent a series of societal changes and people were increasingly free from the threat of death, from the sovereignty of monarchical rule and from the socio-economic changes after the collapse of feudalism. In examining the social, political and economic changes and the practices that developed from these changes, we might recognize some of the processes of power that structure our current social institutions and practices. Instead of using ideologies to explain the exercise of power, Foucault (1980, p. 102) contended that ideologies are examples of discourses, the knowledge apparatuses produced by power. As such, they act as organizing principles for the relations shaped by the relationship between knowledge and power. By locating Multiculturalism Policy within a web of power relations shaped by the discourses, we are able to look into the effects of the policy at its various locations or points of application. How do the discourses shape social structures? How do they affect institutional conceptualization and implementation? How do they constitute individuals and shape their relations? How do they shape what we know and what we do? More importantly, how does the relationship between power and knowledge shape practices in multicultural education where unequal power relations are reproduced?

In framing multiculturalism and its educational implications in Foucault's conceptual vocabulary, we might be able to understand how societal relations evolved with the birth of the economic and political liberalism in the eighteenth century. It is my contention that his notion of power helps us understand why a liberal policy like multiculturalism was so easily accepted by members on both ends of the political

continuum and why it is under attack today. His analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge sheds light on the tensions in social policies like multiculturalism and its implementation in education. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 27-30) maintained that power should not be analyzed from a single centre of an intendant or from the perspective of who wields it. Power needs to be studied in terms of its unending movement of shifting relations where some are made dominant over others (p. 109). Instead of conceiving of this dominance of power as a negative and repressive force over others like the sovereign power of the monarch, Foucault (1980, p. 119; 1982, p. 779) contended that we ought to study the positive effect of power where it produces knowledge that constitutes discursive formations and rationalizations. Foucault (1982, p. 786) described the function of power as an “ensemble of actions” that brings into play the relations between individuals or groups rather than as the capacity that is exerted over things and that gives the ability to modify, use, consume and destroy. His notion of power as an economy locates it in the multiplicity of relations structured by technologies, or non-dominating practices, thus creating a new “economy of power relations” (p. 779). Although the pathological forms of power that have been manifested in history like fascism and totalitarianism in Western societies may be in the past, Foucault (p. 779) argued that these are not unique manifestations of the excesses of power but are extensions of ideas and mechanisms which are already in place in most societies. Citing excesses of political power like the use of concentration camps (p. 779), he argued for the problematization of “banal facts” where an historical awareness of the conditions that make possible such circumstances might help us recognize the existence of the economy of relations constituted by “banal” processes.

Foucault (1997/2003, p. 253) introduced the concept of bio-power as a power that “has taken control of both the body and life”. Emerging in the mid-eighteenth century, bio-power as the form of power arose when the problem of life began to be problematized in the field of political thought. Bio-power is described as the political technology with mechanisms that brought human life into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge/power an agent of transformation of human life (Foucault, 1978b, p. 143; Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 241). Because bio-power “takes life both as its object and objective”, it is a paradoxical power that kills, and is also a power “to improve life” (p. 254). It is this difficult paradox that obscures the connection between

benign, if not noble, institutional practices and the exercise of power in the objectification of individuals. As opposed to power as a “menace of death” in the monarchical period, bio-power’s institutional “management of life” since the 18th century (1978b, p. 147) demonstrated its control over lives through relations of power. Bio-power is not a “naked fact” of the monarchical right, “an institutional right, nor is it a structure which holds out or is smashed: [instead,] it is elaborated, transformed, organized; it endows itself with processes which are more or less adjusted to the situation” (1982, p. 792). Foucault’s notion of bio-power demonstrates how governmentality¹ emerged as a system of mechanisms in liberal democracies where people’s attitudes, choices and beliefs are guided towards objectives that are shifting, changing, and multiple. As a remote means of governing through the mechanisms of bio-power, the consent of the governed is enlisted not through force but through the shaping of knowledge and creating a rule of relations sustained by institutions. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 111) emphasized that the power in this rule of power relations is not about rights or sovereignty; it is about “domination, about an infinitely dense and multiple dominations that never comes to an end”. This unending development of infinite techniques of the mechanisms of bio-power is what Foucault (1978b, p. 11) described as the “polymorphous techniques of power”; where objectifying mechanisms and strategies make possible the domination within unequal relations of power. By examining Foucault’s work on the political nature of bio-power, we might understand how the fall of the monarchy and the collapse of the feudal economy initiated the rise of political liberalism that is the precursor of the capitalist and the neoliberal imperatives dominating the institutions in most western democracies today (Baumeister, 2000; Paras, 2006; Peters, 2008). An historical overview of the development of bio-power and how it evolved with social changes, historical events, and political rationalities might clarify its protean and paradoxical nature.

¹ Governmentality is a form of domination where people are not forced to do what the governor wants but is a versatile equilibrium with complementarity between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which the self is constructed or modified by others and the self through the subtle coercion-technologies and self-technologies (Foucault, 1993, p. 204).

I begin with a description of how bio-power developed into its political form to establish the economy of power relations. Then I list and describe the six mechanisms of bio-power employed to manage lives, followed by an interpretation of Foucault's ideas on the possibilities of resisting this management in the inherent struggle in his notion of power. I argue that by framing multiculturalism and its educational implications in Foucault's conceptual vocabulary, we might better understand the role of institutional policies on power relations in the classroom. Aside from using Foucault's examples in his work, I also use historical and current Canadian examples to clarify the concepts.

2.1. Historical Evolution of Bio-power

Foucault's (1978b) concept of bio-power was the focus of both his 1978 book, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: The Will to Knowledge* and his 1975-1976 lectures at the Collège de France, translated into English as *Society must be Defended*, which was published in 1997 (translated in 2003). In these two books, he discussed how the technology of bio-power as a system of mechanisms and techniques was deployed to establish control and manage the lives of individuals and populations through knowledge production and social structures. His historico-political analysis described how bio-power emerged in the shift from the feudal economy to the mercantile capitalist economy in 18th century France, when governance was transferred from the juridical rule of the monarchy to the contemporary forms of governing institutions.

The fall of the monarchy was precipitated by the weakening of the fear of death as lives became more secure from the threat of wars, famines and plagues. It became harder for the monarchy to retain its form of power as lives became more stable and viable. Furthermore, the economic and social mobility that occurred with the shift from feudalism to capitalism created economic and social changes, further diffusing the political power of the monarchy. With the shift from the king as the single locus of power to the emergence of an elite class of bourgeois with their newly-found wealth as the multiple loci of power, juridical power evolved into bio-power where institutions run by the new ruling elite class were able to deploy mechanisms to reinforce and maintain their positions and privileges.

Juridical power during the monarchy revolved around the king himself. It placed the lives of the people under the control of the king in what Foucault described as a “take life or let live” (1997/2003, p. 241) principle. Essentially, the principle of “right of the sword” (p. 240) gave the king sole authority to have individuals killed or spared in what is actually the king’s right to kill. Sovereignty was founded on people’s will to live; this fear of death gave the king legitimacy and power over people’s lives. Rituals like royal ceremonies and public executions were conducted regularly to re-enact the power of the king. The king’s court existed to put into effect the mechanisms that operated daily rituals to affirm and re-qualify the sovereignty of the king and to reinforce the king’s right over people’s lives.

Foucault (1997/2003, p. 232) described the birth of the State after the fall of the monarchy as a transfer of the locus of power rather than dissolution of power because the French revolution that overthrew the king spoke the same “truth” by instituting the rights of the nobility and the people over lives. Bio-power is characterized by this political liberation, which transferred the singular right of the monarchy to the multiple rights of the society and its members. With the “death” of the king, the monarchy was “crowned” when the culminating point of the monarchical relations of domination was transferred to “the constitution of a Statist totality that is in the hands of a national collectivity” (p. 233). This is why Foucault (1978b, p. 89) contended that in our political thought and analysis, we still “have not cut off the head of the king” despite “differences in epochs and objectives” (p. 88). Power is still exercised in accordance with the right of fundamental lawfulness whose sovereignty rests in the personification of the collective being of the society instead of the king as the sovereign individual. The liberalization from monarchical sovereignty transferred power to the society as a whole. The management of lives was justified in defence of the society instead of in defence of the monarchy. The juridical power of the monarchy had been transformed to bio-power, which ushered in “new mechanisms of power” that were not centred on death as juridical power was under the monarchy. Instead, bio-power is the form of power that guaranteed life (1997/2003, p. 253), “whose operation is not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalization, not by punishment but by control” (1978b, p. 89).

Under this post-monarchy bio-power, institutions were developed whose task was to exercise a new principle: to “make-live or let-die” (1978b, p.139). As the power over life (as opposed to the monarchical power over death through the right to take life), bio-power is the right “to foster life or to disallow it to the point of death” (p. 138). To “make-live” is to allow life to flourish while to “let-die” does not just mean “killing”, but also every form of indirect killing: “exposing someone to death, increasing the risk of death for some people, or, quite simply, political death, expulsion, rejection, and so on” (p. 256). It is not limited to the “right to kill”; it could also be the “right to eliminate”, or the “right to disqualify” (p. 261). Bio-power was deployed to “take charge of life” and to distribute it “in the domain of value and utility” (p. 144), in consonance with emerging capitalist values of production and usefulness. The economy of tension between the make-live and let-die functions created the social order needed to maintain the prevailing economic and political structure. A present day example would be when the British Columbia government cut the funding for autism; autistic children are allowed to let-die where they might not have adequate care and early intervention (Canadian Press, 2009). This manifests the exercise of bio-power in the structural management of individual bodies.

Bio-power functioned primarily to manage the “anatomy-politics on the human body” (1978b, p.139). This disciplinary management of individuals focused on discourses formed around individual biological characteristics such as gender, age, race, ability, and health, and it was exercised primarily through the state and its institutions. It was a system for codifying individuals based on their physical characteristics, which gave rise to institutions like the hospitals, mental asylums and prisons to manage the “sick”, the “lunatic”, and the “criminal”. Bio-power eventually expanded into a more efficient “massifying” (1997, p. 243) power that was deployed through the administration of regulatory measures on populations instead of just individuals. This regulatory technology of power was shaped by discourses created through managed population instruments such as surveys, statistics, and forecasts. These instruments of knowledge constituted the discourses on the individuals and the groups in order to determine the regulatory measures to be administered. This administration of regulations served to manage the multiplicity of the population in order to contain individual bodies under a “‘bio-politics’ of the human race” (1997/2003, p. 242-243). Bio-power developed into a

system of techniques for “assuring the ordering of human multiplicities” in an economic process in order to increase both the “docility and the utility” of the population as a function of the apparatus of production to make the exercise of power less costly and more efficient (1977, p. 218). Foucault (1977, p. 301) described the institutional production of delinquents in the 19th century resulted in the development of a sophisticated juridical system of carceral management that granted the penal institution the power to punish and the opportunity to reproduce delinquency.

Foucault’s analysis of power (1982; 1997/2003) did not focus on institutions to ensure the subservience of the citizens, on a mode of subjugation as the form of rule, or on the general manner of dominance of one group over another. Instead, he focused on power as a multiplicity of force relations within a field constituted by actions and reactions involved in the process of strengthening, struggling and reversing strategies embedded within the rule of relations. As a system of functions and effects, bio-power should not be analyzed from a single centre. Instead, it should be understood in how it is exercised legitimately to perform its make-live and let-die functions in its capacity as a democratic right rather than a monarchical right (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 16-17). It is a form of power that should be examined in its real and effective practices by looking at its object, or field of application, and in where it is embedded and circulated as well as how its material effects are produced. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 32) also recommended that power has to be analyzed in terms of the political utility or economic advantage as the effects produced through its mechanisms rather than who has power where. In this context, when lives are not directly under threat, make-live functions involve the distribution of political and economic advantage that is withheld from those designated to let-die.

In principle, power does not reside in persons as much as it resides in the distribution of designated bodies in an “arrangement whose internal mechanisms produce the relations in which individuals are caught up” (1977, p. 202). The combination of disciplinary and regulatory techniques enables bio-power to reproduce, instituting a new system for controlling and managing lives en masse through the distribution of make-live or let-die functions within relations. Instead of the traditional display of sovereign power through its “murderous splendour” (p. 144), the exercise of

power became institutionalized, not residing in an individual like the king, but in the State and its institutions, which appear neutral, just and benign in its defence of the society.

Foucault (1997/2003, p. 181) contended that the period between the 17th and 18th century saw the proliferation of knowledges that was regulated through the processes of selection, normalization, hierarchicalization and centralization. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 180) described this period as the economico-political struggle over knowledge to differentiate it from the monarchical period, which was characterized by historico-political struggle when the central administration of the king's historiography was to protect the king from other forces (p. 177). In bio-power, the economico-political struggle involved a continuous generation of new practices for managing the multiple and heterogeneous knowledges that threatened the economic inductions and power-effects that were bound to the "exclusive ownership of knowledge" (p. 180). Eschewing the Enlightenment claim to the "triumph of light over darkness or of knowledge over ignorance" (p. 180), Foucault described this period as one where techniques of bio-power were directed at annexing and universalizing knowledge. Knowledge became the crux where power could be employed to manage the emergence of the "plural, polymorphous, multiple and dispersed existence of knowledges which existed with all their differences" (p. 179). The ownership, dispersal and secrecy of knowledge became a strategic instrument to discipline knowledges, a historical function of what Foucault called "science" (1997/2003, p. 182). Saul (2004) described this Western affinity for certitude in its struggle against the complexity of multiplicity as one of bio-power's manifestations.

The role of knowledge undergirds the technology of bio-power. This power is exercised through the production of knowledge where the objects of knowledge are produced through discourses in order to support power relations (1978b, p. 97). These "truths", or knowledge produced, enable the exercise of power to reinforce itself in circularity of reproduction. This is similar to the monarchy and its court that enacts rituals to reinforce its own power as exemplified by the public executions. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 24-25) cited the "will to truth" (1978b, p. 79) as the essence of power because it cannot be exercised unless an economy of truth has been produced by this desire for knowledge. Power demands truth from us because knowledge becomes the currency that gives institutions legitimacy and power to structure societal relations. He argued that power is exercised through the production of knowledge, forming the

discourses of truth that permeate and sustain the social relations in the society. We act upon each other on what we believe is the “truth” regarding the other. This use of knowledge to justify the management of bodies is manifested in the production of the Aboriginal people as infantile and savage in 1866, therefore incapable of responsibility for their lands; so the government had to redistribute their lands for “better use” (Harding, 2006). Another example would be when a child is labelled with “Attention Deficit with Hyperactivity Disorder” (ADHD), he is inscribed with a “pathological” status that explains his behaviour and justifies the therapy and medication to be prescribed.

The relationship between power and knowledge is the key to understanding the generation of mechanisms that reproduce and maintain the discourses of “truth”. By understanding the implications of this economy of knowledge production, we go beyond the “scapegoat theory” (Stoler, 1995, p. 69). This theory, as an ad-hoc response to crisis, posits that “under economic and social duress, particular sub-populations are cordoned off as intruders, invented to deflect anxieties, and conjured up precisely to nail blame” (p. 69). Describing the social war where knowledge is the weapon as a perpetual one, Foucault (1982) described the objectives of knowledge producers, or “those who act upon the action of others” (p. 792), as “the maintenance of privileges, the accumulation of profits, the bringing into operation of statutory authority, the exercise of a function or of a trade” (p. 792). Objects targeted for knowledge production are therefore strategically selected not to simply pinpoint the blame, but to justify the deployment of let-die functions. Thus, power is what is exercised to implement and re-inscribe a relationship of force on the object where those who produce and perpetuate knowledge maintain the advantage and entitlement. Bio-power is the system of mechanisms by which knowledge producers sustain their make-live function and enact it by administering let-die functions on individuals or groups who threaten their make-live functions. The relationship between knowledge and power undergirds the mechanism of bio-power in codifying individuals or groups into a justifiable order of relationships. For instance, by grading students from “A” to “D”, the capacities and the potential of students are constrained and limited by the arbitrary standards of the grading system which have implications on the lives of the students beyond the classroom. Bio-power maintains and reproduces power relations through a set of “mechanisms, techniques and technologies” (1997/2003, p. 241) for which Foucault developed a new conceptual

language. In the next section, I list and describe the six concepts that function as mechanisms of bio-power: objectification and subjectification, grid of intelligibility, subjugation of knowledges, normalization, disciplinary partitioning & hierarchical regulation, and panopticism.

2.2. Six Concepts of Bio-power

2.2.1. *Objectification (and Subjectification)*

In his study of the forms of power and how they work, Foucault (1982, p. 781) used “subject” in two ways. The first is the process where individuals are put under another’s control or where they are made dependent on others; the second is where individuals are able to be “tied to their own identities by a conscience or self-knowledge” (p. 781) as agents. For the purposes of this study, I will use “object” for the former and “subject” for the latter. Objectification is a dehumanizing process where power is exercised to constitute an individual through knowledge and how this knowledge “categorizes the individual ... imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him” (p.781). Subjectification, on the other hand, is a self-affirmation process when individuals are able to be marked by their own individualities and to attach or define for themselves their individualities. One’s position between objectification and subjectification strongly determines one’s make-live or let-die functions through the rule of relations based on what is known. For instance, when a casual label of “loser” is ascribed on a child, there are social, if not academic, ramifications of this objectification on his life in and out of school. Knowledge can be produced from what kind of a “loser” to how much of a “loser” he or she is and let-die functions can be exercised on her or on him.

The distinction between objectification and subjectification is important when we look into Foucault’s notion of how the exercise of overt power evolved from the loss of monarchical sovereignty over the people as objects under its rule to the exercise of power in a new form that is more “calculated, organized and technically thought out” (Foucault, 1977, p. 26). This technicization displaces the technology and mechanisms of power from the point of their application to where persons can easily be objectified

and where the exercise of power has no face. By exercising its power through disciplinary and regulatory mechanisms, bio-power expanded its application on the body by using it as an instrument to exercise power over the “soul” (p. 16), or what Foucault described as the non-codifiable aspects of the person: “the heart, the thoughts, the will, the inclinations” (p. 16). The practice of producing knowledge or coding the intangible and abstract “truths” to define persons becomes the means to employ the technology and mechanisms of power where self-regulatory processes could take place.

Objectification is the production of individuals as objects of knowledge, where what is “known” about them ascribes characteristics, which have implications on their make-live or let-die functions. For instance, the designation of “honour” classes in secondary public schools indicates a differential curriculum for the students in these classes and for those who are not. The presumption of their capacities has both pedagogical and curricular implications. Another example is the objectification of the Chinese-Canadians in the 1880s as a “foreign race with incompatible values and norms” (Li, 2008, p.130) which resulted in the Head Tax policy in order to restrict their immigration. The presumption of their “foreignness” inscribed them with unsuitable characteristics for migration to Canada. These exercises of power through policy and social practices displace power from the point of its application into knowledge-based “neutral” rationalities based on a particular grid of intelligibility or narrowly defined discursive space.

2.2.2. *Grid of Intelligibility*

Bio-power rests on the processes within a “grid of intelligibility” (1997/2003, p. 226) formed at the nexus of power and knowledge. The grid provides the justification and represents the parameters of legitimacy that set the conditions of possibility for the “disciplinarization” of knowledges in order to select and order “valid” knowledges. It is at this nexus that an object of knowledge becomes the discursive focus, where legitimized knowledge constructed regarding the object constitutes an integrated and legitimized system of knowledge. Foucault (1978b) described how sexuality in the 18th century was an object of knowledge made intelligible for the purposes of protecting society from sexual perverts. A contemporary example would be the controversy in Quebec over the rights of Muslim students to wear the hijab or niqab (apparel that partially or fully covers the face except for the eyes) to school (Shariff, 2006). Teachers perceive the Muslim

apparel as too “restrictive” and preventing proper assessment and identification. The “grid” defines what is restrictive and what interferes with teachers’ duties creating the rationale for what Shariff stated as a zero tolerance, or a blanket approach that overlooks the interlocking and intersecting systems of discrimination.

The grid also organizes the social order through the rule of relations between individuals or groups that has been established by the logic of the grid. Just as not all discursive participation bears equal weight in the discursive space, the grid establishes a particular hierarchy in the power relations of its participants. Foucault’s framework enables us to understand how the symbiotic relationship between knowledge and power functions to maintain the social order through the location of the individuals vis-a-vis the grid. When children’s sexuality was made the object of knowledge in the 18th century, the relationships between parents, the educators and the doctors were shaped by their shared goal: to protect children from “instinctual disturbances” (Foucault, 1978b, p.41). The grid contains the overarching rationale for the exercise of disciplinary and regulatory measures. Citing systems of logic like ideologies as examples, Applebaum (2009) illustrated how knowledge and rationale become common sense and normalized. An example would be the adoption of the ideology of the “War on Terror” after 9/11 by the public out of its fear of terrorist attacks, which resulted in the discriminatory treatment of Muslims in North America. An extreme case would be the deportation of Maher Arar, a Canadian citizen, back to Syria where he was imprisoned and tortured for a year (Abu-Laban & Nath, 2007). Due to “the bounds of the transparency available in the post-9/11 context” (p. 92), the legitimating capacity of the law was able to narrow the grid of the inquiry at the House of Commons to Arar’s innocence or guilt instead of the structural violence in the form of racialization and exception. Further, Applebaum (2009) concurred with Foucault that the grid consists of discursive practices that determine what can be said, what must remain unsaid, and what it is possible to think. The silencing in the “government’s very active pursuit of non-disclosure” (Abu-Laban & Nath, 2007, p. 93) and the dearth of media coverage during the Maher Arar Inquiry leave Prime Minister Harper’s apology and payment to Arar of 10.5 million dollars in compensation highly disturbing. Why the secrecy?

2.2.3. Subjugation of Knowledges

Another concept in the exercise of bio-power is the subjugation of knowledges through elimination or disqualification. This could be any knowledge designated as primitive, disruptive, particular, discontinuous, useless, or naïve. The silencing and fragmenting of the knowledges make possible the creation of a generalized body of universal discourse recognized as “truth”. Knowledge that does not serve the rationale of the grid is subjugated through censorship, elimination, distortion, or the withholding of knowledge. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 179) described the loss of artisanal, particular and local knowledges due to the productive efficiency of the capitalist economy that demanded more homogenized and interchangeable products as an example of this subjugation. He also cited as an historical example of the subjugation of knowledge the “ignorance, absentmindedness, laziness, and greed of the noble class’s” profound omission of the historical relationship that exploited the labourers on their lands during the feudal period (1997/2003, p. 228). This is akin to the amnesiac statement of Prime Minister Harper about Canada having “no history of colonialism” as mentioned previously where knowledge could be “forgotten”.

The subjugation of knowledge is a complex process. The silencing of an object of knowledge also has the paradoxical effect of inciting discursive formation on it. Eschewing the repressive hypothesis commonly assumed of sexuality in the eighteenth century, Foucault argued that targeting sexuality as the object of knowledge stimulated the pursuit or quest for its “truth”, animating our will to know. This quest for its “truth” made it possible to both produce and mask knowledge. On one hand, the strategic production of knowledge on sexuality focused on those deemed not of normal sexuality. On the other hand, the silencing or safeguarding of certain truths serves to legitimize and to enforce the unspoken norm of sexuality. For instance, “legitimate and procreative couples” (1978b, p. 3) in 18th century France were allowed their rights to secrecy because they were the models of “normal” sexuality.

2.2.4. Normalization

Normalization posits an optimal model constructed with prescriptive objectives to get people to conform, where the “normal” is able to conform and the “not-normal” is incapable of conforming to this model. Bio-power extracts a particular object of

knowledge to create a unified body of knowledge that could be homogenized and naturalized as standard, rational, and commonsense, thereby creating a norm. The norm functions to reaffirm the strength of the knowledge producers through its universalization. The “unities” (1978b, p. 103) of knowledge control the discursive formations that are used to define and justify the norm. Citing the pedagogization of children’s sexuality during the 18th century, Foucault (1978b, p. 104) described how doctors and educators produced a discourse that defined a set of activities as “contrary to nature” and “dangerous”, putting children under supervision and monitoring them in the “war against onanism”. The privileged norm is the point from which all other objects are measured against and are designated as normal or not-normal. Knowledge was amassed on children who might be over-sexualized but there was no clear body of knowledge about normal sexuality in children. In the normalization process, the object of knowledge marks the precondition for the let-die function to be applied to those excluded from the norm group. The de-normalized objects’ ability to constitute themselves and to make choices about their own lives is diminished or compromised in the let-die functions. Comparatively, those deemed as “normal” are able to define themselves and to make their own choices. This is why married couples in 18th century French society were able to “safeguard their truth and reserve the right to speak while retaining the principle of secrecy” (Foucault, 1978b, p. 3).

It should be noted that what was held up as the object of knowledge is not the norm but those that fell outside the norm. The official body of knowledge produced in the 18th century on unhealthy and perverted sexuality exemplified this practice. The power of the norm rests in its normalcy, therefore, not requiring the questioning, the judgment, the scrutiny, or the “gaze” that the excluded and not-normal individuals or groups are subjected to. In fact, the technique of normalization confer on those who are part of the normalized group the right to exercise the power to scrutinize, question and judge those that were excluded. This binary schema of the normal and not-normal is an important political tool to maintain control over another group by distributing the exercise of power through segregation and exclusion. It creates the polarization in the rule of relations between a normalized “Us” and a gazed “Them” in the dualistic mechanism of exclusion. It also creates a space for the excluded who were marked by procedures of individualization (Foucault, 1978b, p. 199). Foucault described this individualizing

technique as similar to the pastoral power of the Christian institutions that constituted its power by regulating the individual fitness for “salvation in the next world” (Foucault, 1982, p. 783). Normalization creates a sophisticated structure in which individuals are integrated under one condition: that this individuality is to be shaped in a new form and to be submitted to a set of very specific patterns (Foucault, 1982, p. 783). Foucault (1978b, p. 199) cited how the constant division between the “normal” and the “not-normal” to which each individual is subjected to resulted in the development of a whole set of techniques and institutions for measuring, supervising, and correcting the “not-normal”. He included the treatment of the lepers, the beggars, the vagabonds, and the madmen as examples.

In Canada, Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009) developed a framework regarding discourses at the intersection of security, racialization, and foreignness, and applied it to three historic instances where the de-normalized object marked as foreign is not static but is changeable depending on security threats deemed significant during those specific periods. The intersection of the three discourses produced a new “abnormal” object: the internal dangerous foreigner like the Japanese during World War II, the *Front de Liberation du Quebec* (FLQ) during the 1970 October Crisis³, and the Kaneshatake/Oka during the 1990 crisis⁴. The process of normalization is important for the disciplining of multiplicity in a state’s *raison d’être*: to strengthen itself through policing disorder and by governing space and population even if the “enemy” is from within. Dhamoon and Abu-Laban’s examples showed how the state divides and designates certain groups as “foreigners” as opposed to “normal” Canadians who are under threat by these groups and how the state can arbitrarily rationalize the containment and armed defence against

³ The October 5 crisis began when cells of the Front de libération du Québec (FLQ) kidnapped the British trade commissioner, James Cross, and then kidnapped and later murdered the Quebec Minister of Labor, Pierre Laporte. The FLQ was referred to by Prime Minister Trudeau as “kidnappers, revolutionaries, assassins,” and “self-selected dictators” who wanted to undermine “the elected representatives of all Canadians” (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009, p. 172).

⁴ The government conducted a para-military assault on the people of Kaneshatake when the municipality of Oka wanted to build a golf course and condominiums on historic and disputed land that was an ancient Indigenous sacred burial ground (Mackey, 2002, p. 112).

its own citizens. This de-normalized production of their identities locates them precariously in the hierarchy of the national space.

2.2.5. *Divide and Rule (Disciplinary Partitioning and Hierarchical Regulation)*

In the classic divide and rule technique, Foucault (1977) contended that the practice of classifying and dividing individuals or groups of individuals enacts a relationship of force where a different “truth” can appear and the “penetration of regulation into ... everyday life through the mediation of the complete hierarchy ... assured the capillary functioning of power” (pp. 197-198). In these unequal relations, power can be maintained and reinforced through “dividing practices” (1982, p. 778) that detach groups within themselves or from others. He argued that these practices objectify people by dividing the normal and the not-normal, the sane and insane, safe and dangerous, or healthy and sick. Foucault (1978b, p. 93) described power through its capacity to enable the strategic configuration of unequal force relations, “which, by virtue of their inequality, constantly engenders states of power”. The grid performs “disciplinary partitioning” (1977, p. 199) which effectively divides the population and creates the space of exclusion for those designated as not-normal. With the norm as the point of reference, knowledge about individuals or groups can be used to classify and arrange them vertically along the grid in an order of visibility. Based on knowledge instruments such as disciplinary expertise, statistics, projection studies, and forecasts, certain individuals or groups are made more visible for their “deficit” of normality. Visibility is the condition where identification enables the application of “disciplinary techniques with regulative methods”.

Not only is knowledge organized, selected and transmitted based on the order, but the condition for the centralized control and management of individuals or groups is also based on this hierarchical order. This centralization of disciplining and regulatory techniques creates a similar circular pattern as the ones used by the court of the monarchy. They operated under a set of practices that maintained and reinforced the power of the king. The grid defines the field of intervention by determining who is to be disciplined by surveillance, training, usage, or punishment. It defines who is invisible and who escaped the gaze of regulation. As an example, Foucault (1997/2003, p. 183)

cited the role of universities in implementing these disciplinary processes where the proliferation of knowledges falls under the discipline and regulation of the institution. By repressing the multiplicity of knowledges, the grid of intelligibility set up by the university succeeds in controlling the production and the transmission of knowledge. Furthermore, a rule of relations is also set up where different levels of expertise are conferred on individuals as authorities in the universities to maintain the hierarchical order of the social relations and to centralize the control of knowledge production and dissemination by consensus.

The crux of Foucault's (1978b, p. 95) analysis of power is neither the aims nor objectives of its intendants nor the targets of the exercise of power but the processes that made its exercise possible. How are individuals constituted by what is "known" about them and what are the consequences of being "known"? Foucault (1978b, p. 105) pointed out as examples the individuals or groups of individuals who were singled out for visibility through normalizing discourses in 18th France since they were "privilege[d] objects of knowledge, who were also targets and anchorage points for the ventures of knowledge": children and their sexuality, women and their "hysteria", couples and their Malthusian reproductive capability, and individuals and their "sexual perversions". The visibility of those deemed not-normal, or of "peripheral sexualities" (p. 39) renders them objects of discipline and regulation or targeted for "lines of attack" (p.146). In 18th century France, infant behaviours were scrutinized and sexualized in the campaign for the health of the species. Women's emotional states were scrutinized and medicalized to safeguard family and society. Child-bearing couples were monitored and regulated to foster or curb procreation. Forms of perverse sexual behaviour were defined and analyzed for instances of fetishist deviance from normalized human biological instincts.

This normalization mechanism is also manifested in our current educational practices. Special education professor Dudley-Marling (2004) cited our practices of socially constructing learning disabilities in schools through tracking and ability grouping, age-graded instruction and evaluations based largely on assessing differential rates of learning. He contended that these practices are based on a normal distribution on a bell curve without taking into consideration the system of interactions in the place called "school". These practices also produce student identities such as "learning disabled", "developmentally delayed", "at risk", "special ed", or "challenged", which are ascriptions

that bear negative effects on their lives in and out of school. De-normalizing individuals or groups also make them more visible as objects of knowledge and thus subjects them to “normalizing” processes where they were under constant surveillance.

2.2.6. Panopticism

In his work on the penal system, Foucault (1977, p. 200) referred to visibility as a trap. He used Bentham's principle of panopticism where a spatial arrangement was used to keep a visible target disciplined through surveillance. Given the prison set-up as the spatial arrangement and partitioning of the guards and the prisoners, the privilege and power of the unseen guards enabled them to make objects out of the visible and segregated prisoners. Not only were the guards separated from the prisoners, but the prisoners themselves were separated from each other. Taking this dividing and isolating arrangement beyond architecture and into human consciousness, we could describe the panoptic consciousness as one where the panoptical power is conferred on the invisible (through the unverifiable presence of its gaze) that is able to put the visible under surveillance. This uncertainty of the surveillance sustains the power of the invisible by assuring its function regardless of its presence where the observer that sees is never seen, but the observed is seen but does not see (1977, p. 200). In panoptic consciousness, self-regulation can therefore be enforced without an enforcer and be administered through the internalized sense of discipline of the observed. This internalized sense of discipline is a powerful process for the self-objectification of the isolated individual because it gives an illusion of autonomy since there is “nothing” to resist. In Foucault’s prison, the prisoners, who were isolated in their cells, could not resist the guards who they could not see or whose presence they could not verify. Perhaps that is why identifying the intendants is not as important as knowing how the process of self-objectification takes place on the part of the prisoners who had learned to behave as if they were constantly under surveillance.

Foucault (1997/2003, p. 61) contended that the principles of exclusion and segregation are the standard practices of a normalizing society. These practices strengthen the position and the rationale for controlling its population by generating methods for self-policing and for distributing the exercise of power down a hierarchical order under the guise of a neutral virtue: protecting or defending the society. This

panoptical order creates partitions between the invisible normalized groups and the visible and known not-normal groups, thus enabling the multiple relations to be automatized through disciplinary and regulatory social practices. Bio-power rests on this automaticity that renders the exercise of power invisible with no “king”; yet, it is able to maintain the unequal relations of force needed to sustain the economy of the make-live or the let-die functions where the dominant groups can keep the subjugated groups in a disadvantaged position.

Foucault (1997/2003, p. 255) explained that forms of power relations first serves to fragment and divide; then these relations establish a set of conditions that he called a “relationship of war: In order to live, you must destroy your enemies”. As an exercise of bio-power, it is a relationship where I “make-live” myself and allow you to “let-die”. He was quick to emphasize that this is not an adversarial relationship in the simple political sense but the elimination of threat and the preservation or improvement of the bio-power system. Thus the suspension of freedom and denial of injustice is often accompanied by a “greater good”. In the 18th century, the supervision of women’s bodies through the medicalization of “hysterical women” was necessary for the protection of the health of their children and the future generations of society (Foucault, 1978b, p. 104).

Foucault by no means structured the mechanisms in the way I have listed them here. He did not delineate the six mechanisms as succinctly but he described each process extensively in his different publications. They function as different aspects of a whole process to effect the logic of the bio-power system. I am presenting them in the form above for the sake of clarity so they will be recognizable as we apply them later to the discourses in multiculturalism and multicultural education.

These six concepts of bio-power as described above help us understand how the technology of bio-power is still prevalent in societies today when we problematize how individuals are objectified when they are constituted by power effects. We could frame unquestioned mundane practices as the normalization of an individual or group to justify the “let-die” function of bio-power on another individual or group.

Stoler (1995) contended that the effect of this normalization process is what underlies the discourse of the “permanent social wars” (p. 69) that plague modern

societies. Using the broadest sense of evolutionism, Foucault (1997/2003, p. 256), described bio-power as the “struggle for existence among species, the selection that eliminates the less fit” which was also a way of regenerating one’s self. Thus, the perpetuation of the disciplinary practices generates and entrenches power in those who perpetuate the system. In his analysis of societal power relations, he described social injustices like racism (and I would add sexism, homophobia, classism, ageism, “loser”-ism and other forms of social partitioning) as a de-normalizing mechanism that “justifies the death function in the economy of bio-power” (p. 258) on individuals or groups of individuals. This justification opens the path for the administration of rules or measures to determine and maintain a particular dynamic of power relations.

Relationships are always relations of power, and when we fail to take into account ourselves as embedded within this web of relations, or when we ignore it, we could inadvertently be objectified or we could objectify others (Foucault & Lotringer, 1996, p. 144). The concept of bio-power introduces a notion of power that is not always exercised in repressive violent ways but in the establishment and maintenance of unequal relations between subjects where they can act upon each other or allow themselves to be acted upon as objects through rational and justifiable means. Foucault’s (1997/2003, p. 110) historical analysis of institutions illuminates the permanent feature of social relations as a “war”, whether it is through the social order established by institutions or individual relationships between people (Foucault & Lotringer, 1996, p. 143). By locating power deep in the nexus of social relations instead of as an abstract relation of repressive forces, Foucault defined the exercise of power as the material structuring of the “possible field of action of others” (1982, p. 790) where there is always resistance. He posited that power and resistance co-exist because “resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power” (1978b, p. 95). Relations of power are constant struggles against power exercised upon us as subjects due to the “recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of freedom” (Foucault, 1982, p. 790). He argued that “power is exercised only over free subjects and only in so far as they are free” because freedom is the condition for the exercise of power (p. 790). The need to exercise power presumes there is “freedom’s refusal to submit” (p. 790). A careful look into how Foucault’s concept of the individual within relations illuminates the ways in which individuals can resist the objectifying mechanisms of bio-power by

subjectifying themselves as they strive to protect what Fanon (1952) concluded as that which is most human to man: freedom.

2.3. Recovering the Subject – Choosing to “Make-live”

“To reveal relations of power is, in my opinion at any rate, to put them back in the hands of those who exercise them” (Foucault, 1996, p. 144)

While the section above sheds light on how the objectification processes of bio-power to constitute individuals and to subject them to dehumanizing let-die functions, this section will look into the possibilities of Foucault’s (1982, p. 785) notion of resisting objectification by subjectifying ourselves and by constituting ourselves through discovering other fields of action instead of being limited by what has been handed to us. We might allow a “delinquent” student to fall through the cracks of the school system since he manifests the characteristics of the “delinquent” label as described in the school manual, or we could shape our own actions to help the student succeed by disrupting the “delinquent” status and exploring possible ways he or she might be helped to succeed. Instead of asking “who” is subjugating the student for “what” objective, perhaps we should ask “how” or what ways we might help thwart the power effects on the student since we are aware of how power has been applied to him or her. It might be more helpful and empowering to ask how the student came to be labelled “delinquent”. The value and power of Foucault’s conceptualization of the mechanisms is in how we disrupt their function.

While Foucault’s (1982, p. 778) work on power in the field of 18th century madness, sexuality and criminality discussed how individuals are made into objects constituted by the mechanisms of bio-power, his quest was to examine how “a human being turns himself into a subject”. His extensive descriptions of how power relations are enacted, reinforced and reproduced through different mechanisms indirectly show us how we are constituted by those mechanisms and how we participate not only in the “rules of universal but on the grounds of historical rationalities” (Foucault, 1988, p. 148). Unmindful of the various social changes, historical events, and political rationalities that shape our daily practices, we participate in perpetuating oppressive or let-die functions

of bio-power. For even with the best intentions, any program could become a tool for oppression when we blindly accept as truth the knowledge produced for us because we forget we are much freer than we feel and that knowledge could be criticized and destroyed (p. 10). Foucault (1997/2003, p. 45) argued that we need not ask how, why or by what right subjugation takes place, but as I have done with the mechanisms above, we must show how actual relations of subjugation manufacture individuals and create the basis for multiple subjugations. To recover our subjectivities, we could resist the objectifying ascriptions on us and fashion ourselves even within the system of power relations based on our power to produce, disrupt or even not to produce knowledge.

Lest we assume that power works in oppositional logic, Foucault stated that “power is everywhere” (1978b, p. 93). He conceived of its function and effects as omnipresent because it circulates in the web of relations that constitutes social interactions. The conditions that set the possibility for the exercise of power could be of reproductive or resistant nature. Since power is reproduced through its continuous exercise, it implies the presence of a constant resistance. This was illustrated in Foucault’s (1978a) essay on the concept of the dangerous individual, where he explored the fissure at the centre of the legal machinery in the case of the man who refused to reveal or defend himself in court (p. 17). It was an act of freedom where the power of the subject to resist had often been underestimated. By letting the judge condemn him without letting the judge base the condemnation on what could only be a fragmentary knowledge of his identity, the man established his power to be judged based on his actions, and not on an essentialized reduction of who he was as a man. Understanding how identities are constituted by social practices points to the importance not only of how our identities are ascribed to us, but also how we commonly attach identities to individuals or groups. When we examine the actions that we often take for granted, it might be helpful to see how it plays into the make-live and let-die paradigm of bio-power. Our exploration into recovering our subjectivity deserves scrutiny both into how we are made objects by others or ourselves through the technologies of bio-power, and also into how we could be subjects who reject our objectification and who reject the objectification of others. How are these actions possible? How does one resist objectification?

Although this “progressively governmentalized” (1982, p. 793) form of bio-power that normalizes and divides individuals or groups of individuals through the objectifying production of knowledge has been exercised increasingly in modern democracies, it was an ancient practice in Europe. Going as far back as the 11th century, Foucault (1997) described how the tension between the Norman conquerors and the conquered Saxons demonstrated the arbitrary and shifting relations that made one group dominant and superior over another. It was not a relation by “natural right” or the establishment of sovereignty. He argued that political, economic and juridical conflicts are just as easily coded, articulated and transformed by dividing practices into discourses where any characteristic can be strategically coded using a new vocabulary as an instrument for conflict and to position individuals or groups of individuals in a hierarchical order. This fragility is important to note because we discover that this strategic production of objectifying knowledge contains within itself the impetus for its resistance because the process of inclusion implies the corollary exclusion that takes place. For each unitary body of knowledge: what are the knowledges being diminished or silenced? When cultures are being valorized, what aspects of lives are being discounted?

Foucault (1997/2003) suggested that theoretical unities can be suspended and destroyed (p. 6) and subjugated knowledges can be resurrected (p. 7). He posited that discourse after the 18th century ceased to play the organizing role with the loss of sovereign monarchical rule, creating a lacuna where we are able to constitute ourselves (1996, p. 16). By promoting new forms of subjectivities (Foucault, 1982, p. 785), we might be able fashion ourselves free from the limitations set on us by the grid. If the grid serves to contain the multiplicity of possible actions, might resistance constitute the production of a new grid or the privileging of another grid? Although Foucault’s framework provides strategies for resistance, he does not give specific tactics to counter-homogenizing discourses. However, he did point out the emperor’s nakedness by unveiling the disciplinary constraints that disguise the exercise of power. This liberates us from accepting the nudity in silence and from being unknowingly complicit in normalizing the hypocrisy. This emancipation can be practiced at the multiple points of the relations we engage in. If we understand the mechanisms and the techniques of power that it is in its exercise and not its possession that it produces effects, what are the implications when we realize that we are the conduits of power that reproduce

unequal relations and objectify individuals? How do these mechanisms illuminate the ways in which multicultural education produces objects and perpetuates existing power relations?

In exploring the mechanisms of knowledge production and the techniques of knowledge subjugation, normalization, division and regulation practices, we discover that subjectification can also be practiced as freedom to subvert the knowledge that objectifies and to reject the normalizing and dividing practices that segregate. The constant struggle within the grid of intelligibility to contain and manage multiplicities represents the fragility of the seeming stability of the grid. Resistance to the grid can be exercised through the same mechanisms that constitute the grid itself. Beyond interpreting and analyzing historical forces, we are able to put ourselves in the strategic position of modifying the power relations by disrupting the mechanisms and their techniques.

In this chapter, I summarized Foucault's notion of bio-power: how it emerged after the fall of the monarchy in the 18th century to its current bio-political form. I also described how the six concepts of bio-power work as mechanisms in the objectification process. By providing a framework for how bio-power functions, these mechanisms give us the conceptual language of their use and the possibilities for resisting or subverting them.

In the next chapter, I give an overview of multiculturalism in Canada and the debates surrounding it through the lenses of bio-power. I also demonstrate some of the contestations in the discourse of multiculturalism since its introduction. Next, I will discuss three other discourses (Colonialism, Culture, New Racism/White Privilege) through the lenses of bio-power that intersect with those on multiculturalism in order to show how practices in multicultural education have been shaped by the interaction and overlap of the multiple discourses.

3. Multiculturalism and Bio-power in Canada

Since the creation of the United Nations after World War II, the upholding of its universal system of human rights has been endorsed by all western liberal democracies. Respect for universal human rights has been the ground rule for negotiating the increased demographic diversity of nations due to postwar population displacements and movement (Vertovec, 2010). Claude (as cited in Kymlicka, 2007a) posited that minority group rights were subsumed under the protection of individual human rights for the “larger interest of making the nation state secure and its institutions stable”. Because nation-building and postwar reconstruction involved the integration of diverse populations, multiculturalism emerged as the “dominant integration conceptual framework” (Duncan, 2005) of the western democracies in the decade between the 1960s and the 1970s. Its adoption and conceptualization has not been seamless and unproblematic in Canada. Hébert (2002) argued that multiculturalism as a social and civic paradigm has been taken up in different ways by different nations, it continues to “live in a plurality of guises which rests upon the specific developments of political, social and cultural pluralism in each country” (p. 15).

3.1. Multiculturalism in Canada

3.1.1. *History*

Multiculturalism has been defined and interpreted in many ways. For this study, I examine its specific historical context in Canada before I discuss how multiculturalism was conceptualized. As a settler nation caught between retaining a tenuous Anglocentric hold and the management of its diversity, Canada's history of imperial colonization is a narrative of its struggle with its diversity since its Confederation in 1867 (Day, 2000; Mackey, 2002; Willinsky, 1998). Kymlicka (1995) described Canada's diversity as being complex because of its multinational and polyethnic nature; it is beset

with a diversity other countries do not have: national minorities, indigenous peoples and various minority immigrant groups.

To understand why multiculturalism was such a triumphalist beacon of the Liberal government in the 1960s, we need to know about Canada's history of struggle for nationhood. Although the 1931 Statute of Westminster recognized Canada's independence from Britain, people in Canada remained British subjects until the Canadian Citizenship Act took effect in 1947, finally making them autonomous legal citizens of Canada (Bloemraad as cited in Macklin & Crepeau, 2010). It was not until the patriation¹ in 1982 that Canada was handed full control of its Constitution (Paul, 2009, p. 1). Quebec refused to sign it because it implied the tie to and the recognition of the British Parliament, creating a state of constitutional irregularity that is still in place to this day. As an example of the strong British legacy, Champion (2006) pointed out that the maple leaf on the Canadian flag was a product of the British world in design and implementation. He narrated how the Canadian flag debate in 1964 was a "British coup" by "a small cadre of Anglo-Canadians in the government" (p. 69) where French Canadians and ethnic groups were largely excluded. Dominated by the British majority since Confederation, Canadian society was characterized by what John Porter (1965) called a "Vertical Mosaic"². In this seminal book on social inequality in Canada, he argued that social class formation had been based on a hierarchy structured along ethnic lines with little chance for mobility for those who are not of Anglo-Celtic stock. Day (2000) also contended that a modern nation-state like Canada continues to be hampered by the colonial legacy of the Great Chain of Race (2000, p. 191), which he described as the system where humans are classified according to assigned ethnocultural characteristics in a hierarchical order. As an official acknowledgment of this ethnocultural diversity, multiculturalism appeared to be the perfect solution to the

¹ Patriation is an exclusively Canadian term that refers to the 1982 adoption of the Canadian Constitution in Ottawa. The event formally handed over all legislative control to the Canadian Parliament and eliminated the necessity of British Parliamentary approval on certain motions (Paul, 2009, p. 1).

² The "vertical mosaic" is John Porter's metaphor of the class and power structure of the society where a system of privilege is maintained in an unequal hierarchy (Porter, 1965).

two main issues troubling Canada at the time of its introduction in 1971: national identity and equity in diversity. These two issues were unequivocally intertwined. Day (2000) stated that the national unity and identity of Canada have always been grounded on “the fear of conflict and disorder that permeates the Canadian discourse on diversity” (p. 157).

As Canada reached its centenary in 1967, the project of developing a national identity was of paramount importance (Osborne, 1996). Responding to commentators about Canada being the world’s “first post-modern country” (p. 51), Osborne described Canada’s national identity as distinctly not distinctive. The challenge was to create a pan-Canadian identity that was both independent of Britain and differentiated from the United States. As a nation that never revolted against Britain like the United States, Canada was not a postcolonial state but remained a nation ambivalent about being “a legatee and executor of Empire and settlement” (Champion, 2006, p. 91). Kymlicka (2003) posited that the shift in the 1960s from the “‘deferential’ and ‘communitarian/conservative’ Canadian identity” (p. 363) to a more liberal and “kinder, gentler” (p. 365) nation was to wean itself from Britain. This new liberalism also initiated a need to forge a distinct identity in order to counter a “deeper-seated sense of Canadian inferiority vis-à-vis the United States” (p. 365). To maintain its humanitarian philosophy and to resist Americanization, Canada developed a set of social policies, emerging as a modern welfare state in the 1970s (Durst, 2006; Osborne, 1996). Though it shared the same basic liberal democratic values as the United States, Canada provided its citizens with more than basic individual human rights. It established social institutions to provide public services like education, health care, pension, and unemployment services. Despite the ambivalent relationship that Canada had with Britain as one of its imperial settlements and with the United States as a neighbour with shared history, Horowitz’s (as cited in Kernerman, 2005) statement reflects Canada’s national identity as still caught in between the two nations: “the key fragment in Canadian political culture is liberalism...” but the “roots of Canadian socialism are in the Tory fragment brought to Canada by the Loyalist” (p. 30). Breton (as cited in Mackey, 2002) described multiculturalism as a symbolic intervention right after Canada’s centennial celebration in 1967 to redefine the Canadian nation still tethered to the British model of a “tolerant” and “superior form of justice” (p. 64). In a reaction vis-a-vis the

assimilationist “melting pot” metaphor of the United States, multiculturalism also offered Canada a new narrative with the equitable “mosaic” that was more liberal (Bannerji, 2000; Day, 2000). The concept of the mosaic also represented Canada’s departure from its assimilationist history to its desire for a culture of respect for its diversity stemming from its humanitarian ideals of universal human rights and civic liberalism (Durst, 2006; Kymlicka, 1995). Canada’s commitment to civil liberties with the Multiculturalism Act formed part of its international human rights obligations, as stated in part of the preamble of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (Kymlicka, 2007a):

AND WHEREAS Canada is a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which Convention recognizes that all human beings are equal before the law and are entitled to equal protection of the law against any discrimination and against any incitement to discrimination, and to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which Covenant provides that persons belonging to ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities shall not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion or to use their own language; (see Appendix A, p. 1) (1985, p. 1)

The overriding principle of the Multiculturalism Act was to create a unifying national identity that defined Canadian nationhood. The four main goals of the Act can be summarized as follows (Dewing & Leman, 2006; Edwards, 1992; Moodley, 1986):

1. assisting all cultural groups in their efforts to develop the capacity to contribute to Canada;
2. assisting members of all cultural groups to overcome barriers to full participation in the Canadian society;
3. promoting creative encounters among groups in the interest of national unity;
4. assisting immigrants to learn at least one of the two official languages of Canada.

Acknowledging the diversity of the Canadian heritage, the policy affirmed that the diverse groups that made up Canada have equal rights and opportunities to live their differences, whether these are in conscience, religion, beliefs, language, race, language,

and ethnicity (Canadian Multicultural Act, 1988). The rights are to be protected and differences are to be preserved, respected, and recognized and there should be no discrimination based on these differences. The Act affirmed that the differences would be respected, that contributions of different groups would be recognized, and that barriers to their participation in the Canadian society would be eliminated. The egalitarian precept to accommodate the needs and claims of the traditionally marginalized and vulnerable minority groups demonstrated a departure from Canada's historical exclusion of these groups. The intent of the Act was to send a message of pluralism as a view of state and society, instead of a unitary concept of citizenship, in order to cut loose from the narrative of the nation's xenophobic past (Hébert, 2002, pp. 15-17). Day (2000) and Osborne (1996) described multiculturalism as a shift from an ethnocentric history of Anglo-Canadian agenda that had systematically deployed "excluding, containing, and deporting" (Day, 2000, p. 144) its Others to an agenda that formally harnesses the vitality of the nation's diversity as part of its identity. The Multiculturalism Policy was officially legislated in 1988 in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, where its basic tenets were incorporated into Section 27 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom. Canada became the first nation to have a state-initiated Multicultural Policy (Bannerji, 2000; Kymlicka, 1995).

But multiculturalism did not settle gently into the national imaginings of Canadians. It was passed amidst controversies from all sides. To better understand the debates over multiculturalism, we need to understand how it was perceived and received given the historical context inside Canada at the time of the policy's introduction. Since the Multiculturalism Policy consists of an agenda on government minority relations, we need to take into consideration the positions of these minority groups vis-à-vis the multicultural policy.

3.1.2. *Minority Groups*

Like most western democracies, Canada had been moving towards a more liberal agenda since signing the UN Declarations of Human Rights in 1948. There was a spread of competing claims for equity from previously marginalized and excluded groups that emerged in the 1960s as decolonization movements abroad began and civil rights consciousness spread globally (Warren & Sue, 2011). However, the demands of

feminists, organized labour, and different religions were not considered as divisive as the demands of some of these diverse groups, namely the Quebec Nationalists, Aboriginal peoples, and immigrants, who were seen as real threats to fostering social cohesion and to forging a humanitarian national identity. The concerns and the quests for equitable participation of these three latter group in Canadian nationhood were complex and varied. It is important to note that the point of departure of multiculturalism in Canada is the notion of the liberal democratic values shared by all Western democracies (Kymlicka, 2003). The faith in its potential for equity was tied up in the belief that the protection and exercise of equal rights would build social cohesion and national solidarity. This liberalism undergirds the vision set out by the Multicultural policy to achieve social cohesion and to foster positive racial relations (Moodley, 1995). Supporters of liberal multiculturalism like Kymlicka (1995) extolled the balance it could provide between individual rights, the accommodation of cultural differences, and the promotion of social cohesion (Nugent, 2006). A brief look into the historical experiences of the groups affected by the policy will help us better understand the debates and critiques regarding the Multiculturalism Policy.

3.1.2.1. Quebec nationalists

In Porter's (1965) analysis of social class and power in Canada, "it became clear that the Canadians of British origin have retained, within the elite structure of the society, the charter group status with which they started out, and that in some institutional settings the French have been admitted as a co-charter group whereas in others they have not" (p. xiii). Citing Arsenault, Day (2000, p. 103) described how the British Council of Victors in 1710 voted to deport the French population except for those who adopted Protestantism so the Crown could replace them with Protestant families from England or Ireland.

Historically constructed as the "Acadian problem" (Day, 2000, p. 103), the French Canadians were subjected to several of the British let-die solutions for diversity, which were considered to be "gentler" than those of the other groups: deportation, assimilation, and finally, toleration. Arsenault (as cited in Day, 2000), though, has documentation of instances where physical elimination was applied when the other methods failed. The history of the British management of this "problem" reveals the development of bio-

power techniques to maintain the rule of relations between the British and the French colonizers.

The imposition of British laws and political institutions failed to assimilate the “intractable” (p. 105) French Other despite various measures of containment and sporadic instances of capitulation. The British finally gave the “gift” of religious tolerance, linguistic freedom and liberal political institutions with the passing of the Quebec Act of 1774, setting the reluctant conciliatory tone for the relationship between the two charter groups (Day, 2000; Elliot & Fleras, 1992; Mackey, 2002). The different techniques to contain this group of Other illustrate the hierarchy of let-die practices applied on the French-Canadians in the struggle between the two groups.

In the 1960s, the Quiet Revolution in Quebec initiated a series of social and political changes in the province that continued to drive a wedge between the English and the French. The emergence of a secular political faction, the Quebec Nationalists, in a province previously dominated by the strong Catholic Church that has been battling English domination and control, increased the determination to establish Quebec as a distinct society with its own official language. During this period of liberalism, the tense relationship eventually led to the creation of the Official Languages Act of 1969, which conferred equal status on the French as an official state identity and as a co-charter group (Innis as cited in Moodley, 1995). Despite official party representation at the Parliament, the separatist ideals of Quebec continued to hound the nation. The federal government made two attempts to negotiate amendments to the Constitution during the 1987 Meech Lake Accord³ and the 1992 Charlottetown Accord⁴ in order to get Quebec to sign on to the Canadian Constitution. Both failed to fulfill the Francophones’ demand for extra-societal status (Paul, 2009). Adding a sore point to the already tense relations between the French and the Aboriginal nations, the Meech Accord was blocked by Elijah

³ The Meech Lake Accord was a constitutional referendum to negotiate a reconciliation with Quebec to “heal the wounds” of 1982 Constitutional exclusion (Mackey, 2002, p. 111).

⁴ The Charlottetown Accord was the second referendum for amending the 1982 Constitution so Quebec would endorse it in exchange for “distinct society” status. (Mackey, 2002, p. 111).

Harper, an Aboriginal member of the Parliament, who had been negotiating for territorial rights on behalf of indigenous peoples (Mackey, 2002). Two Quebec referendums on secession were held in 1980 and 1995 with the separatists losing by narrow margins. The House of Commons currently recognizes Quebec as a “nation inside Canada” (p. 3). But as we shall see later, symbolic acts not followed by legal developments only deepened the animosities and eroded the trust and goodwill between the two groups. This struggle continues to be characterized by the development of subsequent means to determine the hierarchy of their relations.

For the Quebecois, the Multiculturalism policy was another strategy by the Anglophones to undermine the French as a national minority. Moodley (1983) argued that by supporting ethnic revival and diversity, the state had subverted Quebec’s agenda to build a distinctly French Canadian culture. Nugent (2006) argued that multiculturalism was a subtle denial of the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society. She indicated that the Trudeau government enacted the policy as a “cultural bulwark against Quebec nationalism” by equating the national status of Quebec to the ethnic status of the polyethnic groups. This manifests the mechanism of bio-power to subjugate the truth of Quebec’s distinct culture and status. The ‘truth’ of the discourse on multiculturalism and bilingualism maintained the unequal status of the French as a co-charter group by focusing on the language rights but not the cultural rights as a distinct society. The Francophones reasserted their cultural hegemony by articulating their own vision for integration. Eschewing Trudeau’s statement during the introduction of the multicultural policy that “although there are two official languages, there is no official culture” (Kernerman, 2005, p. 94), the Francophones developed their own policy of Interculturalism. They claimed that it was more republican and more focused on integration to a common public culture (Nugent, 2006).

3.1.2.2. Aboriginal Peoples

Since their first contact with the Aboriginal peoples, the Europeans have relied on the Aboriginal peoples for labour, skills, and knowledge of the land and its resources. The sovereignty and capabilities of the Aboriginal nations were recognized, as is evident in early colonial documents of 1826 where the British settlers indicated:

that Indians constituted separate and sovereign peoples subject to their own law, who were capable as nation[s] and tribes forming and breaking alliances with colonial powers, and who had national or tribal territories under their control (Smith as cited in Dickinson & Wotherspoon, 1992, p. 409).

However, the cooperation and recognition did not prevent the subsequent exploitation and extermination of the Aboriginal population in Canada. Their treatment has been Canada's "national tragedy and a disgrace" (Elliot & Fleras, 1992, p. 158). As the Other of the New World, the Aboriginal peoples were a "problem" because they possessed the resources that the colonizers wanted (Elliot & Fleras, 1992; Day, 2000). As objects in the mechanism of bio-power, they were produced as lacking the "primary markers of civilization, reason, and religion" (Day, 2000, p.75). They were subjected to disciplinary measures constituted by "civilizing" practices like conversion and assimilation as de-normalized objects. Community development and social policy researcher Robert Harding (2006) belied the authentic intent of the European colonizers to assimilate and civilize the Aboriginal people; the construction of the Aboriginal population as "semi-human, semi-civilized, semi-useful" savages (Day, 2000, p. 77) was to justify their eventual extermination, the ultimate let-die function. Harding (2006) argued that the real "problem of the settler nation was not so much the unassimilated Indians but because successfully "assimilated 'Indians' would compete for land and create problems for the settlers" (p. 228). Dickinson and Wotherspoon (1992) contended that the relations between the colonial powers and the Aboriginal peoples have always hinged on the economic expansion, or the make-live functions of the European colonizers and the belief in European racial superiority, which is a logic embedded in the grid of intelligibility that justified the "burden" of its civilizing mission.

The exploitative relationship between the Aboriginal peoples and the colonial powers eventually shifted to total domination in the middle of the 19th century when the fur trade declined and the British started consolidating their colonial power. That was the beginning of their full disenfranchisement in 1846, when the Aborigines Protection Society took away their lands and banned them from any public official affairs (Dickinson & Wotherspoon, 1992). The Indian Act of 1867 legislated the total domination, control and containment of the Aboriginal peoples under the federal government. Their rights were contained within the grid of the federal recognition process where the system of

identification could confer Aboriginal identity and where different levels of status were assigned based on this identity. They were excluded from their territories and confined to reserves governed by the federal government; bands lost their self-governing powers and their legitimacy to lead their own people. The Gradual Civilization Act in 1857 enabled the federal government to start schools on Indian reserves. For almost a hundred years, these Residential Schools were run by different churches: the Catholic, the Anglican, the Presbyterian, and the United churches (Fenwick, 2001). In these institutions, the systematic subjugation of their Aboriginal heritage rendered the Aboriginal children as objects devoid of culture except for what was “distributed” within the institution. Cultural genocide was able to accomplish what physical genocide did not. Fenwick (2001) argued that the social “problems” created by the let-die functions persist to this day due to the effects of the “concerted campaign to obliterate Aboriginal languages, traditions, and beliefs compounded by mismanagement and the woeful mistreatment, the neglect and abuse of many children at the Residential Schools” (p. 33). The Aboriginal population is still considered a “problem” and a drain on taxes and resources as issues of poverty, alcoholism, crime and suicide are regularly highlighted without the concomitant analysis of the impact of the Canadian government’s long history of colonial domination on their population (Harding, 2006).

The Aboriginal peoples joined the activism of the 1960s and demanded the recognition of their land rights and the honouring of their treaty claims. Since then, there had been some changes in the Indian Act through decades of negotiations, most of which are still being negotiated today (Satzewich & Lioudakis, 2007). Attempts to correct historical injustices are complicated by the system of designating Aboriginal identity set up by the federal government over a hundred years ago. The effect of the dividing practices continues to segregate and to determine their restored rights differentially. The Indian Act divided the Aboriginal population by status in order to distribute privileges and to apply restrictions, a differentiation strategy totally alien to the communal culture of the Aboriginal populations (Satzewich, 2011). Colonization had not only dispossessed them socially, economically and politically, but it also precludes them from any decolonizing political practices like other colonized nations because of the persistence of the legacy of the colonial relationship. It is important to note that when the United Nations General

Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007, Canada was the second to the last nation (just before the United States) to sign in 2010.

St. Denis (2011) contended that multiculturalism does not take into consideration the continuing colonization of the Aboriginal people. As the most disadvantaged group in Canada (Nagey, Larque & McBride as cited in Day & Sadik, 2002), the Aboriginal peoples perceived multiculturalism as another strategy of the “paranoid colonial-settler nation” to counter the “fear of loss of Europeaness or Whiteness and the lifestyle and privileges” (Hage, 2002, p. 419). Day and Sadik (2002) described the liberal multiculturalism of Canada as a “postcolonial ‘solution’ to a colonial ‘problem’” (p. 5). The Aboriginal peoples were not only subjected to cultural genocide and loss of sovereignty; they were also subjected to the racialized⁵ policies of Canada. They were constructed and positioned within the hierarchy of the excluded Others in the vertical mosaic within a grid that has been denying their rightful historical status within the nation.

As the indigenous population of Canada, the Aboriginal peoples refused to be defined as belonging to the racialized ethnic minority because their demand for self-government is undermined by the Multiculturalism Policy. St. Denis (2011) argued that the Policy minimized the significance of the Aboriginal peoples in Canadian history by subsuming them under the multicultural recognition of cultures. She contended that the recognition and protection stated in the policy do not address their fundamental rights to their territories and self-government. The Aboriginal peoples’ desire for self-government has been attacked as “a regressive form of ethnonationalism” (Day & Sadik, 2002, p. 9) and even as a form of racism (Lawrence as cited in Satzewich, 2011, p. 57). The Aboriginal peoples maintain that their status requires a “nation-to-nation relationship” (Day & Sadik, 2002, p. 9) and not a state-to-citizen relationship like the other ethnic

⁵ Racialization is the condition for racism that involves historically produced patterns of cultural representation, knowledge production and social organization that gives meaning to biological, cultural and social differences; it is always relational where one group is always racialized in relation to another (Stanley, 2011, p. 9).

groups. Furthermore, Day and Sadik (2002) also emphasized that as indigenous nations, the Aboriginal peoples across Canada have different treaty agreements and land claims that have to be negotiated separately.

Multiculturalism conflates the status of the Aboriginal peoples with the racialized visible minorities, thus undermining their status as the Founding peoples of Canada as well as their land claims and treaties, where the homogenization of all racialized groups served a political agenda (Dhamoon, 2009; Moodley, 1995). As an election ploy of the Liberal government, multiculturalism was used to garner ethnic votes, which were critical in light of Quebec nationalist separatism (Moodley, 1995; Paquet, 1989). Although the Aboriginal population grew as a result of increased birth rate, decreased mortality and increased Aboriginal identification, the comparatively faster growth of other visible minorities due to higher birth rate and continued immigration gave the immigrants more electoral power than the Aboriginal nations, driving a deeper wedge between the two groups.

Through the knowledge apparatus for objectifying the racialized population in Canada, multiculturalism was a means to contain and manage them within the same grid. Belanger and Malenfant (2005) used the 2001 census to examine the projected population of the visible minorities in Canada for the 150th anniversary of the Confederation. They stated that the visible minority population in Canada as of 2001 constitutes 14% of the total population. Visible minorities are defined as “persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour” (Employment Equity Act as cited in Statistics Canada, 2006b). By 2017, this group is projected to reach 21%, an approximate 50% increase. That means a quarter of the total Canadian population and half of the population in major Canadian cities will consist of visible minorities (Belanger & Malenfant, 2005; Cardoso & Pendakur, 2008). In the Statistics Canada Projection of Aboriginal populations from 2001-2017 (Statistics Canada, 2006a), the Aboriginal population of Canada surpassed the one million mark in 2001. Having a younger median age and a higher annual rate of growth, the Aboriginal population is projected to reach almost 1.4 million by 2017 (Statistics Canada, 2006a). By examining the population of these two racialized groups in Canada, the Aboriginal peoples and the visible minorities, it is easy to discern the rationale of the grid for conflating the two groups for political expediency. Although the Aboriginal peoples and

the different ethnic groups share the search for equity and social justice, the path to redressing their historic and current injustices are different. To conflate them only devalues them further and generates more acrimony that divides the two groups even further in the mechanism of a grid that both objectifies and divides in order to rule more expediently.

3.1.2.3. Immigrants

Amidst the tension between the “two founding nations” (Satzewich & Lioudakis, 2007, p. 30), and the civilization-to-recognition policy for the Aboriginal people (Day, 2000), the third group that threatened the social cohesion of Canada was the multitude of immigrants who have been arriving in Canada even before Confederation. Citing Broad and Antony, Bokhorst-Heng (2007) suggested that the multiculturalism framework established “multiculturalism” to be about this group of “Other”, exclusive of those with British or French heritage, since the rapid diversification of the population in the 1960s was due to immigrants from non-European countries. She characterized the Multiculturalism Policy as both an opportunity and a constraint in the national narrative of multiculturalism. Trudeau framed the policy as an affirmation of the freedom of individuals’ choice of cultures where they will not be “locked for life within a particular cultural component by the accident of birth and language” (Trudeau as cited in Bokhorst-Heng, 2007, p. 645). Bokhorst-Heng pointed out that Trudeau’s construction of individual freedom and choice is limited and ethnocentric. Echoing McIntosh’s 1988 work on white privilege, Bokhorst-Heng argued that visible minorities do not have that choice because they are locked into their cultures by their visible difference.

The immigration history of Canada has always reflected its conflicting assimilationist political and capitalist economic policies to create Porter’s “vertical mosaic” in Canada (Bokhorst-Heng, 2007, p. 50). The hierarchy of immigrant desirability determined the policy as well as the social political discourse on immigrants. This tension between balancing economic and social priorities of Canada’s immigration policy persists to this day. Sandercock and Brock (2009) and Ward (2002) cited the historical trajectory of the explicitly opportunistic immigration policies to create a White Anglo Canada prior to 1967. Simmons (2010) defined current Canadian immigration policy as a continuing political-economic and cultural process. Citing historical instances and the

recent events since 9/11, Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009) argued that Canadian “national security” had also become one of the top criteria of the immigration agenda.

Like most countries in the process of nation building at the turn of the twentieth century, Canada has relied on the constant influx of immigrants from different countries as the means for Canada to populate itself and to sustain its economy. Today, Canada is second only to the United States as a top immigrant receiving country due to its declining birth rates and its aging population.

Canada has always actively planned, managed, and controlled its immigrants. Citing Tie, Aiken (2007) stated that the pre-Confederation immigration policy of Canada was to appropriate lands from the Aboriginal peoples and to render the lands productive as soon as possible. There was unrestricted entry for anyone who could come and till the land. The Anglo-only policy was suspended in order to fill the settlements with agriculturalists and farm workers; but it was assumed that if the newcomers were not Anglo-Saxons, the next desirable group, the Europeans, would be welcome (Day, 2000). Replicating European imperialism, Canadian immigration law had always imposed restriction based on race: Jews and people from Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean were excluded or subjected to discrimination and restrictions (Aiken, 2007). In 1967, Canadian immigration policy shifted to the Points System as part of the move to its more liberal commitments. Potential immigrants were assessed based on independent qualifications like education, skills and training. Since then, most immigrants are from non-traditional source countries in Africa, Asia, and the Americas; this is a huge shift from the immigrants who arrived from Europe after World War I (Aiken, 2007; Arat-koc, 1999; Citizenship & Immigration Canada, 2010). Using this “race neutral” Point system policy for immigration, Canada is not only able to select immigrants based on skills and work experience, but also, in terms of their ability, to bring available capital to facilitate immediate participation in the Canadian economy (Mitchell, 2001).

The wave of immigrants from non-Anglo nations has always raised concerns regarding cultural homogeneity in the project of nation building. Discriminatory treatment of immigrants have dotted the history of Canada like the groups of Europeans who suffered discrimination and exclusion, as exemplified by the experiences of the Doukhobors and “Galicians” (a catch-all category for all people from Eastern Europe),

and the Germans and Italians who were interned during World War II (Day, 2000). However, Reitz and Sklar (1997) documented the fairly rapid assimilation of European-origin immigrants when compared to racial minority immigrants because “foreignness” is ascribed universally to all racial minorities “based on skin colour, regardless of specific culture, identity, behaviours, or network affiliation” (p. 233). The visible minorities in Canada also include different ethnic groups who arrived in Canada before 1967. The racialization process have produced all non-whites and non-Aboriginals as “immigrants”. In Reitz and Sklar’s (1997) study of racial minorities, they concluded that social and economic discrimination occur simply on the basis of skin colour alone; they discovered that these visible minorities are treated as “foreign” regardless of culture and that racial disadvantages have no relation to ethnic or cultural retention. This is not surprising given the let-die functions like the deportation, exclusion, and internment of the different groups of racialized Others in Canadian history.

More recently, Dhamoon and Abu-Laban (2009) warned of the dangers of racializing “foreignness” in light of the harassment and suspension of the rights of Muslim-Canadians since 9/11. By conflating national security and inassimilable cultural differences, nativism has become permissible nationalism during this time of “war against terrorism”. Nativism as a strategy in North America to partition “natives” and “foreigners” emerged in the early 1900s when anxieties about the wave of immigrants fleeing European economic dislocations arrived to pursue the American dream. These “foreigners” were constructed as “a threat to democracy” (Banks, 2002, p. 9). Johanson and Glow (2009) referred to Davidson’s work to explain that nationalism in white settler nations like Canada has always been historically “underpinned by patriarchal, capitalist, and racist values Such values are written into the very fabric” (p. 386) of the nation’s “federation, its major public and social institutions, and its traditions and celebrations” (p. 386). Day (1998) cited the various forms of nativism in Canadian history such as the Vancouver anti-Asian riot in 1907 and the internment of the Germans, Italians, and Japanese during World War II. Since 9/11, this same nativistic “protection” also undergirds the production of Muslim-Canadians as a “national security danger”.

Ethnic groups in Canada are well aware of the historical production of the foreignness that has contributed to their exclusion which could not be erased by the Multiculturalism Act (Dhamoon, 2009; Satzewich, 2011; Stanley, 2011). The Act was

seen as a double-edged sword for those whose foreignness has always been under scrutiny, if not attacked. The racialized ethnic groups in Canada are still ambivalent to this day; they have concerns about whether the recognition of their differences will actually result in respect or equity or will mark them as a threat to social cohesion and national identity. They see the Multiculturalism Policy as purely rhetorical and symbolic; yet, they are expected to celebrate the beneficence of the policy (Kymlicka, 2003; Lee, 2007). Research has shown that immigrants are the main beneficiaries of the Multiculturalism Act as the policy instruments direct funding to English language programs and the festivalization of cultures; but these panopticing measures have also made them targets of reactions against multiculturalism (Harney as cited in Ungerleider, 1992; Jedwab, 2008; Lee, 2007; Moodley, 1983). One recent example would be the MacLean's article on the "enrollment controversy" which suggested the limiting of Asian students in top universities in Canada because the universities are becoming "too Asian" (Findlay & Köhler, 2010).

3.1.3. *Conceptualization and Debates*

As we discovered from the responses of three of the diverse groups in Canada, multiculturalism has come to mean so many things that it is apparent that its reception has been shaped by the different historical and political aspects of their relationship to the Canadian state. Instead of defining it, I hope to explore the multiple ways it has been conceived and discover the ways it has not been explored as an instrument of state policy. Despite the different responses to multiculturalism, it is important to interrogate its multiple conceptualizations and debates because it carries political energy that has material consequences on the lives of individuals and groups of individuals. This is apparent from the general reactions of the three minority groups in Canada as discussed in the previous section, where we could see that the unproblematic assumption of the benevolent and unifying aspirations of state-initiated multiculturalism still leaves many questions unanswered if we do not look into the different discourses that overlap and intersect.

Canadian multiculturalism emerged during the socio-political changes in the 1960s. Although it was legislated and constitutionalized, the Policy did not take effect in a vacuum but was part of Canada's long history with its diversity. Kymlicka (1995)

posited that Canada has always faced unique challenges in its form of diversity. He described Canadian diversity as being multinational and polyethnic in nature. He distinguished the French and Aboriginal population as “national minorities”, each group having its own history, distinct culture and language, geographical territories, and its desire for autonomy and special political status within Canada. The multiple ethnic groups who came to Canada are what Kymlicka referred to as the “polyethnic groups”. This differentiation between the national minorities and the polyethnic groups helps clarify the nature of their competing claims. In describing Canada's struggle with its inherent diversity, Day (2000) traced the tense assimilationist beginnings of Canada from the French “Acadian problem”, the “Indian problem”, and the “problem of Immigrant Diversity” to the present day liberal multicultural approach as Canada’s history of dealing with “this amorphous heap of problematic Others” (p. 128).

Political and economic changes and the concomitant social and cultural changes in the past forty years have not made the policy any less controversial. If anything, it has become even more contentious. Citing Angus and Kallen’s studies, Day (2000) described Canadian multiculturalism in three forms. The first is descriptive, where multiculturalism is a sociological, or demographic, fact of Canada. Second, multiculturalism is a prescriptive social ideal; and the third is a conflation of the first two, both descriptive and prescriptive, where multiculturalism as a policy is both a response and an implementation of the ideal. Day (2000) argued that problems emerged when the federal government conflated the first two and gave the policy its fictitious history that a sociological reality has become an “already achieved ideal” (p. 6) with the legislation of the Multiculturalism Policy. It becomes clear how a Canadian public intellectual like Kymlicka (2004) could write about marketing Canadian pluralism abroad for humanitarian reasons and how Prime Minister Harper (Reuters, 2009) could boast of Canada as the envy of the G20 nations and as having no history of colonialism. Moodley (1983) described multiculturalism as resembling the emperor’s new clothes, referring to the tendency to confuse myth and reality, which has only contributed to the obfuscation rather than the understanding of the discourses on multiculturalism.

Satzewich and Lioukakis (2007) provided a helpful description of how the liberal schema framed the multicultural policy in a variety of ways. The call for cultural pluralism created “an image of Canada as an equal, tolerant, and fair society”

(Satzewich & Liodakis, 2007, p 126). It also secured a neo-liberal advantage for Canadians to participate more successfully in international trade as cosmopolitans embedded in a society of diverse cultures and languages. They also contended that subsuming the policy under the Canadian Heritage umbrella represents the civic agenda in fostering participation and inclusion. What could be wrong with a Western liberal notion of equality, progress, and order?

The liberal Multiculturalism policy has not escaped critics from both sides of the political spectrum in Canada. The Right claims that it has resulted in the national “fragmentation in the face of economic globalization and growing cultural diversity” (Sears & Hyslop-Margison, 2006, p. 20) and contributed to “ghettoization and balkanization” (Welsch, 1999, p. 197). The Left claims that the policy does not address the realities of discrimination and unequal power relations. Furthermore, they argued that the policy created a “fallacious construction” (Day & Sadik, 2002, p. 11) to contain all its Other into multicultures, homogenizing and reducing their cultures to fossilized attractions on special occasions. The only aspect on which both sides agree is its divisiveness (Broudy as cited in Sleeter, 1996).

The ongoing debate manifests the limits of western liberalism in addressing the issue of diversity in Canada. It stems from an ahistorical and rational concept of diversity (May & Sleeter, 2010). Solomos (2001) reiterated Guttman’s argument about the key dilemma of liberal multiculturalism: the inherent individualism of liberal political thought contradicts the neutral and universalizing impersonality of treating everyone as equals. The framing of universal equality circumvents the material inequality and unequal power relations of Canadian society (Bannerji, 2000; Dhamoon, 2009; May & Sleeter, 2010; Satzewich & Liodakis, 2007). Warren and Sue (2011) decried the universal abstraction of sameness and equal-ness of multiculturalism as “notoriously power evasive” (p. 45). Even Canadian political philosopher Taylor’s (1994) treatise on the politics of recognition of communitarian multiculturalism conspicuously avoided the power-evasive articulations of liberalism. Without interrogating the power structures that produce unequal relations, liberal multiculturalism assumes that individuals have choices regarding their ascription, recognition, representation, and access to resources (May & Sleeter, 2010; San Juan, 2000).

Mackey (as cited in Henry, 2002) revealed that in the Legislative Briefing Book obtained through an Access to Information request, there were three important points emphasized during the debate over the proposal of the Multiculturalism Act in 1988. The first stated that the policy was meant to be highly symbolic. Second, the approach to equity was not to be adversarial, and last, the “non-coercive approach emphasized cooperation, encouragement, awareness, and persuasion” (p. 236). These three points are what Troyna (1993) described as the process as symbolic condensation, where “benevolent multiculturalism” limits the policy to a no-friction symbolic form; therefore, the state agenda is able to endorse a “festive aura of imaginary consensus” (Moodley, 1983, p. 320). Troyna (1994) also cited how Edelman’s concepts of symbolic political language and condensation symbols are appropriated by political discourses through the “manipulation of ambiguity” (p.79) in order to obfuscate principles and prescriptions. Condensation symbols are designed to create symbolic stereotypes and metaphors to appease critics and to frame solutions in ways that may be contradictory or ambiguously related to the way critics initially viewed the issue (Edelman as cited in Troyna, 1994). Within the grid of its liberalism, Henry (2002) asserted that multiculturalism provides a veneer for liberal pluralist discourse in which “democratic values such as individualism, tolerance, and equality are espoused and supported” (p. 238) without disrupting the wider structural forces that shape the power relations of the society.

The myth of the harmonious multicultural mosaic has produced two contradictory effects. On one hand, research and theorization in the field of social justice have grown. Since the 1990s, there has been a proliferation of multicultural scholars extending their work beyond diversity and into anti-racism and social justice (Banks, 2004; Dei, 1993; Dei & Calliste, 2000; Henry, Tator, Mattis & Rees, 1995; Sleeter, 1996; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). The field of White Studies has emerged (Carr & Lund, 2009; Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008), where white privilege and ethnocentrism are currently problematized in more productive ways than just negotiating guilt and victimhood. On the other hand, the myth permits the complacency and blindness over any ethnic or racial disharmony. It indulges the fantasy that colonialism and racism are in the past, sanitizing history in the process (Warren & Sue, 2011). The proliferation in the public articulation of anti-immigrant sentiments can take place without any mention of race yet effect let-die functions on those ascribed as “immigrants” (Bauder & Sharpe, 2008). Satzewich

(2011) described the continuing effect of the gender bias in the Indian Act that deprives Aboriginal women of identifying themselves as “Registered Indian”, therefore denying them accessing to social services that make-live them. The distance between the promise of the harmonious mosaic and the centuries of Eurocentric assimilationist ideals could not be easily bridged. Therefore, it is helpful to remember that the multiculturalism policy was a federal response to the demographic reality of diversity. As a theoretical ideal for social harmony, it has not dismantled the centuries of ethnocentrism that underpin western liberalism (Day, 2000; Day & Sadik, 2002; Moodley, 1983).

3.2. Multiculturalism: Some Intersecting Discourses

In this section, I discuss some of the other discourses on multiculturalism that also shape practices in multicultural education. Although historically and conceptually distinct, I show how three other discourses, namely colonialism, culture, and new racism/white privilege, intersect with multiculturalism through the lenses of bio-power. It will become apparent that all these discourses overlap. I begin with the colonial history of Canada and its link to multiculturalism. Then, I examine the rationale behind the focus on culture in multiculturalism, where culture becomes the object of knowledge in order to avoid the language of race. This leads to the discourse on new racism and white privilege today. Why and how did white supremacy in the colonial period seem to “disappear” in the 1960s? Looking into these discourses will enable us to understand why culture instead of race is discussed in the discourses on multiculturalism.

By using bio-power to frame the following discourses, I also explore how the relationship between power and knowledge positions individuals or groups discursively in a web of power relations constituted by material and structural inequities. These relations are the outcome of the way knowledge in a particular society is organized, the way institutions are structured, and the way discursive practices shape and establish power relations.

3.2.1. Colonialism and Multiculturalism

By drawing on Foucault’s notion of bio-power, we begin to understand that colonization is a manifestation of how bio-power functioned as a European liberal

technology to manage populations in colonial Canada, and how multiculturalism is an extension of the same bio-politics that is intersecting with the neo-liberal policies in institutions. The same thread of liberalism and the same mechanisms run from the colonization agenda to the multiculturalism policy and to the global logic of neo-liberalism in our society today. Referring to liberalism, Foucault (2004/2007, p. 48) argued that this “ideology of freedom is the condition of development of modern ... capital forms of economy” and serves as the framework for bio-politics (Foucault as cited by Senellart in Foucault, 2004/2007, p. 383).

Classical liberalism, also called “liberal humanism” (Gray as cited in Bonilla-Silva, 2010, p. 26), was the core of modernity’s challenge to the philosophical, economic, cultural, and political changes of the feudal order. It manifests in a certain set of characteristics: individualism, universalism, egalitarianism, meliorism, rationality, and the framing of everyone as “equals” (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; May & Sleeter; Thayer-Bacon, 2008).

This study is not a critique of liberalism but a call for deliberation on the liberal policies that have shaped modern democracies since the waning of the feudal order under monarchical rule in Europe, of which multiculturalism is but one. Bonilla-Silva (2010) pointed out that modernity, racialization, colonialism, and liberalism are products of the same historical movement. By analyzing the emergence and mechanisms of liberal bio-politics in the 18th century, we examine “what kind of assumptions, what kind of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought” (Foucault as cited in Mackey, 2002, p. 4) undergird our social policies today. Even the two prominent scholars on Canadian multiculturalism Will Kymlicka (2007a) and Charles Taylor (2002) did not transcend the epistemological and philosophical liberal blindness to the structural relations in history and the ones currently in place. Their work reflects the patriarchal notion of re-rationing of rights and recognition based on the grid of liberal intelligibility. When we examine the effects of liberal policies like multiculturalism, we need to problematize the issues of society today beyond the abstractions of widely held liberal values like democracy, equality, and tolerance (Banting & Kymlicka, 2006; Garnett, 2004; May & Sleeter, 2010). What are the material effects of liberal politics on society? How has the liberal logic shaped the power relations of free and rational individuals in the society through knowledge production?

Liberal politics in Canada did not start with the multicultural policy. This political thought spread to the Americas with the arrival of the first European colonizers who brought their “civilizing missions” (Abdi, 2009; Stoler, 1995). By examining how bio-power functioned in Canada with the arrival of the Europeans, we might understand more clearly the logic and function of the Multicultural policy. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 120) conceptualized governmentality to characterize the state’s power to discipline and regulate the governed, similar to “the way techniques of segregation were to psychiatry, techniques of discipline were to the penal system and what bio-politics were to medical institutions”. Likening the exercise of bio-power in the 18th century institutions to statist power, “governance is the exercise of command, of a constant, zealous, active, and always benevolent prescriptive activity” (p. 122). Stoler (1995) described the governmentalization taking place in post-monarchy Europe in the 18th century as a colonization of its internal Others: children, women, and homosexual men. She contended that with this “internal conquest and invasion within” (p. 60) its borders in order to contain and manage its Others, it was inevitable that the exercise of bio-power spilled over into its colonial ventures. Stanley (2011) contended that by the time they dominated Canada, the European colonizers had already developed their techniques of colonization and the liberal politics of bio-power. Employing the “bifurcation of the social fabric” (Stoler, 1995, p. 60) as the modus operandi of bio-political power, Canada's history has been punctuated with the make-live and let-die principles of bio-power where different groups have been objectified as “dangerous” to the nation and where the constant production of knowledge and techniques to manage it persists to this day. The French and British settlers initiated the perpetual social war not only with each other, but also with the Othered groups: the Indigenous Others and the diverse groups of immigrant Others. There are other invisible and normalized groups within Canada but these historically de-normalized groups have constantly been objectified in the process of state racism, a tactic that Stoler (1995, p.59) described as the internal fission of society into divisions to create “biologized” internal enemies against whom the society must defend. It should be noted that these are the groups being panopticed under the Multiculturalism Policy.

Postcolonial writers like Fanon (1952), Said (1978), Spivak (1988) and Stoler (1995) belied the benevolent justifications of the colonial project. These justifications of

the colonial project range from the civilizing mission of the “savages” to their liberation from paganism and ignorance. The production of this myth masks the fact that the scramble for land and resources had proven to be the defining and enduring legacy of the colonial occupation (Harding, 2006). The grid of colonial intelligibility maintains the benevolent myth on which the colonial vision and its attendant policies were based. Day (2000) described the “European methods imported” (p. 73) by the French and British settlers as solutions to the problem of managing the diverse Others they encountered. The beginning of the colonial period in the sixteenth century saw the monarchical form of power where the Aboriginal peoples was under constant threat of death and where the decimation of their population went unrecorded as in the case of the Beothucks⁶ whose existence is still under contention (Day, 2000). The exercise of the non-sovereign nature of bio-power in the eighteenth did not alleviate the situation of the Aboriginal peoples. The subjugation of knowledge with regards to their culture and history as well as the ongoing land claims and treaty rights negotiations have resulted in the continuation of disenfranchising let-die functions to this day. Stanley (2011) described the normalizing process where European colonizers were produced as “native” to the territory while literally removing the Aboriginal peoples from both the space and the knowledge of the nation.

Let-die functions of the colonial bio-power were exercised on the other groups as well. Li (2008) described the consistent legislation targeted against Chinese-Canadians with a series of policies like the Head Tax, vote prevention, and school segregation. The Chinese-Canadians were consistently produced as “aliens” and “interlopers”; the Indo-Canadians were “invisible” and the Japanese-Canadians were “dangerous” (Stanley, 2011). Stanley (2011) argued that state racism was already built into governmental processes and later into Canadian state systems, including the knowledge instruments like the census, where populations were constituted based on race. As early as 1871,

⁶ The Beothucks, a tribe native to Newfoundland when the British arrived in 1583, is described as the “vanished race”. Their extermination might be so total that there is scant and inconsistent official record of their existence. Hence the myth of the “vanished race” (Day, 2000, pp. 91-94).

the Census of Canada had “Whites: 11,500; Chinese, 3,000; Blacks, 300; Kanakers, 200”. It is important to note that the Indigenous nations were not included.

Day (2000, p. 93) contended that the colonial policies and practices since 1769 foreshadowed the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988. Zizek (1997) argued that under multiculturalism, the State posits each culture the way a colonizer treats its colonized. The seeming articulation of equality and tolerance of the policy masks the unquestioned rule of relations embedded in the society where the freedom of social, political and economic mobility is actually shaped by forces that maintain the prevailing order. Liberalism provides the language for the national mythology that construes Canada as a “peacekeeping nation” and as innocent of colonization, slavery, and discriminatory legislation, as was clearly expressed by Prime Minister Harper at the G20 2009 Summit.

When the Multiculturalism policy was introduced four decades ago, it was a social ideal for a nation divided by high levels of cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversity. It articulated a vision of national cohesion made possible by the recognition of and the tolerance for Canadians of diverse origins. Framed in its liberal, albeit patriarchal, spirit of equality for all, multiculturalism was met with a cultish zeal that Bissoondath (as cited in Cameron, 2004, p. 118) claimed has silenced its critics for fear of being called a racist. A state-sponsored initiative to build a pluralistic society, the Multiculturalism Policy has all the rhetoric befitting an advanced civilized democratic nation. As is often the case, the relationship between policy prescription and lived practices is never linear. Four decades have proven the Policy to be framed in “hollow liberalism” (Garnett, 2004, p. 8) that is grounded in the vision of equality and rationality. But the Policy instruments and practices reflect the make-live functions of bio-power to maintain unequal relations of power that were in place since the colonial period. The developments brought about by technological and global changes during the past few decades have highlighted the reality of the diverse nature of the Canadian population, yet not much has changed with regards to the exercise of bio-power employed to manage differences in the past three centuries. How have power and knowledge functioned to enable the technology of bio-power to maintain discrimination and exploitation? How have knowledge and power continued to maintain the uneasy history of relations in Canada?

Willinsky (1998) cited the “intellectual interests of imperialism” (p. 26) as a function of the relationship between power and knowledge. Describing the colonial agenda as an apparatus for defining and extending the privileges of the West, he contended that the formation of the Royal Society by scientifically minded Londoners and Oxford dons in 1660 was not simply coincidental with the spread of British imperialism. It was eventually followed by the Royal Asiatic Society in 1824, the Royal Geographic Society in 1830, the Royal Botanic Gardens in 1841, the Royal Anthropological Institute in 1843, and the Royal Colonial Institute in 1868. The strategic institutionalization of knowledge was crucial in maintaining the imperial order and interests with the expansion of the empire. The deployment of scholarship became a valuable tool for the “intellectual mercantilism” (p. 32) that drove the universalization of bodies of knowledge in the colonization process. Institutions legitimized the production of the non-Anglo Colonized Others in ways that justified the let-die functions. Racialization enabled the panoptization of the marked Others.

Stoler (1995) stated that racialization, as the “organizing grammar of an imperial order” (p. 27) of colonialism, was not fully biologized and institutionalized until the 19th century. Since then, science has been serving the Western colonial agenda through the notion of “race”; it has become the measure of civilization to rationalize the let-die functions like elimination, exploitation, and exclusion of racialized Others (Satzewich & Liodakis, 2007; Stoler, 1995; Willinsky, 1998). Even the attempt to dislodge the notion of race by the UNESCO Statement of Race in 1950, which states that “all men belong to the same species” (Montagu as cited in Willinsky, 1998, p. 169) could not erase the legacy of the colonial construction of Otherness because it had been an effective instrument “to rationalize the hierarchies of privilege and profit, to consolidate the labour regimes of expanding capitalism, [and] to provide the psychological scaffolding for the exploitative structures of colonial rule” (Stoler, 1995, p. 27). As we shall see, racialization continues to be an enduring rule of relations that has “divided up the world” (Willinsky, 1998). It has been a constant tool for partitioning and hierarchizing populations. It remains so within modern democracies in the continuing discourses framed by racialization but masked in the institutional language of liberalism.

Describing the role of governments in defining discursive fields in the exercise of power, Lemke (2001) posited that the political rationality of institutional policies needed

to be examined through their technologies of power and their forms of knowledge. Mills (as cited in Abowitz & Harnish, 2006) contended that “institutions and social context . . . play an important determining role in the development, maintenance, and circulation of discourses” (p. 679). Abowitz and Harnish (2006) argued that although civic meanings shift and fluctuate with political, economic, and technological changes, institutions remain the dominant sites of civic discourses given the State’s presumed neutral and just position in a liberal democracy. Multiculturalism was similarly grounded on knowledge production and accumulation. Quoting Pettman, Banerjee and Linstead (2001) contended that multiculturalism often translates as the acquisition of knowledge for the purpose of servicing and managing minorities. It was one of the means to manage the multiple fractures of Canada by shifting the racialized discourse on diversity to culture instead of race.

3.2.2. *Why Culture?*

In the 1960s, when “race” had become an empty scientific term and racialization had become an unacceptable practice for civilized polite societies (Satzewich & Liodakis, 2007), multiculturalism provided the “veneer for liberal-pluralist discourse in which democratic values such as individualism, tolerance, and equality are espoused and supported without altering the core of a system that marginalizes racial others” (Henry, 2002, p. 8). Instead of racialized Otherness, multiculturalism has appropriated culture as the object of knowledge in order to objectify the Cultural Others. Frederickson (as cited in Lee, 2007) contended that “culture could be reified and essentialized to the point where it becomes the functional equivalent of race...As a racialized signifier, culture is used to differentiate and discriminate self from others” (p. 275). Thus, it seems acceptable to criticize other cultures of “barbaric cultural practices that tolerate spousal abuse, honour killings, female genital mutilation, forced marriage, or other gender-based violence” (Citizenship & Immigration Canada, 2011, p. 9) than to see different forms of unjust patriarchal practices that cut across cultures. The reification of cultural practices that are decontextualized from their cultural milieu shapes the production of all individuals thought to be associated with those practices. Instead of culture as lived experiences intersecting with other historical, social, political, and economic factors, culture has been used as a static label to consign persons into spaces on the grid of

multicultural intelligibility where some cultures are normal and invisible while others are “different” and visible.

Dhamoon (2009) contended that both Kymlicka (1995) and Taylor (1994), as privileged producers of knowledge, have naturalized culture as a pre-social aspect of identity because it valorizes culture as a stable and valuable index of individuals and because it constructs cultures as bounded entities that can be judged, objectified, and made visible. Banerjee and Linstead (2001) contended that multiculturalism's focus on culture results in the consumption of culture, thereby setting the rule of relations where minority cultures are panopticed and framed as objects with fixed characteristics based on the de-normalization of their cultures, thus reducing the members of the cultures into consumable spectacles. In this objectifying panoptical process, Kazmi (1997, p. 340) further asserted that multiculturalism “museumifies” cultures by reducing them to inert and decontextualized pieces of social reality. Thus, instances of honour killing and practices of shark's fin eating are barbaric cultural acts rather than examples of universal acts of patriarchy and animal cruelty.

Furthermore, multiculturalism enables the state to commodify culture itself by appropriating and marketing it as the “diversity” in a neo-liberal economy where cultural diversity is itself capitalized. David Smith (2006) located the beginnings of widespread globalization and its attendant neo-liberalist ideology during the era of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher in the early 1990s, when the cold war ceremoniously ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall and capitalism made its unbridled escalation, taking over the global economy. Multinational corporations grew into transnational corporations, overriding state agenda, redefining what Smith described as “in purely economic terms the essential character of what it means to be human” (p. xxii). Mitchell (2003) and Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2008) pointed out how the notion of diversity has been appropriated into a commodity for the global marketplace. Cultural artefacts, such as totem poles, lost their meanings, as they became proud symbols of Canadian “diversity”. Immigrants welcomed under the neo-liberal immigration policies have been re-inscribed as “investors and entrepreneurs”. Mitchell (2004) further articulated the intersection of multiculturalism and neo-liberalism in the production of Canadians as “self-reliant” (Arat-Koc, 1999), and “economically productive and contributing to national and global competitiveness” thereby justifying the immigration program based primarily on capital

contribution to the Canadian economy with the expansion of the Business and Investors classification (Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2008). Mitchell (2004) demonstrated how Canadian identity is a complex and evolving notion shaped at the intersections of race and political economy. New Canadians are introduced to the fact that “a belief in ordered liberty, enterprise, hard work, and fair play has enabled Canadians to build a prosperous society” (Discover Canada, 2011). Mitchell (2004) and Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2008) posited that multiculturalism is being “unplugged” by the neo-liberal agenda, where one's position on the grid of transnational intelligibility is determined by market demand and productivity. The production of the cultural Other made it an object easily managed in the grid of the neo-liberal intelligibility to serve political or economic agendas. Bonilla-Silva (2010) warned against this thread of abstract liberalism under the guise of the market economy, which constitutes a new racial ideology wherein the colonial gaze never blinks as let-die functions continue with the changing state agenda.

3.2.3. *New Racism and White Privilege*

The depoliticization of race by emphasizing culture in multiculturalism has created a “new racism” (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Satzewich, 2011; Stanley, 2011; Troyna, 1993). By sidestepping the issue of racialization, multiculturalism has led to stereotyping individuals by their ethnic origins even if the objective of the Policy was to confer on them the right to practice their ethnic cultures. Bokhorst-Heng (2007) stated that the Policy effectively defined the boundaries of the racial discourse amidst all the rhetoric on equitable participation and equal protection against discrimination (Government of Canada, Article 5(1)(d); Article 5(1)(g), 1988). Dhamoon (2009) maintained that multiculturalism depoliticized racialization by focusing on culture and ignoring how it is intertwined with racialization. Therefore, multiculturalism normalizes the impact of white supremacy by shifting the focus to difference and tolerance. In examining the familiar nativistic narratives in the critiques of multiculturalism, Lentin and Titley (2011) concluded that the current rejection of multiculturalism is a central strategy in “laundering the increasingly acceptable forms of racism”. The appropriation of apolitical terms like multiculturalism to transcend political boundaries succeeded in practicing what British philosopher Martin Barker called “new racism” where racist language is strategically avoided and its practice is obscured (Satzewich, 2011; Stanley, 2011; Zizek, 1997). Citing that new racism is premised on the belief that it is human nature to form groups of

the same culture, Troyna (1987) defined multiculturalism as an ideology where a national identity could be constituted by a plurality of cultures without interrogating the relations of power. Describing new racism as “subtle, institutional, and apparently non-racial” and not “in your face” (p. 210), Bonilla-Silva (2010) described colour-blindness as such a practice by “otherizing softly” (p.3). Akin to Stoler’s (1995, p. 25) description of the discourse on race in the European historiography as possessing a “polyvalent mobility”, he also asserted that the racial ideology is constituted by changing frameworks where we now have “racism without racists”. As a deed without a doer, the techniques of racism go unabated yet invisible. Therefore, if you are for multiculturalism, you could not be a racist; and if you are against multiculturalism, you are a patriot who advocates national cohesion and unity. How do racism and multiculturalism intersect?

James (2008) argued that within the Canadian discourse on multiculturalism, culture is used to signify race and difference and is a code for race in order to mask the inherent racism of the Canadian state. As such, Canada is able to rationalize the treatment of its racial minorities, yet claim that it does not differentiate people by race or skin colour, but that differences are seen to be related to culture. To cite an example, Minister Jason Kenney of Canada’s Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration announced a new decree in December of 2011, where Muslim women who wear hijabs or niqabs will be banned from citizenship ceremonies (Cohen, 2011). Calling the practice “bizarre”, Minister Kenney described it as “counter to Canada’s commitment to openness, equality, and social cohesion”. Effectively de-normalizing a cultural attire and excluding its wearers as not “Canadian”. In the same *Edmonton Journal* article, Professor Abu-Laban of the University of Alberta pointed out another effect of the decree: that although very few women will actually be affected by the rule, it positions all Muslim women as stereotypically oppressed by their religion. Instances like these are consequences of multiculturalism where racism is couched in nativistic rhetoric and where the Other is produced as threatening social cohesion and subverting Canadian values and way of life (Lentin and Titley, 2011).

Satzewich (2011) argued that multiculturalism actually promotes racism by indirectly assuming there is an “Us” to recognize and to tolerate “Their” diversity. Aside from implying that there is a superior culture that is not part of the diversity, it confers on the “Us” group the power to determine the limits of tolerance and diversity. Zizek (1997)

described multiculturalism as a “disavowed, inverted, self-referential form of racism”, (p. 47) where “We” respect and tolerate “Them”. By essentializing “Them” as a static contained unity, we can maintain “Our” distance, which is made possible by “Our” privileged universal position. He further described multiculturalism as a racism that posits the “Us” in the privileged space of “no culture” in order to look upon “Their” culture, rendering “Them” visible and particular, thus asserting “Our” own universal superiority. By dividing the “Us” and “Them”, racism effectively divides and objectifies “Them”.

Warren and Sue (2011) argued that the liberal power-evasive articulations of multiculturalism have not reduced racial hierarchies. In fact, racial order has been further affirmed by multiculturalism, reinforcing the partition and hierarchicization of the divide and rule mechanism. The maintenance of cultures without interrogating the historical relations of power between the groups has bolstered white supremacy by suggesting that diversity practices have effectively dealt with racism. In Carr and Lund’s (2009) study on Whiteness, the unspoken colour of diversity and the reluctance of many white people to engage meaningfully with it help to sustain the racial order. Arguing that due to the entrenched narrative of Canada as an expansive decent nation characterized by multiculturalism and the subjugation of racist narratives, they discovered that the racist past of Canada has been met with resistance and denial and that most Canadians are not even aware of the existence of slavery in their history. Carr and Lund also contended that since racialization is a highly contentious public issue, multiculturalism promotes the false notion that liberal policies appeal to common human decency and tolerance, and negate racism in society.

The discourse on Canadian multiculturalism has promoted the myth of cultural freedom and equality of opportunity (James, 2008). By defining itself in a grid of liberalism as colour blind and defining culture as the basis for difference and diversity, Canada does not “see” race and as such, it does not have “race problems” (p. 100). Bonilla-Silva (2010) described this colour blindness as “racism lite” (p. 3), an aspect of the new racism which serves as the ideological armour for a covert and institutionalized racism in the post-Civil Rights era. He also pointed out that the beauty (or the danger) of this blindness is that it maintains white privilege. This blindness enables the make-live and let-die functions of multiculturalism to be obscured where the knowledge of the

effects of the unequal power relations are subjugated and practices of inequity and discrimination injustices continue to shape the lives of those who are not white.

In 1988, McIntosh (1988) wrote about the “invisible knapsack” that white people have never acknowledged. Referring to it as the subjugated awareness of white privileges gained from the disadvantages of non-white people, she listed the ways the racial order subtly advantages one group over another without the former acknowledging their unearned privileges. Lee (2007) described white privilege as a logic of coexistence for people who have thrived on monoculturalism and hegemony. Dua, Razack and Warner (2005) argued that the potency of whiteness is strongest in settler nations because it has been reinforced by centuries of racialization policies. National mythologies that valorize European-Canadians’ role in nation building as the model for national identity help to maintain white privilege, which often obscure discourses that are produced about the role of the non-whites. This silence on the privileged historical position of whiteness has become normalized and made it axiomatic that white people do not have to define themselves by their skin colour and subsequently, are able to see themselves as non-racialized (Aveling, 2004). This allows them to ignore or deny that racialization takes place and therefore allows them to maintain innocence in the effect of their whiteness on in the rule of relations that shapes their lives in material ways. Bonilla-Silva (2010) asserted that it is this blindness that makes reverse discrimination possible, when the privileged can claim they have been discriminated against by the equity initiatives in education and employment. Critiques of equity initiatives like Affirmative Action⁷ or Employment Equity⁸ come from two sides. As expected, those who do not benefit cry “reverse discrimination” when their make-live functions are reduced. But those who benefit also decry the panopticism it enables, compounding the discrimination they already suffer. Equity policy will not solve the systemic barriers

⁷ Affirmative Action is a policy in the United States to create more equitable opportunities for underrepresented groups by providing limited preferential treatment in employment and education (Bonilla-Silva, 2010, p. 28).

⁸ Employment Equity policy is the Canadian version of the Affirmative Action passed into law in 1986 as a response to workplace racism and discrimination (Satzewich, 2011, p. 107).

that stand in the way of the make-live functions of those who have been marginalized. Can we even imagine the pressure on an Aboriginal student from a single parent home who enters university via the equity policy but has had little preparation for post-secondary education in the school on the Reserve? Yet, should we do away with equity policies? Wu (2002, p. 133) argued that the question that should be asked about equity policies like Affirmative Action/Employment Equity is: What will we do to address continuing racial disparities? In instances like white privilege, for which no one is directly responsible, he posited that Affirmative Action/Employment Equity is one way to acknowledge and to remedy the situation of unearned privilege at the expense of other groups. But the systemic barriers should be further unpacked to take into consideration the nuances and context of the inequities (Satzewich, 2011).

However, Aveling (2004) observed that when the consciousness about the plight of the non-whites is raised, issues of guilt, fear, and alienation are also being increasingly articulated. The awareness of white privilege has grown as new racism continues to construct the racial Other albeit in “softer terms”; for example, Nieto (1999) described how the label “at-risk” (p. 20) students are identified as those who belong to cultural and ethnic minority groups. Aveling (2004) contended that our awareness of our own positionalities are grounded vis-a-vis the Other because it highlights that we are not in the Other's position. This is similar to what Said (1978) wrote about the West building its own identity through the strategic construction of the Oriental Other. This normalizing process works through the “conception of the self as the ‘average’, the ‘mainstream’, and the ‘ordinary’” and the “heightened perception of ‘minorities’ as a threat to one’s own well-being” (Hage, 2000, p. 85). The panopticizing scrutiny of the Other enables a reified construction that is particular and contrasted to the unseen universal self. A Foucaultian analysis of racialized power cannot be understood outside this corollary effect of whiteness and its privileges. Hébert (2002) stated that the daily practice of exclusion of those who are Othered shows the inadequacy of multiculturalism since “colonialist and essentialist markers of identity still persist” (p. 18). The mechanism of normalization at work during Canada’s “struggle for centuries to displace, contain, exterminate, and assimilate a growing number of problematic Others” (Day, 2000, p. 134) in order to protect the normal “Invisible Self group” (p. 129) is still in place today.

Multiculturalism in Canada performs the binary partitioning between the multicultural Other and the invisible normalized culture. The former is assigned to the periphery under the panoptical gaze of the latter. We need to understand that the technology of power does not only serve ideological productions like liberalism or capitalism. It also functions to form and to accumulate knowledge within relations of power for the function of the six mechanisms in order to organize societal relations. Foucault (1997/2003, p. 29) stated that power functions within and is immanent in the rule of these relations. It circulates through a dialectical network where individuals could both submit to or exercise this power from their locations within the network. Multiculturalism is an attempt to establish such a web of relations through techniques to supervise and to manage diversity which are implemented through symbolic political practices under what Moodley (1983) described as the “festival aura of consensus” (p. 320). Nowhere are these practices used to establish social order more apparent than in the practices implemented in schools under the banner of multicultural education.

In this chapter, I have briefly described the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the Multiculturalism Policy based on the stated objectives of its intendants in 1971. In giving a short history of the relations between the federal government and each of the three groups that constitute Canada’s issues with diversity, I have illuminated the debates surrounding the policy and the mechanisms of bio-power at work. In the second section, I used the concepts of bio-power on three additional discourses in Canada that intersect with the grid of intelligibility of multiculturalism so that we may discern how they shape some of the practices in multicultural education today.

As schools are the sites of knowledge production and a microcosm of societal relations, I demonstrate in the next chapter how bio-power is manifested in the practices of multicultural education. First, I give a brief history of multicultural education as opposed to the history of the Multiculturalism policy itself that appeared in this chapter. I also demonstrate how multicultural education has been conceptualized in British Columbia at different levels, the provincial and the local teachers’ federation, in order to highlight the complexity of the discourse and the competing intelligibilities at its capillaries. I also introduce two other discourses that surround multicultural education. I distinguish these discourses as the *modes* of and the *myths* about multicultural education, which I use to analyze practices in multicultural education. By examining the

play of discourses in the conceptualization of multicultural education, we learn that the mechanisms of bio-power also function in the common practices we take for granted and have implications inside and beyond the classroom.

4. Multiculturalism and Bio-power in Education

From its historical and political background, multiculturalism in Canada should be understood as a state initiative (rather than a grassroots initiative) that stemmed from a policy as a response to the uniqueness of the nation's diversity and the issues it was struggling with at the time of its introduction. The geographical, linguistic, cultural and demographic diversity across Canada is reflected in the fact that Canada is the only industrialized country in the world that does not have a national policy for education (Ghosh, 2004; Scott, 2001). Provincial ministries in Canada conceptualized multiculturalism based on different aspects of the policy, from celebrating differences to managing diversity, constructive engagement, and inclusive citizenship (Fleras & Kunz, 2001). A recent federal review of the Multiculturalism Policy reveals similar shifts in focus regarding the barriers to full participation in the Canadian society: from perception of the linguistic and cultural differences to the acknowledgement of discrimination and unequal race relations (Dewing & Leman, 2006). Aimed at developing equitable opportunities for diverse students, fostering positive intergroup attitudes and redefining a multicultural Canadian identity, multicultural education is conceived as a set of principles and practices where students can learn a set of knowledges, skills and values in order to live in a multicultural society (Ghosh, 1996; Kehoe, 1994).

In examining how the Multiculturalism Policy has been conceptualized in education and how it has been implemented in schools, this study illustrates the “limited and limiting” (Troyna, 1994, p. 70) notion of multicultural education practices. In this chapter, I explore the different discourses surrounding multicultural education and how bio-power has shaped them. This will help us better understand how bio-power, as it functions in education, could present barriers to fostering a plural society whereby “all Canadians, whether by birth or by choice, enjoy equal status, are entitled to the same rights, powers and privileges and are subject to the same obligations, duties and liabilities” (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1985, p. 1). Incorporated in the Multiculturalism Act and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, these values of

inclusion, anti-discrimination and equitable citizenship are representative of the ideals of all liberal democratic societies. How have multicultural education fostered these ideals?

I begin with how the field of multicultural education developed and how it was conceptualized in Canadian education. Then I give a brief discussion of the two other discourses that shape practices in multicultural education: James A. Banks' five dimensions of multicultural education as its modes, followed by some of the myths in the discourse on multicultural education in Canadian schools.

4.1. Multiculturalism: History and Conceptualization in Education

Major works in multicultural education have been initiated and developed in the United States (Bokhorst-Heng, 2007). Although the United States never officially had any multicultural policy, Johnson (2007) traced the beginnings of multicultural education there to the development of diversity policies for schools in the 1930s and 1940s. These policies and intercultural curricula emerged during a period of racial tension right after the Depression. The inclusion of culturally pluralistic issues in education was being addressed in the 1930s and eventually culminated in the desegregation of public schools in the United States in 1954 with the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*. It was during the civil rights movement in the 1960s that the process towards educating for a more socially just society was conceptualized to address other inequalities based on race, class and gender. The movement formed part of the development of the international focus on equity and human rights led by the United Nations.

When the Multiculturalism Act was passed in Canada in 1988, the multicultural education movement in the United States was already well underway. As one of the founders of multicultural education, James A. Banks traced its development to the ethnic revitalization movement in the 1960s that emerged from the civil rights movement (Banks, 2006). The Black Studies movement grew from the emancipation and desegregation struggles of the African-Americans where writings of and by African-American scholars like Woodson's *The Mis-education of the Negro* and Du Bois' *The*

Philadelphia Negro were widely published and made accessible. The inclusion of African-American curricular content and the establishment of segregated Black public schools run by African-American teachers and administrators initiated the move towards a more equitable education for a group historically marginalized in American society (Banks, 1995).

Although the civil rights movement was the main impetus for multicultural education, Banks (1995) described the earlier inter-group education movement as another antecedent of multicultural education. The inter-group education movement's primary goal was to reduce prejudice and discrimination in order to respond to the growing tension between different religious and ethnic groups which were segregated along racial lines right after World War II. Based on these two historical antecedents, multicultural education included broad goals such as the inclusion of ethnic content and knowledge and the development of egalitarian attitudes through structural changes. Multicultural education eventually came to consist of a complex body of educational research, theories, and practices that examined the interconnection of variables like race, gender, and class with academic achievement and school experiences. Multicultural education was part of the socio-political movement in American public schools to engender an education grounded in democratic ideals and in the preparation of citizens to participate in a democratic society. Hébert (1992, p. 59) lauded the achievements of multicultural education as manifested in the improvement of race relations, the reduction of ethnocentrism and prejudice, the development of intercultural consciousness and competence as well as the development of social and cognitive skills. It shares goals and intersects with other educational initiatives like citizenship education, global education, peace education, antiracist education, intercultural education, and human rights education in promoting equity, social justice, social transformation and active and inclusive citizenship (Schugurensky, 2002).

Like most educational policies in Canada, multicultural education was heavily influenced by the developments in the United States and its implementation was based primarily on the dominant North American educational traditions. The study of multicultural education in Canada is further complicated by the autonomy of the provinces and territories and the diversity across the country. This diversity was recognized 145 years ago; the British North America Act of 1867 (called the Constitution

Act of 1867 since 1982) placed the educational system of provinces and territories in Canada under the jurisdiction of each province and territory. It also placed the jurisdiction of all Aboriginal education under the federal government until a landmark policy in 1972, which, in principle, advocated for the local control and parental involvement in Aboriginal education (Hare, 2007). The ministries of the different provinces coordinate through the Council of Ministers of Education in Canada (CMEC). Primary funding for education comes from the provincial government and local school boards. The federal government's influence on education is primarily through subsidies from policies like the Multiculturalism Policy and other federal transfer payments (like the educational funding for specific groups like Aboriginal education and the families of those serving in the military). The state also indirectly funds education through equalization payments as an ongoing commitment to equality in order to prevent inter-provincial disparities in public social programs. Only New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island receive full state funding.

Multicultural education in Canada should thus be examined within this unique history of Canadian diversity and the relative autonomy in its development within each province and territory. There is no single conceptualization of multicultural education but the gap between its conceptualizations and its implementation reflects the tension between its "cultural nationalist" framework (Watkins, 1994, p. 100) and its socio-political origins. The former focused on its "safe" liberal notions of tolerance and celebration to create a pluralistic society while the latter engages in the unequal relations and structures that pose barriers to fostering a just and humane society. This tension is reflected in the diverse ways each of the provinces frame their multicultural efforts in education through time.

Moodley (1995) described the different focus of each province in its conceptualization of multiculturalism and how the inclusive policy framed the educational policies. Ontario, as the major urban gateway where most recent immigrants are concentrated, produced the *Changing Perspectives: A Resource Guide for Race and Ethnocultural Equity, K-13* as early as 1988 "to help educators toward the goal of equity in a multicultural, multiracial society" (Moodley, 1995, p. 805). Given the racial tensions in this most diverse province of Canada, the ministry focused on anti-racism, ethnocultural equity and human rights as articulated in the ministry policy document

(Ontario Ministry of Education & Training, 1993). The integration of heritage languages was included in the regular curriculum as part of the response to the policy. However, the 2009 education strategy has since shifted its focus to diversity, equity and inclusion instead of the former focus on racial and ethnocultural equity (Ministry of Education, 2009).

Each of the other provinces conceptualized multicultural education policies based on their own needs. In Nova Scotia, English is the common language shared by the majority. The province focused on race relations and cross-cultural initiatives in its educational resources and pre-service teacher education to improve relations and ease tensions with the historically marginalized Black and Aboriginal populations (Moodley, 1995; Scott, 2001). Sharing a diverse population of Europeans and Aboriginal peoples whose first languages are neither English nor French, the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta integrated heritage language programs into official school curricula (Majhanovich, 1992). Because of the significant Aboriginal population in these three provinces, they have also developed initiatives to enhance and integrate Aboriginal values, histories, languages and cultures into the regular curriculum. Alberta and Manitoba have just recently added English language lessons and cultural training for its minority population that consists of new immigrants whose first languages are Chinese, East Indian and Farsi (Scott, 2001).

Quebec's ideological opposition to multiculturalism is grounded in its historical struggle to retain its culture and language in the province (Ghosh, 2004). Moodley (1995) described Quebec's multicultural initiative of allowing minority children to retain their ethnocultural heritage through a half-day heritage school program for immigrant families. However, Ghosh (2004) noted that children of immigrants are required by local legislation Bill 101 to attend French-only school, as French is the legislated official language in Quebec. This is further reinforced by the 2003 Supreme Court decision that upheld Bill 101, despite a group of French-speaking parents who rallied to send their children to English schools.

British Columbia never developed an official multicultural education policy, though it did adopt Bill 39 in 1993 to pass the Multicultural Act of British Columbia. Through its arm, the Multicultural Advisory Council, initiatives to promote and to support

the multicultural programs have been coordinated throughout all the government ministry and corporations. The annual *Reports on Multiculturalism* by the Multicultural Advisory Council in the past decade have documented its plans and progress. These reports focused on support for language learning, employment equity and Aboriginal education. Initiatives to promote social justice and antiracism were left to various independent organizations like the British Columbia Multicultural and Intercultural Education Council (BCMIEC) and the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (BCTF). With the constant stream of new immigrants in British Columbia, the policy on languages takes precedence over other concerns. English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and resources were organized for students from pre-school to elementary and secondary levels.

Given the above summary of how the multicultural policy has been framed in different provinces, the rest of this study will focus on multicultural education in British Columbia, where demographic diversity continues to increase rapidly due to immigration, where historical persecution of minorities is well-documented, and where the Aboriginal peoples are still negotiating land claims and treaty rights. For this study, the context of British Columbia presents excellent opportunities for studying the practices in multicultural education.

4.1.1. Ministry Level

The BC Ministry of Education published *Diversity in BC Schools: A Framework* in 2008 (see Appendix B), detailing its commitment to the recognition and the honouring of diversity in the province. The Ministry's notion of diversity encompasses the initiatives for equity in the areas of multiculturalism, human rights, employment equity and social justice. The goals of multiculturalism and its support for Aboriginal peoples include: development of cross-cultural understanding, elimination of racism and systemic and attitudinal barriers to full and equitable participation, and the development of culturally responsive services to meet the needs of the communities. Grounded in various federal and provincial legislations as its guide, the instrument reflects the social justice vision of the Multiculturalism Act.

In 2007, the ministry approved a course, *Social Justice 12*, for secondary schools where teachers and students explore different aspects of social inequities in society. Despite some resistance because it was developed as part of a settlement of a Human Rights case brought to the Ministry of Education, the pilot program of Social Justice 12 has been made available to all school districts in B.C. Responses have been contentious, but its introduction and implementation in some school districts are significant steps.

In 1997, the Council of Ministers of Education Canada (CMEC) required all provinces and territories to “review curriculum and learning resources to ensure they are free of racial, ethnic, cultural, gender, and socio-economic bias” as reflected in the UNESCO Recommendation Against Discrimination in Education report on the status of Canada (CMEC, 1997, p. 8). Furthermore, the province launched EmbraceBC in 2002, a community-based project to fund initiatives that promote multiculturalism and eliminate racism. Curiously, it is the key partner of WelcomeBC, the province’s framework for welcoming newcomers to the province, implying that multiculturalism and racism are current issues being attended to. This connection signals a shift in the priorities of the ministry to the linking of multiculturalism to the production of diversity as part of the grid of neo-liberal ideology where the social ideal of multiculturalism is presumed as a marketable sociological fact to immigrants.

Since 2004, the provincial reports by the Multicultural Advisory Council in the Ministry of Education have no mention of equity or social justice. The focus has been on literacy, Aboriginal education, accountability, and integration of the diverse students in the province. Its mandate as presented in the *Report on Multiculturalism* in 2004, 2008, and most recently, 2009, states:

The K–12 school system works to empower all learners to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to contribute to a healthy, democratic and pluralistic society with a *prosperous and sustainable economy* [italics added] (Government of British Columbia, 2009, p. 19).

The mandate for the years in between was:

2005: The Ministry’s vision is to make B.C. the best-educated, most literate jurisdiction on the continent. The mission of the Ministry of

Education is to set *legal, financial, curricular, and accountability frameworks economy* [italics added] so as to enable all learners to develop their individual potential and to acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to contribute to a healthy, democratic and pluralistic society and a *prosperous, sustainable economy* [italics added].

2006: The Ministry's vision is to make British Columbia the best-educated, most literate jurisdiction on the continent. The Ministry provides leadership and funding, develops policy and legislation, oversees system governance, *sets results-based standards, develops accountability frameworks, monitors performance and reports results economy* [italics added] for the K-12 education system. Government expanded the mandate of the Ministry of Education in 2005 to include literacy, early learning and public libraries.

2007: The mandate of the Ministry of Education is to enable all learners to develop their individual potential and acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to contribute to a healthy, democratic and pluralistic society and a *prosperous and sustainable economy* [italics added]. The goal is to make B.C. the best-educated, most literate jurisdiction on the continent.

Noting the Ministry's focus on the "prosperous and sustainable economy" since 2004 report and its 2011 Revised Service Plan that mentions as part of its strategic context the province's GDP and competitiveness in the global economy, this trend marks the alignment of its agenda to the Federal agenda of the CMEC. These same neo-liberal priorities of economy, standards, and accountability in order to compete in a globalized order were reflected in the Country Report of the Council of Ministers of Education (CMEC, 2000). The report stated the importance of the international activities of Canadian educators and institutions as critical resources in the global era for strengthening education in Canada which are:

especially true in helping our schools deal with issues such as multiculturalism, the needs of other cultures and language groups, and, more broadly, the whole range of factors related to cross-cultural learning and sensitivity. In addition, international activities contribute to the education of Canadians so that they may understand the international contexts in which the current generation of students will need to *compete* [italics added] (p. 34).

The reports are based on the funding allocation from both federal and provincial government. The focus on English language programs and Aboriginal education in each of these reports signifies the actual priorities of the multicultural thrust of the ministry. There is no mention of multiculturalism, social justice, equity or anti-racism. This ideological inconsistency between the policy instrument developed for schools (focus on social justice) and the policy mandate by the ministry (focus on neo-liberal global economy) will be reflected in the discourses on multicultural education, even as they are implemented by a relatively independent teachers' union.

4.1.2. British Columbia Teachers' Federation

Incorporated as a benevolent society in 1919, the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (BCTF) is a union of professionals consisting of all public school teachers in the province (BCTF website). In their publication *Better Schools for BC: A Plan for Quality Public Education*, their position as frontline actors in the implementation of multicultural education is manifested in their awareness of the real issues that the framework by the Ministry never acknowledges. Their plan includes initiatives and recommendations to address the misuse of meaningless assessments and the role of poverty in the education of their students. More importantly, in the section for diversity and equitable opportunities are these words: "*Teachers work hard to provide real equity of opportunity for all, but historical factors and systemic barriers mean equity remains a distant goal*" (2011, p. 14). By revealing an awareness of the factors that underlie the issue of diversity, teachers show their engagement with the real issues underlying social justice that was not in the Ministry or federal documents.

We may assume that documents may have no power by themselves, but the language used in official or public documents like the Ministry's and the Federation's websites carry weight in the direction of their discourses. The difference between these two discourses forms part of the tensions in multicultural education, as we shall see how some conceptualizations are formed from the intersection of these two discourses. Joshee (2007) contended that professionals in multicultural education have never veered away from its social justice agenda. In 1982, the Vancouver School Board established a race relations policy designed "to improve race relations and to increase cultural understanding in Vancouver Schools" (p. 142). By 1997, twenty-seven school

districts in British Columbia had a multicultural policy, a race relation policy, or a multicultural and anti-racism policy. In the website of the school district where the narratives in the next chapter took place, there is a committee for multiculturalism and anti-racism in the section for teachers. The consistent focus of the multiculturalism initiative on equity shows the teachers' awareness of the policy as an issue beyond cultural differences. This aligns with the research done by educators in multicultural education.

4.2. Modes and Myths of Multicultural Education

Multicultural education has developed into a complex field consisting of theories, research and practices that covers the intersecting diversities in school such as race, culture, language, social class, gender, sexuality, and ability (Sleeter & Grant, 2009). Sleeter and Grant (2009) constructed different approaches to engaging in multicultural education from the multifarious ways it has been understood. The broad goals of multicultural education and the different emphases placed on it by various stakeholders complicate its implementation. Canadian multicultural educator Phillion (2002) characterized it as mostly detached and abstract with little knowledge about actual experiences of people and relationships. It leaves teachers with vague though flexible options in implementation. For this study, I will focus on the work of one of the founders of multicultural education, James A. Banks. His conceptualization of the five dimensions of multicultural education has direct implications on the practices of multicultural education which will enable us to examine the modes within and the myths from which it has been implemented (Banks, 1995; Banks, 2008).

Banks developed the dimensions of multicultural education in order to help teachers go beyond the addition of ethnic content and cultural festivals in schools often associated with responsiveness to diversity (Tucker & Banks, 1998). The dimensions were conceptualized to capture the complexity in the curriculum, pedagogy and school structure so that teachers and administrators could navigate and promote meaningful societal changes through education. With the politics surrounding Multiculturalism Policy notwithstanding, the stated goals of the Policy and the five dimensions of multicultural education share the same vision of engendering a society where equitable opportunities

could be accessible to all. Positing that multicultural education is a way to foster a more enriching and equitable schooling experience for all children as they learn to participate in a democratic society, he conceived of the five dimensions to help teachers re-conceptualize the role of knowledge in education (Tucker & Banks, 1998). Banks (1996) emphasized the role of knowledge construction in order to achieve the transformative possibilities of multicultural education for society. In a democratic society, schools have the crucial role of educating all students for gaining access to equal participation in the society where they all share the ideals of liberty. Banks (2006) contended that the transformative role of teachers in fostering a democratic society has been hampered by a myopic view of multicultural education. By conceptualizing the five dimensions after thirty years in the field, Banks aimed to increase the academic achievement of students, to improve race and ethnic relations, and to educate all students so they could make decisions and take actions that promote democracy and social justice.

4.2.1. *Modes - Five Dimensions of Multicultural Education*

4.2.1.1. Content Integration

Banks (1995, 2008) described content integration as the inclusion of information, examples and data from other groups or cultures to both affirm the self-esteem of those groups and to expand the knowledge of all students about diverse histories, cultures and perspectives. He (2008) referred to this popular aspect of multicultural education as the additive approach. This is often accomplished by adding a book, a unit or a course to the curriculum in social studies and language arts classes. By fitting the additional material into the curriculum, the basic structure and canon remain unchanged.

As an example, Banks (Tucker & Banks, 1998) narrated his experience when a math teacher approached him after one of his talks on multicultural education. She conceded that multicultural education was fine for social studies, but it had nothing to do with her as a math teacher. Multicultural education has become the grid within which other cultures and curriculum materials are contained within existing curricular framework and assumptions. Seen from the lenses of the normalized dominant culture, multicultural content integration has been labelled as an “entitlement program and curriculum movement” (Banks, 2006, p. 8) by minority groups that are about “Them”, and not “Us”. This is evidenced by the widely held notion by teachers that schools with no

significant number of students from minority cultures do not need multicultural education. But Banks (Tucker & Banks, 1998) argued that all classes are culturally diverse and teachers should be conscious that their own culture, values, and perspectives are part of this diversity.

Hand in hand with the idea that only students from minority cultures need multicultural education is the notion that teachers are burdened with this curricular addition due to the increasing presence of these Other students. With their plate already full from the high stakes testing, accountability policies and budget cuts in public education, teachers perceive Othered students as panoptimized objects requiring special accommodation. These presumptions could only be possible if content integration is perceived as an additional curricular material for “Them” instead of an equitable and enriched curriculum as part of good pedagogy.

4.2.1.2. Prejudice Reduction

Based on studies in social sciences, the dimension of prejudice reduction covers theories and research on strategies to develop positive attitudes and behaviours and to foster cooperative interactions. Banks (1995) focused not only on the biased attitudes between children of different groups but also on the self-rejection of children in marginalized groups. Using research in the social sciences that exposure to other cultures and sharing experiences helps to develop positive attitudes and that seeing their own cultures represented promotes positive self-identification, Banks stated that schools readily embark on the celebration of the most visible and accessible aspects of culture like the holidays, the food and the music and dances. However, this monolithic representation of culture produces cultural identities perceived as static and constant. In the process, it creates a normalization of knowledge where the objectified culture is ascribed characteristics that are fixed, iconic, and subjected to particular attitudes, perceptions, and attentions.

Arguing that children by age four already carry attitudes about ethnic and racial groups, Banks (2006) proposed that negative attitudes could be changed when educators design interventions that promote positive images and feelings about other groups in an integrated, consistent and natural fashion. In Paley’s book (1992), *You Can’t Say You can’t Play*, she told the story of how a class of kindergarten students re-

negotiated the rules of peer relations. By engaging them in their own practices where they objectify each other and exercised let-die functions like exclusion and rejection, Paley took them on a journey of liberating themselves from the traps of unexamined rules that divide and establish patterns of behaviour. If bio-power functions in a classroom of four to six year olds, what does it imply for us who are not aware of its functions?

4.2.1.3. Equity Pedagogy

Equity pedagogy consists of teaching strategies and classroom environments that help marginalized students attain the capacities and opportunities to participate in the creation of a just, humane, and democratic society (Banks & McGee-Banks, 1995). Ladson-Billings (1994) and Nieto (2000) are just some of the researchers who have looked into culturally sensitive and culturally responsive teaching practices by taking into consideration other socio-economic and cultural factors that prevent some groups from engaging fully in their learning. As manifested in the Reports on Multiculturalism mentioned in the previous section, the Ministry's notion of equity pedagogy has been focused on the English as a Second Language (ESL) program. This program was designed to help "linguistically disadvantaged" students achieve academic success in the school system through prescriptive and regulated literacy initiatives (Meyers, 2006).

Referring to this kind of initiatives as the "temptation of malefic generosity" (1978, p. 100), Greene contended that these practices lead to passive gazing, "a prototype of the social act" (Lefebvre as cited in Greene, 1978, p. 100). She warned against this "academic confinement of experiences" (Marcuse as cited in Greene, 1978, p. 100) because it reduces humans "to technical systems, deprive[s] them of spontaneity and erode[s] their self-determination, [and] their autonomy" (p. 100). By imposing a specific grid that determines their "fitness" to become equitable participants, there are assumptions of who the students are and what their capacities are. Beyond the implications of learning English unproblematically, the focus on ESL implies a patriarchal gaze on the "disadvantaged", perpetuating what Banks (1995) described as the concept of cultural deprivation, an aspect of the Deficit theory whose strategy was to "blame the victim" (Nieto, 2000, p. 231). Labelling this cultural racism as the biologization of racism, Bonilla-Silva (2010, p. 40) described this process of fixing cultural characteristics as

stable and as providing the grounds for asking, “why don’t they have it all together?” as a way of blaming the marginalized groups for their failures. This de-normalizing strategy commonly used in schools constructs students who are constituted as deficient based on their genetic, cultural or linguistic deprivation while ignoring social, economic or political structures that contribute to the “deficiency”. The production of the “ESL” student as “someone who lacks something”, as “not possessing” the English language, paradoxically places them in an inequitable position under the panoptical gaze. Cummins (as cited in Trifonas, 2003) contended that this production of “ESL” students reproduces the existing patterns of social stratification and deflects the gaze away from the structures that maintain the social order.

Meyers (2008) argued that the way the ESL programs are implemented produces the myths of equity: that there are equal opportunities for ESL success in the schools, that schools can provide adequate language and literacy supports, and that the difficulties facing ESL students are due to weakness in literacy. She contended that taking into consideration the issue of social justice might help schools match the rhetoric of equity with effective and reflective practices. One example is the courageous attempt of a middle school mainstream class teacher in the York region. Faced with the high drop-out rates of ESL students in her district, Leoni (Cummins, Bismilla, Cohen, Giampapa & Leoni, 2006) experimented with allowing some of her ESL students to write in their first language. They were provided with the bilingual resources they needed in both English and their first language. This is not usually done in a typical monolingual Canadian classroom where signs and admonitions of “English only” are common. Yet Leoni discovered the high level of literacy skills of these students. Without the monolingual limitation on their work, these students were able to bring out the subjugated knowledges they possessed which contributed not only to their affective transformation but to their academic success. The empowerment they experienced from being able to express themselves and negotiate their identities (Norton as cited in Lee, 2008) was proof that the focus on what they can do rather than what they cannot do had a more positive effect on their learning. What does this imply for teaching English to help these students “catch up” to the population designated as the norm? The self subjectification process of the students made possible by negotiating their own identities is as crucial as their abilities and opportunities to articulate their knowledges.

4.2.1.4. Knowledge Construction

For Banks (2008), knowledge construction is an important aspect of multicultural education without which the three abovementioned dimensions (Prejudice Reduction, Equity Pedagogy, Content Integration), would not have real impact. Multicultural education implies the limitations of monocultural education. Willinsky (1998) contended that our modern Western liberal education is a continuation of the colonial project that was engaged in practices that are “ongoing acts of cultural reproduction, efforts at fixing meaning, selective remembering, and deliberately engineered forgetting” (Stanley, 2009, p. 143). This is why Banks (Tucker & Banks, 1998) saw great possibilities for equity work in schools because knowledge is the currency whereby teachers can help students explore the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of reference, and the variety of perspectives available for re-interpreting and re-constructing knowledge.

Greene (1993) conceived of curriculum as the interplay of conceptions of knowledge, conceptions of the human being, and conceptions of the social order. As such, school curricula strongly shape how universals are structured, what categories are invented, and how discourse is manipulated. Schools are able to determine the grid of intelligibility that defines “truth”. Through curricular and pedagogical silencing and marginalization, certain knowledges are subjugated and judged to be of little ideological utility and regular practices are used that reproduce certain “positionalities in the matrix of power relations” (Lee, 2008, p. 102). The paucity of knowledge of the normalized “Us” enables the perpetuation of the unjust treatment (let-die) of the Other about whom knowledge has been constructed. Carr and Lund (2009) posited that we not only teach from what we know, but we also teach from what we do not know. And what we do not know is often implicated in our actions that we perceive as “innocent” and “neutral” because what we know is often socialized within particular epistemological communities.

Anthropologist Bateson (2000) described how Western epistemological positions always tend to estrange others who are perceived as different from “Us” in order to rationalize our differential treatment of these Others. By constructing a monolithic Other as not like “Us”, the “rules for civilized behaviour no longer apply” (Pipher, 2006, p. 4) and the let-die function of bio-power is justified. Banks’ (Tucker & Banks, 1998) emphasis on the powerful role of educators also laid the responsibility on them to go

beyond their own epistemological locations. When teachers help students unpack how we conceive of what we “know”, they begin to understand that what they know have underlying values and assumptions. Knowledge reflects the social and cultural contexts as well as the political and economic interests of its producers, and established knowledge in our educational institutions is not exempt from reinforcing particular ideologies and social orders (Banks, 2002). Critical educators engaged in this work of interrogating ideologies underlying curricula, of questioning the legitimacy of bodies of knowledge, and of unpacking the official knowledge (Apple, 1993; Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1990; hooks, 1994) have made some progress into the ways some teachers are changing their practices. Aveling (2006), Gay (1983), Sleeter (2001) and others have also been examining how teachers themselves can learn to see through their own prejudices and develop more positive perceptions and attitudes in their practices. They are often not aware of how they have normalized themselves as the bearers and distributors of the legitimized culture, a “good” that will determine students’ fates.

In LaDuke’s (2009) work with pre-service teachers on multicultural education, she took them on a field trip to some of the ethnic neighbourhoods where the students in the district lived. The reflection notes written by the predominantly white middle class pre-service teachers revealed their stereotypical perception of the students and of the families who came from these neighbourhoods. By taking the uncomfortable journey of unpacking their assumptions and perceptions, LaDuke met ambivalence, silence, and resistance from a privileged group who saw their own role as neutral and value-free. The cognitive dissonance created anxiety and hostility in the classroom. This discomfort was exacerbated when prejudice was perceived as a matter of personal attitude while ignoring the wider sensibilities that dominated the society at large.

Applebaum (2009) stated that those in unexamined privileged positions are seldom able to understand the effect of their privileges on others. There were instances when the group felt they had been “silenced, when their voices are no longer centre stage, or because they refuse to critically examine their own beliefs ... for it is easier to stand outside systems of oppression and privilege ... than to understand how they are complicit” (p. 395). Those who did understand realized the systemic barriers to academic success and were uncomfortable with the tension between their own material position and the unequal structures of social reality. This manifests the limitations of

knowledge in effecting change or transformation when one is embedded within a grid because systemic structures also shape our choices. Teacher educator Sonia Nieto (2000) stated, teachers are sincerely concerned about their students but “are often at the mercy of the decisions made by others far removed from the classroom” (p.5).

4.2.1.5. Empowerment of School Culture and Social Structure

As an institution deeply embedded in the society, schools are themselves a social cultural system shaped by the socio-political forces of the society (Banks, 1995). This last dimension, empowerment of school culture and social structure, is the key aspect of multicultural education because it consists of ways to restructure institutions, including schools, in order to foster a society that is equitable for all its members. But not all school cultures are able to promote educational equity and cultural empowerment. Trapped within the ideological narratives of a society where existing structures are reproduced, school cultures cannot be empowered without the concomitant structural changes. Banks (2006) advocated a transformative approach to multicultural education in order to effect cultural changes in the school and societal structures. This approach challenges the assumptions and unpacks the ideological meanings of school cultures and societal structures. It excavates subjugated knowledges and disrupts the master narratives. Transformative pedagogy also shifts the gaze to the perpetrators of the master narratives and to the hidden and normalized curriculum by disrupting its canonical status.

In his genealogical study of multicultural education, Kazmi (1997) contended that multicultural education could not be anything but subversive if it is to have any meaning or value at all. Its pedagogical value and significance lies in its ability to disrupt the order of things that maintain the status quo. By interrogating the system of knowledge and the forces that legitimize and perpetuate it not as transcendental but as concrete and historical, Kazmi suggested that multicultural educators might be able to disrupt the way knowledge is organized and circulated in order to subvert an inequitable social order. He further clarified that multicultural education is not to teach about other cultures but to teach other cultures not with the goal of understanding them but to work for epistemological disruptions. Multicultural education needs to problematize and to expand the limits of what monocultural education has perpetuated.

Gay and Howard's (2000) research identified that 86% of schoolteachers in North America are from white middle class families; moreover, their research also illustrated that teacher education programs are shaped by the ideology of the prevailing social system. This is not to say that societies are ruled by singular ideologies, but that there exists a dominant one in the centre that shapes the grid of intelligibility wherein social institutions like schools are formed. Cockrell, Placier, Cockrell, and Middleton (1999) found this monocultural background of teachers with very little experience in diversity and limited understanding of equity problematic. Merryfield (2000) further contended that many middle-class white teachers had their most profound experiences with social inequities while living or travelling outside their own country. How might we make the connections between the dynamics of power relations that give rise to different kinds of oppression? Like the pre-service teachers in LaDuke's (2009) class, teacher education did not address this demographic gap between teachers and students (Gay & Howard, 2000). This oversight is not limited to this particular demographic group although the effect could be better imagined by the sheer majority of white middle class members in the teaching profession. Teachers from minority cultures are also caught in their own location on the grid of power relations. As a classroom teacher, Toyosaki (Toyosaki, Pensoneau-Conway, Wendt, & Leathers, 2009) cited how he himself became a "sub-oppressor" (Freire, 1970, p. 45), a stage where the oppressed "adheres" to the oppressor to escape his or her own objectification, instead of working for his or her own liberation. At this point, I would like to point out that in the grid of power relations, there is no simple dichotomy of oppressed or oppressor. Rather, the grid consists of a dynamic where persons occupy multiple locations under different positionalities depending on how the positionalities are defined on the grid and how the positionalities interact. The power in the grid is in its "unending movement – which has no historical end – of the shifting relations that make some dominant over others" (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 109). Toyosaki's positionality as a Japanese man intersected with his positionality as a teacher, making him unaware of his own actions as a teacher.

How are we as teachers preparing children for a socially just society when we presume that we stand outside the power relations in the community we live and work in? Might we just be reproducing the same system of privilege and oppression? Social justice work assumes that no one stands outside power relations and thus requires

continued vigilance over any type of domination, including ideological ones (Applebaum, 2009). Part of empowerment is to look into the subjugated and competing ways of thought and ideas at the margins. For teachers to be able to negotiate the tension between ideology and their material positions, we need an awareness of how the former plays in role in the latter. It is important to be conscious of our own location in the grid of power relations and examine the knowledge and assumptions that we possessed.

4.2.2. *Myths of Multicultural Education*

The liberal conceptualization of the Multiculturalism Policy perpetuates a national narrative of an egalitarian pluralistic society; but national imaginings and ideological underpinnings are intertwined. Bokhorst-Heng (2007) contended that practices in multicultural education are shaped by the political and ideological meanings of the policy. She argued that particular multicultural narratives still emerge out of the socio-political and historical nuances of these ideological meanings. Ideological mechanisms do not work in a linear manner, the way bio-power does not work directly on human bodies in multicultural education. It works in the minds and consciousness, or what Foucault called the “soul”, described as the non-codifiable aspects of the person: “the heart, the thoughts, the will, the inclinations” (1977, p. 16).

What follows are the assumptions that underpin the liberal conception of multicultural education, which I call “myths” by showing how other realities unseat them. These myths have become part of the grid of multicultural education that might have held our “souls” captive. Awareness of these myths might dislodge our epistemic and affective positions regarding “truths” we seldom question or doubt. Perhaps these myths might also help us understand the discrepancies in the conceptualization of multicultural education in the ministry mandate, in the ministry instruments, in the teachers’ initiatives and its implementation.

Furthermore, problematizing these myths is important because they have also shaped the perceptions and aroused the resistance of teachers. In their work in pre-service teacher programs, Gay and Howard (2000) encountered questions about the relevance of multicultural education and resistance to engaging with multicultural education content in the classrooms. The reasons ranged from racial prejudice, anxiety

about knowledge of other cultures, doubts about ability to teach ethnic others, and misconceptions about multicultural education. The latter includes the notion that multicultural content is separate from regular curricular content and adds to the growing demands on teachers, that multicultural education is simply the appreciation and awareness of diversity, and that multicultural education is a direct confrontation with racial issues in the classroom. Perhaps we should unpack these misconceptions in order to recognize how our assumptions are shaped by multiple discourses.

4.2.2.1. Multicultural Education is for the students from minority cultures.

Banks (2006) noted that teachers who teach homogeneous classes felt they do not need multicultural education because they do not have many students from minority cultures. School administrators in predominantly white neighbourhoods also think multicultural education are irrelevant for them. There is no dearth of multicultural educators who view multicultural education as an inclusive initiative to respond to the increasing change in classroom demographics and to address the needs of the students who come from diverse minority cultures (Carlson, 1995; Hebert, 1992). This myth is not erroneous as much as it is myopic and an intellectually indefensible view of multicultural education that has made teachers discriminate against its value in the curriculum (Banks, 2006). Of course, knowing about one's culture or having it mirrored in the curriculum could benefit students from minority cultures. But is it sufficient to enable them to attain equal access to participation and/or to protect them from discrimination? Of course, it is important for students from minority cultures to learn about their cultural group's contribution to the dominant culture. But does it change the perspective of the students and teachers from the dominant culture? Because this myth is grounded in the cultural deprivation theory of the colonial project, it reproduces the same hierarchy of power relations (Scott, 2001; Willinsky, 1998). Aside from normalizing the dominant culture, it panopticalizes the students from minority cultures where they are ascribed identities beyond their choices and which have material consequences on their school experiences. This reinforces the "truth" about the "deficit" of these students because the deficit theory defines educational problems as arising from those who are at the bottom of the social, linguistic, gender or cultural order (Nieto, 2000, p. 231). The theory also identifies the students as the problem instead of the systemic barriers within the socio-political structures and institutions. This myth has contributed to the perception of the

teachers that the problem stems from the students' families, home culture and other stereotypical notions, therefore making them "hard to teach" (Kailin, 1999, p. 732).

This myth does not only provide the illusion of liberal fantasy for an institution in a progressive society, it also signifies that the patriarchal hand that gives can also take it away. Perhaps the question we should ask is why is the multicultural initiative not conceived as an aspect of the regular curriculum to benefit all students? Why is it contained within multicultural education? Might it be that promoting the notion as an "entitlement" for students from minority cultures makes it possible that as an "entitlement", it could be also taken away (Banks, 2006)? For what purpose is this liberal fantasy? In Banks' (2006) study of multicultural studies across cultures in the United States, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Britain and France, he observed that whenever the state's practice of its assimilationist agenda is the strongest, cultural studies is introduced as the panacea to quell possible ethnic unrest that might resist the assimilation. Ought we not question the political utility of this myth in containing and appeasing restless minority groups?

To de-mythologize this assumption by making the system of privilege and oppression account for the inequity, it is often assumed that one has to give up one's privilege to be egalitarian or to get out of the system. Applebaum (2009) asserted there is no way of being neutral by standing outside the system; one is always inside the system. In fact, she argues that neutrality is a perpetuation of oppression by default because it normalizes the status quo. However, Brod (as cited in Applebaum, 2009) contended that since we are in the system, we have the choice to challenge or to reinforce it. He asserted that privilege is not something we take; it is something the system gives us, which we have the option of not taking.

4.2.2.2. Multicultural Education is against the West and will divide the nation.

Banks (2006) characterized the canonical debate around curriculum as an ideological resistance to the unseating of a unilinear Eurocentric approach in North American education which had always reflected the values, experiences and perspectives of the dominant group in the social structure. Within that grid, social and historical knowledge claims represented the interests of the European settlers and

subjugated the knowledges of the other groups that make up the society. The colonial project “divided up the world” through its “conceptual instruments” (Willinsky, 1998, p. 3). By imposing its language, science and religion, the colonizers were able to teach the colonized why they were “subservient to the born-to-rule civilization” (p. 4). This underlying legacy of the European colonization of the Americas accounts for the unquestioned privilege of teachers who belong to that tier of the society. Willinsky (1998) identified this sensibility as the unidentified aspect of our education where much of the knowledge produced and perpetuated was understood to legitimize the political and cultural dominance of the Euro-American worldview. Multicultural education, like African-American studies, and Aboriginal studies, is characterized as “hostile and anti-establishment” and will de-stabilize the social cohesion of a liberal democratic society (Kazmi, 1997). What could be wrong with the Eurocentric canonical knowledge in the society?

The problem is not only that the Euro-American worldview is considered the point of reference to which all other worldviews are compared. It also regulates, if not silences, other meanings that criticize, are different, or that challenge its legitimacy. Even as schools perpetuate the socialization of the students to the prevailing social order, there are teachers who battle against this unitary order of knowledge in order to achieve a more balanced worldview. Applebaum (2009) argued that the guardians of this Eurocentric order have used these teachers’ own language against them in the following incident. In 2002, neo-conservatives in the United States charged the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) with “liberal bias” because social justice educators “imposed and indoctrinated students into a left-wing ideology” (p. 381) and had silenced conservative students who espouse conservative worldviews. The NCATE consequently removed all references to social justice in its teacher education requirements. Foucault (1997/2003) described this kind of struggle as the role of bio-power to perpetuate a “sort of silent war to re-inscribe the relationship of force, and to re-inscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language and even the bodies of individuals” (p. 16). This myth purports that multicultural education is a form of reverse discrimination by imposing non-canonical curriculum on the general public where the Western canon is under threat.

Banks (2008) also questioned the claim that multicultural education divides the society because it presumes and perpetuates the illusion that the nation is already a united entity. Nations are always fragmented in multiple divisions and are only united in the national imaginary of the dominant elite (Anderson, 1983). They are imagined political communities produced by a national consciousness shaped by the complex play of ideology, economy and immediate societal struggles. Anderson's theory of nationalism characterizes it as a sociological concept formed between profound emotional legitimacy and the changing meanings and interests of nationhood across time. Yet the Canadian state has always (intentionally and/or unintentionally) reinstated its vision of a federally united and free-market nation-state (Dhamoon & Abu-Laban, 2009). However, Macedo (1993) contended that divisiveness has always served political interests by splitting voters along class, racial and ethnic lines. Still, it does not prevent supposedly "highly literate and principled citizens of a great democracy to frequently demonstrate the inability to separate myth from reality ... This inability pushes us to perpetual flirtation with historical hypocrisy" (p. 184). By analyzing this "stupidification" (p. 183) or the "forgetting" of the nation's fragmented wholeness through bio-power, we understand that this classic divide and rule mechanism permits the management of multiple groups for political utility or for economic profit by pitting one group against another. Furthermore, it turns a blind eye to societal inequities by reinforcing the notion that western traditional schooling is the great equalizer and the "redeemer of prejudice" (Willinsky, 1998, p. 1). The normalization of the meanings reproduced in the canon of the school system allows disengagement from the inequities embedded in the core curriculum and institutional structures.

In 1903, W. E. B. Du Bois (1903) stated that "... the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line." Almost a hundred years later, eminent Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor (2002) stated:

Understanding "the other" will pose the 21st century's greatest social challenge Most of us recognize that we are enriched by understanding other human possibilities. It cannot be denied, however, that the path to acknowledging their existence and value can be painful. The crucial moment occurs when the "other's" differences can be perceived not as error, or as a fault, or as the product of a lesser, undeveloped version of what we are, but as the challenge posed by a viable human alternative. ... Other societies present us with different and often disconcerting ways

of being human. Our task is to acknowledge the humanity of these ‘other’ ways while still living our own. That this may be difficult to achieve, that it will demand a change in our self-understanding and hence in our way of life, is the challenge our societies must reckon with in the years ahead. (p. 1)

Both statements express similar sentiments – from different locations on the grid. Taylor’s dysconscious¹ ethnocentrism (though honest) in education is what divides when the notion of “human” itself is appropriated by those who are in the position to define it and are “resigned to tolerate” the Other. This premise of the singular humanity leaves intact the Eurocentric colonial narrative regarding who is normal and human, the worth of which all the Others have yet to attain (Richardson & Villenas, 2000).

4.2.2.3. Multicultural Education deviates from the core curriculum and from focusing on academic standards.

This myth has been reinforced since the publication of *The Nation at Risk* in the United States in 1983, when education became a free-for-all landscape for the perpetual war to produce “docile bodies” (Foucault, 1977, p. 136). The report stated that schools are failing and students’ achievement scores on standardized tests are dropping. It initiated a period of standards-based reforms that culminated with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001. By focusing on teacher accountability for achievement standards and academic assessments, punitive measures are carried out on school administrations and teachers whose students do not perform at a “proficient” level (Shaker & Heilman, 2008). In an inverted logic, Westheimer (2010) described how the reforms set out to measure what could be measured and define the data as measures of educational progress. The effect of these reforms was the retreat from problem-based learning that fosters thinking skills and the shift to circumscribed broad curriculum based on prescribed rubric. Westheimer also critiqued the de-professionalization of teachers

¹ King (as cited in Pennington, 2007, p. 102) characterized dysconscious racism as a form of racism that tacitly accepts dominant White norms and privileges. It is not the absence of consciousness but an impaired consciousness. Uncritical ways of thinking about racial inequity accept certain culturally-sanctioned assumptions, myths, and beliefs that justify the social and economic advantages White people have as a result of subordinating others.

where they are stripped of their curricular and pedagogical authority and are instead, turned into technicians who train students for the tests. Therefore, it becomes difficult to value anything that the tests do not measure, like the skill to foster or navigate a socially just society, or the skill to pursue multiple knowledges. Shaker and Heilman (2008) described the NCLB as a rhetorical coup by the Right that lulls parents and educators into a seemingly equitable policy focused on “core curriculum” and “measurable achievement”.

There are, however, several points that should be problematized. First, the tests contain and dictate a prescribed curriculum that is presumably neutral. As teachers teach to the tests, it has led to an “intellectually emaciated curriculum” limited to a narrow band of subject matter (Westheimer, 2010, p. 7). Furthermore, the presumption of the neutrality of the “core curriculum” supports the criticism of teachers that multicultural education has an agenda and that as “neutral” teachers, they can better serve the students by staying close to the core curriculum. Second, the detrimental effect on students from historically underserved schools belie the “fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education” (NCLB, Sec. 1001 as cited in Sleeter & Grant, 2009) claim of NCLB. Without access to resources and with the additional focus on pushing up test scores, the students from these underserved schools, most of them from high poverty districts, end up falling further behind academically.

Since 2000, the British Columbia Ministry of Education School Act Sections 81 and 168(2) has specified that schools should administer and complete the Foundational Skills Assessment (FSA) to all Grade Four and Grade Seven students (Ministry of Education Website). The FSA is an annual province-wide assessment of British Columbia students' academic skills, and provides a snapshot of how well BC students are learning foundation skills in Reading Comprehension, Writing, and Numeracy. Reports are sent to parents and school rankings are published in print and online. The misuse of this set of data has been a bone of contention between the Ministry and the BCTF. It poses as an instrument of knowledge to help educators and parents make better decisions. Does it? In Foucault's (1977, p. 184) notion of examinations, tests like the FSA act as normalizing and hierarchical techniques for positioning and ordering students, teachers and schools. The scores constitute a body of knowledge where

students are “transformed ... into a whole field of knowledge” (p. 186). The testing system holds, marks, and fixes them on their locations within the grid of intelligibility of the status quo. As objects on the grid, the schools, teachers and students are defined by the meaning of the scores and are the recipients of corresponding let-die effects. The testing system produces objects called “failing” students, and “underperforming” teachers and schools. In the Foucaultian fashion, we ask: what are the effects of producing these objects? Mitchell (2003) tied the test-based level of achievement of educational reforms to an educational vision of the neo-liberal agenda of privatization that seeks to reduce the costs of social reproduction for the government and that aids in the constitution of subjects oriented to individual survival and/or success in the global market economy. As we noted from the documents of the CMEC and BC Ministry of Education’s shift in priorities since 2000, multicultural education has been appropriated to serve this neo-liberal agenda through the production of students to participate in a “prosperous and sustainable economy”.

4.2.2.4. Multicultural Education is instrumental in the production of global citizens.

Mitchell (2003) characterized this myth of the production of “global” citizens as part of the neo-liberal vision for education. Since the late 1990s, the neo-liberal shift has been to focus on diversity rather than equity. In line with the commodification of diversity in the production of globally equipped students, multicultural education became the preparation of students to join a global market. Globally equipped students become competent producers and consumers in the market economy. What could be wrong with that?

Abu-Laban and Gabriel (2008) identified neo-liberal ideals as:

... the valuing of a smaller welfare state, whereby governments do less, and individuals, families and volunteers undertake to do more in the area of social services. Neo-liberal ideals also stress the commodification of social goods (e.g. health care, education, and welfare services). In this process, Canadians are treated less as “citizens” and more as “individuals”, “clients” or “customers”. Not least, neo-liberal ideals emphasize and privilege the “free” market, economic efficiency and unfettered competition. Thus, neo-liberal ideals carry a new understanding of what is “public” and what is “private”, and many services

that were considered public with the Keynesian welfare state are under threat of being wholly or partially privatized” (p. 48)

As indicated in the previous section, the mandate on multiculturalism of the BC Ministry of Education has been informed by this neo-liberal agenda. Students are produced are consumers of this new market ideology as exemplified by the 2000 Council of Ministers of Education Canada Country Report (included as part of the Curricular Changes and Teacher Training) that suggested that:

Schools need to be able to respond to the multicultural nature of their *clientele* [italics added] in meaningful ways (CMEC, 2000, p. 24).

Multicultural education has also been included in the “skills-based” (Mitchell, 2003, p. 395) curriculum where tolerance can be taught and learned. Linking the relationship between state formation, economic organization, and educational systems, Mitchell argued that neo-liberalism has implications on multicultural education because schools are tools of social management with the capacity to legitimize inequality and to defuse social tensions. She also maintained that schools are key sites where the dominant elite can perpetuate a “subordinate consciousness” that could aid in the “maintenance of an unequal system of relations” (p. 390). By appropriating multicultural education, schools reproduce the unitary national narratives of cohesion with their large population of immigrants who are useful in the selling of “liberalism” and “diversity”. Multicultural education also operates as a “fundamental institutional and conceptual tool” for the state to “control differences” from the influx of migrants (Asad as cited in Mitchell, 2003, p. 391). Schools have become one of the “capillaries of disciplinary power/knowledge” that produce the “strategic cosmopolitan” ready to compete on a global scale. This production is informed by the principles of “individual patriotism and strategic enterpreneurialism” (p. 399) where the rule of relations is perpetuated and exported.

These modes and myths are intertwined in that the implementation of Banks’ (2008) five dimensions of multicultural education are informed by the myths, distorting and shaping the outcome of the dimensions in ways that undermine the social justice goals of multicultural education. When we use Foucault’s mechanisms to analyze the dimensions, we discover that the first three dimensions of multicultural education are

based on the myths listed above. Critical educators are tackling the fourth dimension on knowledge construction and anti-racism educators are working on the fifth dimension. Sadly though, as we shall see from the narratives in the next chapter, practices in multicultural education are more commonly limited to the first three dimensions. Might there then be benefit for all teachers to be critical and anti-racism educators then?

In this chapter, I have laid out the history and conceptualization of multicultural education in Canada so we might see the different discourses involved. I also include Banks' five dimensions and the myths as intersecting discourses that have also shaped the practices of multicultural education.

In the next chapter, I explain my rationale for the use of narratives of lived experiences in order to share the challenges of multicultural education. This is followed by three narratives to demonstrate how it has been practiced in some schools in BC. An analysis follows each of the narratives to describe the specific effects of these practices as manifestations of the mechanisms of bio-power. Finally, I discuss the general implications of the practices and how I might re-imagine the narratives given what I have learned about the mechanisms of bio-power.

5. Bio-power and Multicultural Education

Different aspects of multicultural initiatives have been incorporated into education since the 1980s. Canadian schools have added curricular materials from diverse cultures, promoted the need to recognize and respect differences, and allotted space and time for the diverse cultures of students to be recognized. However, there has been criticism that the educational initiatives have deviated away from the issues of equity as they were articulated in the Ministry's policy document (Banks, 1995; Calliste & Dei, 2000; Moodley, 1983; Sensoy, et al, 2010; Sleeter, 1996). In this chapter, I explore how the discourses described in the previous chapters served as knowledge that shaped the implementation of multicultural education in some classrooms. As well, I show how the six concepts of bio-power function as mechanisms to reproduce unequal relations of power. My goal here is to demonstrate the effects of a liberal state initiative that was conceptualized within an educational system burdened by different discourses like its colonial legacy and the neo-liberal agenda, among others. Despite the focus on civil liberties as indicated in the Preamble of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (see Appendix A), how did multiculturalism in education manage to reproduce the same inequitable rule of relations?

Banks (2006) described multicultural education as the site where ideology meets reality. Beset by a particular range of diversity issues, multicultural education in Canada has been shaped by its assimilationist ideology of managing diversity via "education in the British language" oriented towards "correcting the problematic difference" of the Other who is seen as "possessing ethnicity" that the "non-Problematic Selves must be trained to tolerate" (Day, 2000, p.137-156). Watkins (1994) stated that the focus on cultural diversity and the apolitical approach of multicultural education supports an unsustainable romantic notion of liberal pluralism while obfuscating the systemic barriers underlying the principle of social justice in multiculturalism. Moodley (1983) decried the conceptualization of multiculturalism as an ideology in schools to create a myth out of a difficult social political reality through the use of largely positivistic methodologies and

functionalist traditions. Edwards (1992) further criticized how the politically opportunistic and pragmatic ideological conceptualization of the policy enabled a symbolic reception with no substantial understanding of the Act. This promotion of “certain levels of bland tolerance and a fund of passive goodwill” (p. 6-7) was reflected in how multiculturalism was myopically conceptualized in education. Without an inquiry into the actual practices, the underpinnings of power relations in our history still haunt multicultural education in Canada. The three narratives below are examples of how some aspects of multiculturalism have been implemented in three schools in British Columbia. These narratives will be familiar to most teachers, as they have become regular aspects of multicultural education. Each of the narratives is analyzed based on the mechanisms of bio-power at work to provide insights into the unexpected effects of some of the practices. The analysis of these narratives provides concrete, rather than abstract instances, of how multicultural education reproduces unequal power relations. By taking up the different mechanisms in each example, I help the reader to discern how each mechanism functions and how its effects are manifested. This is not to presume that the mechanisms work in isolation; rather, they work in tandem and in an intersecting manner towards maintaining the prevailing order where teachers and students are, more often than not, unaware of their roles in the reproduction of bio-power. Although the different mechanisms may be possible in each of the narratives, I highlight two mechanisms in each one by choosing the two most salient ones for each so we may see how they function more clearly. Multicultural education is a good example wherein we can understand culture and education as an “order of things” built on the system of knowledge through the discourses and on the relations of power (Kazmi, 1997). Through the narratives below, I illustrate this order and analyze its effects through the mechanisms of bio-power.

5.1. Why Narratives: A Short Methodological Detour

In his work, Foucault (1997/2003, p. 27-30) analyzed power from its ascending movement and its rhizome-like web of application. Foucault’s (1982, p. 785) analysis of power examined “how” power is exercised instead of examining “who” and “why” questions of power. By looking into the “real and effective practices” of bio-power at its “field of application” (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 28), I examine some of the practices of

multicultural education in order to explore how the mechanisms function in the exercise of bio-power and to discover the effects as manifested in the dynamic of power relations. In the preceding two chapters, I have laid out the multiple discourses that gave rise to and infused the discourse on the state-initiated multiculturalism policy in Canada. I have also described how the policy had been conceptualized at the federal and provincial level as well as the targets and the field of application: the schools and the students. As well, I have described the historical development of multicultural education and some of the “truths” surrounding its conceptualization in order to include some other discourses that also shape the practices in multicultural education. All these discourses constitute the complex play of the circulation of power in the network of relations shaped by how individuals constitute themselves and others, and the establishment of institutional practices within the grid of these discourses. In this chapter, I proceed to the point of application of bio-power in multicultural education by narrating the processes of individuals or groups of individuals that are produced not only by what we know about multicultural education, but by the “remote processes” (Foucault, 1982, p. 780) that trap us in our own history and limit the ways we constitute ourselves and others. How does what we know shape how we constitute ourselves and others in a multicultural classroom? In what ways has power passed through us? To answer these questions, I explore my own experiences of multicultural education and my role in the matrix of the mechanisms of bio-power.

As a research practice that uses first hand observation and participation, ethnography is a useful tool to capture, interpret and explain the lives, the experiences, and the means by which people make sense of their lives (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998; Ellis, 2004). Smith (1987) reframed ethnography as a “commitment to an investigation and explication of how ‘it’ actually is, of how ‘it’ actually works, of actual practices, and relations”, not as explanations but as interpretations of “it” within “its relations of ruling” (p. 160). In this study, I examine “it” -multicultural education, within what Smith defined as the “relations of ruling”: the relational dynamic practices at the intersection of how institutions organize and regulate the society and the discourses “that interpenetrate the multiple sites of power” (p. 3). Lifting ethnography from its voyeuristic scientific objectivism and responding to the increasing self-reflexivity in all types of writing, Reed-Danahay (1997) described autoethnography as the interjection of researchers into their

studies with a critical awareness of the role of their positionalities in terms of identity, voice, authenticity, and culture. Grahame (2004) contended that a critical approach to ethnography takes up the meanings of the everyday world and problematizes the events and relationships in order to address ideological practices, how individuals are constituted through social relations and how the social relations are linked to institutional processes as well as individual experiences. He also stated that problematizing the everyday world might “restore the presence of active subjects who are knowers of their everyday world” (p. 187), not as a subjectivist endeavour, but to explore the connection between their everyday experiences and institutional practices. Van Manen (1990) posited that the interpretive examination of lived experiences enables us to make this connection by relating the “particular to the universal, part to the whole, episode to totality” (p. 36).

Smith (1987) conceived of individual selves as existing within the context of a social reality that is always in an ongoing production and “coming into being as a condition of our own activity” (p. 126) and in the social processes we engage in. Therefore, beginning an inquiry with lived experiences preserves the presence of active selves in order to practice a “democratic conception of people as knowledgeable practitioners of their lives” (Carroll, 2004, p. 165). As a “method from the margins”, autoethnography is an important tool and resource for those who have been silent or silenced in order to produce and transform knowledge and to challenge ideological power bases (Kirby & McKenna, 2004), thereby addressing Spivak’s (1988) issue of epistemological imbalance about who has the power to produce knowledge and who is the object of knowledge.

Recognizing that no matter how sensitive researchers are, their work inadvertently injects an element of their own dynamic in the relations of power. In these narratives, I locate myself within this web of relations while preserving my presence as an active and knowing self who is conscious and aware of the limitations of these narratives within the complex and provisional nature of my positionality as a parent and a researcher in the field of education. By fully acknowledging my subject position that permeates these narratives, I also recognize the “fragmentation, indeterminacy, ambiguity and complexity, as well as the larger social, discursive and theoretical coordinates” that shaped my narratives (Prain, 1997, p. 71). I ground my interpretations

in the dynamic practices of the institutions not to explain or define them, but to describe the material effects of the dynamics of “institutional processes that organize and regulate societal interactions” (Smith, 1987, p. 160). Performing what Foucault (1984, p. 50) described as a “critical ontology of ourselves”, I practice an “analysis of the limits that are imposed on” an historically marginalized group and I also “experiment with the possibility of going beyond them” (Foucault, 1993, p. 200). As an analysis of an exercise of power from the margins, or in the “infinitesimal mechanisms” of bio-power (Foucault, 1993/2003, p. 30), the narratives constitute one of the studies “of the multiple peripheral bodies, the bodies that are constituted as subjects by power effects” (p. 29). By “critical”, Foucault (1982, p. 778) implied a constant checking without prior objectification. This is a type of epistemological vigilance that does not make any presumptions or expectations.

These narratives are iterative gazing processes between the objective “I” of the ethnographer that is looked at and the subjective “eye” that is looking, a process that precludes epistemological rigidity. The dialectical relationship between the observer and the observed and between the knower and the known is always in tension yet creative and productive. This engagement in a fluid relation of power is crucial because it highlights a movement away from the critique of reflexive ethnography as a “myopic view of scholarship”, “narcissistic” and “in danger of gross self-indulgence” (Bolož, 2008, p. 189); instead, the researcher:

uses personal experiences and highly personal accounts in a culture to reflexively look more deeply at self-other interactions, turning the ethnographic gaze inward on the self (auto), while maintaining the outward gaze of ethnography — looking at the larger context wherein self-experiences occur (p. 190).

By contextually locating the self-narratives within the discourses, the researcher is able to make connections between personal and discursive processes. As Meneley & Young (2005) cautioned, it is not simply “putting oneself within the text, but to engage in a critical reflection on one’s relationship with others as circumscribed by institutional practices and by history” (p. 7), which Ellis (2004) aptly described as “systematic sociological introspection” coupled with “emotional recall” (p. xvii). Like Taber (2010), I use autoethnographic narratives to capture the interactions between the experiences of

individuals and the institutional history and policies that might evoke different responses and interpretations. Eschewing discursive closures, autoethnography also reaffirms the postmodern assumption of multiple positions that recognizes the complexity and open-endedness of individual interpretations and reactions (Abu-Lughod, 2000; Reed-Danahay, 1997). Citing complicity in the reproduction of practices they were struggling against, researchers who used autoethnography recognized their alibis in their own narratives (Lee, 2008; Toyosaki et al., 2008; Urciuoli in Meneley & Young, 2005; Wyatt, 2008). Pensaneau-Conway (Toyosaki et al., 2008) contended that in re-telling events, researchers do not only invite the readers to these experiences, but are also faced with the knowledge of their own complicities and agentic possibilities. Discovering that knowledge is a process where we learn in the disturbing places of visceral contradictions, Pensaneau-Conway experienced the discomfort that emerged in her own narrative which made her recover from her paralysis and become aware of the complicity of her inaction; inaction is also a choice. As an exercise in discomfort, Ellis (2004) warned that a degree of emotional turmoil usually accompanies the self-scrutiny but the insights make the “pain bearable” (p. xx). Stressing that this discomfort goes beyond using reflexivity as a methodological tool, Pillow (2003) cited the importance of the discomfort in disrupting and challenging representations and assumptions and in engaging with the complexities in qualitative research.

Referring to narratives as destabilizing, Richards (2008) also argued that they demand more from the reader because they do not do the thinking for the reader; instead, it shows how “messy and contingent reality can be given the different views and positionings in a given situation, compelling the reader to realign herself or himself” (p. 1723). Dimitriadis (2001) viewed the research process as an unfolding of “multiple, partial and contingent visions of a complex reality that is always being constituted” (p. 595) by a dialogue between researcher and researched as well as between the writer and the reader. The simultaneous intersubjective and intrasubjective processes are what enable autoethnography to avoid the twin dangers of relativism and objectivism in order to create a space in between to negotiate possibilities of alternative interpretations and insights.

Bloom (1996) addressed the power of narratives to engage in the complexity of how subjectivities are produced within social milieus and the dynamics of power

relations. This is especially relevant as a self-emancipatory counter-practice to decolonize individuals' own unconscious assumptions as exemplified by Fanon (1967), who used the notion of "epidermalization of inferiority" to demonstrate how individuals could be made to construct themselves as inferior based on a biological roulette. Freire (2000) also referred to colonized consciousness but he pointed out that "the oppressed suffer from the *duality* which has established itself in the inner most being" and that "they are at one and the same time themselves the oppressor whose consciousness they have internalized" (p. 48). This exemplifies Kambourelli's (2008) argument that autoethnography is itself a "discourse of paradoxes" (p. 35), yet it is within this tension of opposites that he saw the potential to generate a certain productive agency. He explained that this is not an autonomous agency that empowers individual acts to enact change or transformation. Rather, autoethnography unveils the network of meanings and values that create this web of interactions, conferring on and positioning all actors with the power to employ their own agencies to move beyond complicity and to possibly enable a critical self-determination that Frie (2008) described as emerging from an affective, embodied, and relational processing of human experiences.

Li (1981) reminded us that research is about looking for patterns that imply that events are related in a coherent way as we try to unravel the complexities of human interactions. Lin, et al. (2004) also cautioned us to refrain from essentializing experiences, but instead, demonstrated how the patterns of systematic marginalization that emerge show that these experiences are not "isolated, random, individual happenings" (p. 494). So I offer three narratives of lived experiences as examples of some practices in multicultural education so that we may see what the implementation of Banks' dimensions look like in practice. How are the discourses manifested in practice? How do the mechanisms function in these practices?

I speak from two positionalities in each of the narratives. The italicized sections are presented as journal entries of the events as they took place. In these sections, I write as a parent of three children in the public school system of British Columbia from 2004 to 2008, when multicultural education was already well-conceptualized and regularly implemented. I also write as a first-generation immigrant who had decided to raise my children here in part because of the state-initiated multiculturalism in Canada. The second section of each of the narratives consists of my interpretations and analyses

of the narratives later as a graduate student and a researcher in the Faculty of Education.

5.2. Narratives: Lived Experiences as Manifestations in Practice

5.2.1. *The Grid of Intelligibility and Divide and Rule Mechanisms in Prejudice Reduction*

May 2005 *Mrs. Q, the ESL teacher of Matthew's school asks if I can help organize the Multicultural Day for this school year. It is a day during the school year when different cultural groups celebrate and share their cultures. As a regular parent volunteer for the school and as it is my son's fifth and last year in this school, I am happy to be able to give back to the school and show my appreciation for the experiences my children had with the staff and the students. I agree to head the committee and to introduce the Philippines to the school. Having helped in previous Multicultural Days, I verify with the ESL teacher (who is also in charge of multicultural events) about what I have to do for the event. She gives me the \$200.00 for the funding and suggests several options from what had been done the previous years: food tasting, videos, music, dance, games, or performances.*

Together with several parents from the Philippines, we set up different stations for the students to taste Filipino food, to make and play with an indigenous toy, to watch a video of the different provinces, and to learn a native dance. The day culminates with a play about the history of the Philippines from its colonization by the Spaniards and the Americans to its liberation from a dictator in the 1980s. We receive many positive reactions about the food, the toy, and the thrill of dancing between the bamboo poles. I am glad to be able to share the Filipino culture since most of the staff and students there do not know much about the Philippines.

In this narrative, I demonstrate Foucault's notions of the Grid of Intelligibility and the Divide and Rule as mechanisms of bio-power in the multicultural initiative to reduce prejudice by sharing knowledge of another culture. As described in Chapter 2, the Grid of Intelligibility provides the parameters within which knowledge is organized and

circulated; it determines what knowledge is used to create “truths”. By dividing and ruling, bio-power organizes and sorts individuals so they can be ordered and assigned the make-live and let-die functions. Dividing highlights differences and determines the legitimacy of the rules to be applied on the individuals based on their position on the hierarchical order.

Is multicultural education about these “multicultural moments” (Miller, 1997, p. 88) and “ethnic show and tell” (Edwards, 1992, p. 30)? It has been over a decade since researchers raised the issue of how multicultural education had been interpreted as a set of celebratory practices (Calliste & Dei, 2000; Schick and St. Denis, 2005), giving rise to a variety of alliterative references: “saris, samosas, and steel drums” (Troyna & Williams, 1986), “fair, festival, food, and folktales” (Sleeter & Grant as cited in LaCroix & Lundy, 1995), “dance, dress and dine” (Srivastava as cited in Sensoy et al., 2010) and “heroes and holidays” (Sleeter & Grant, 2009). These practices certainly aligned with the Policy’s mandate to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of all Canadians and the recognition of the contributions of all Canadians. Fitting into a grid of familiar fetishization of the Other, they were also the easiest to implement in schools since they do not demand too much from the teachers in terms of knowledge (Sensoy, et al., 2010). This practice is based primarily on liberal discourses, where racism and prejudice is understood to be a product of ignorance and practiced individually (Bedard, 2000) and on the assumption that culture, like race, sexuality and ethnicity, is immutable.

Was it safe to “share a culture”? Have I just made my son “Filipino”? Has he lost his “Canadianness” in the process? Rooted in political liberalism, May & Sleeter (2010) contended that multicultural education as practiced obscures material inequalities and reduces it to the study of cultural artefacts or cultural practices. Cultural displays like these are examples of the “codification of the inducement to speak” (Foucault, 1978b, p. 65) as part of the “sharing” of the diverse cultures in order to enrich the cultural mosaic and to preserve the national unity (Moodley, 1983). Within the framework of being Canadian, or the grid of intelligibility of what constitutes Canadianism, do celebrations like these contribute to the perception of these cultures as contributions to being “Canadian”? When teachers explain to the students that “this is what they eat”, “this is how they dance”, or “this is how they play”, do these explanations create familiarity or do they emphasize the Otherness? Do these decontextualized notions of the Other

discourage prejudice or do they create an alienating exoticization of difference? Has the division between “Us” and “Them” created let-die functions on “Them”? Simplified cultural pluralism like these practices exaggerates differences and ignores the gross cultural assimilationism embedded in the assumption of a dominant “common” culture (Banks, 2006). Without interrogating the heterogeneity of who composes the grid of the dominant culture, it is easy to presume cultural assimilation and ignore structural barriers to equitable participation and membership. Platt (2002) asserted that a multiculturalism that celebrates differences is a “far cry from dismantling inequalities” (p. 45).

Bingham & Biesta (2010) posited that when something as ubiquitous as a culture has to be explained, the primary function is to create the distance it proposes to reduce. It assumes that the Other culture is of an intelligibility that is not natural and needs to be learned. It also assumes that cultures could be “known”. In the established grid of intelligibility, the Other is defined as an outsider of an unknown culture. The lines are drawn between the constructed notions of an “Us” and a “Them” in a binary mechanism of divide and rule. The Other will always be an outsider in the grid that determines who is “Canadian”. This dualistic positioning of one’s self against an Other presumes a stable unchanging self positioned against an intractable ahistorical Other. Within this grid of intelligibility, the celebratory approach contains the difference of the Other within a certain parameter of “our” comfort. This creates a powerful codification of dividing the “Canadian” from the Other and a standard rule of how the Other culture is supposed to be recognized. By institutionalizing the representation, the grid makes common sense about who belongs to the centre and who is at the periphery of the legitimized “Canadian” culture.

This “safe” celebratory approach also trivializes the significance of the contribution of the groups and the meanings of the cultural elements. Wagner (2007) pointed out that this type of “boutique multiculturalism” (Fish as cited in Wagner, 2007, p. 32) renders culture as a consumable exotic whose marketability is a matter of individual taste rather than a matter of human right or equity. Through the sanitized and museumified “expressions” of culture where its preservation and enhancement is regulated, its trivialization is inevitable where:

difference is conceptualized in authentic, essentialized, exoticized, cultulist terms and is positioned as independent of other social experiences, such as race, class, gender, disability, and sexuality; thus it is presented and understood as a form of signification that is removed from political, social, and historical or contemporary struggles and constraints (Dei as cited in Lee, 2008, p. 99)

This additive approach, if done without minding the assumptions, which are based on the grid of unequal set of power relations, equates diversity with equity. It presumes that consumption equals equity. It becomes easy to understand why people could say: "I respect other cultures; I do not discriminate because: I eat sushi. I watch Bollywood movies. I have Korean friends". Moreover, the approach also perpetuates the commodification of diversity because it perceives of diversity not as a social reality but as a commodity. Diversity "sells"; diversity is sexy. Citing the scholars on globalization, Mitchell (2004, 2007) contended that diversity as appropriated by the discourse on strategic cosmopolitanism fits into the possibilities in the grid of the new global neo-liberal order that promotes the entrenchment of cross-border market ideology.

Banks (2006) argued that by "buying into diversity", we dismiss the struggles inherent in diverse societies and we forget that as societies, they are contested spaces where power needs to be constantly renegotiated. It manifests the distorted conceptions of both culture and equity without any shift in relations. The logic of the grid remains intact. The articulations of difference fetish the differences without working through the gap between the differences in a meaningful way where the meanings of these differences could be renegotiated and not fixed on the grid of who belongs and who does not. This simplistic notion that to "know" a culture will reduce prejudice is based on the notion that prejudice is an individual attitude and is based on ignorance and fear of unfamiliar cultures and (Young, 1987). This notion permits the silence and denial of socio-historical influences on the prevailing social order and prevents the exploration of the structural inequities. Sidorkin (2004) contended that the power of some ideas could be obvious and normalized so they are not questioned or problematized. By ignoring how power relations construct differences into a grid, ideas gain a power of "truth" and are able to produce a sense of "pseudo-empowerment" – "a discipline technique based on delegating authority down the hierarchy without changing the nature of the authority" (Sidorkin, 2004, p. 4). The common-placed-ness of cultural celebrations in schools

reinforces the “truth” of cultural equity and contains the articulations of non-dominant cultures within a grid of “propriety”. Watching a video of Filipino cultural highlights might be culturally empowering. But when a Filipino second grader in a public school in Montreal was punished publicly for “eating sloppily” because he ate his lunch with a spoon and a fork¹ instead of a knife and a fork (Pellerin, 2006), I wonder if he would want to express any aspect of his culture in public again.

Tell us what the world has been to you in the dark places and in the light....Tell us what it is to be a woman so that we may know what it is to be a man. What moves at the margin. What it is to have no home in this place. To be set adrift from the one you knew. What it is to live at the edge of a town that cannot bear your company. (Morrison, 2008)

Morrison’s words invite us to speak the way the Others in multicultural education are invited to articulate their cultures. Does it disrupt the grid? Kaomea (2003) cautioned against this “inducement to speak” (Foucault, 1978b, p. 65) that might only reinforce the re-inscription on the object’s position. What kind of knowledge, then, can reduce prejudice?

5.2.2. Objectification and Panopticism Mechanisms in Equity Pedagogy

February 2006 My daughter Daisy started her fifth grade in Canada when she was ten. Always a good student, she did well in all of her classes. She was a shy girl, but she did find a few friends to hang around with. She is half way through the academic year in Grade Seven this year when Daisy discovers something today. The school counsellor hands out forms for the parents of English as Second Language (ESL) students to evaluate the program. As the counsellor calls her name in class, Daisy is totally caught by surprise because she had never attended an ESL class. She had

¹ Like most Southeast Asian cuisines, Filipino food is generally prepared and cooked in bite-sized pieces – chopped, minced, or ground – it makes more sense to eat with a spoon and fork on a plate because there is no real need for a knife. The spoon is primarily used to scoop the food and the fork is used to push the food onto the spoon.

never been pulled out of her class to join the enrichment classes for English learners in all of her three years of schooling. I take the form to the counsellor to inform her that my daughter never went to ESL class and I inquire if there might be a mistake. The counsellor tells me that Daisy has been on the list of ESL students since she started school in Canada three years ago. But she assures me that it is okay; they do not expect anything from her. With her name on the list, it adds to the school funding received for each ESL student. My daughter's reaction is different. She asks if her Grade Five teacher labelled her ESL because she used the word "nice" too much. Being an ESL student in middle school is not a pleasant experience. Seen as "deficient", the designation of ESL has a negative connotation and consequences on Daisy.

This narrative illustrates Foucault's mechanisms of Objectification and Panopticism as discussed in Chapter 2. Objectification labels persons where knowledge formed about them constitutes them in let-die ways like exclusion, rejection or discrimination. It is the key element of the Othering process. Through panopticism, persons are made "visible" and put under the "gaze" where they perceive themselves to be monitored by the constant surveillance on them as visible objects. Thus marked, it leaves no question as to who is to receive the let-die functions of bio-power.

In connection to this story, my other daughter took a peer-teaching class in her senior year in high school. Her task was to help the peer tutoring teacher facilitate the ESL class in her school. The group of about twenty high school students are unhappy, if not angry, at being in the class. When my daughter asked her peer tutoring teacher (who is also the ESL teacher), why the ESL students were not allowed to be in the regular English class, the ESL teacher informed her: "I'm sorry about that. But the school needs the funds we get for each ESL student".

Is ESL just an institutional marker for funding purposes? How have teachers come to be put in positions where they have to label students in order to obtain funding? What are the implications of being objectified as "ESL"? In British Columbia, the English as a Second Language (ESL) program is an important service of the Ministry of Education and is an inherent part of its funding annually (see Appendix C). As one of the top three provinces in Canada with the largest number of new immigrants, over 10%

of students in British Columbia are considered as needing ESL services (BC Ministry of Education, 2011). An ESL student is defined as “those whose primary language, or languages, of the home are other than English and who may therefore require additional services in order to develop their individual potential within British Columbia’s school system” (BC Ministry of Education, 2001).

Although there is abundant research on the field of learning English as a second language, I will not go into the pedagogical aspects of ESL or the bureaucratic set up for funding in public schools, which are also relevant and important issues. Suffice it to say, the ESL program was intended as a part of the equity program in order to provide equitable opportunities for students to succeed in the school system. Instead, I will describe the production of the ESL identity and how it plays into reproducing the social order in schools even if the service is to be “provided in BC school communities that value diversity, bridge cultures and work to eliminate racism” (BC Ministry of Education, 2009, p. 4). What are the implications when ESL learners are objectified as those who do not “own English” (Norton, 1997)? What “truths” are produced about them that bear implications on their school experiences? How is the ESL identity constituted?

The discourse on Canadian identity embedded in official national assessment and curriculum documents has idealized and racialized second language learners (Fleming, 2010). By objectifying those identified as ESL learners, normative standards of being Canadian are being applied that imply certain forms of social behaviour exist as the dominant and singular culture to which these learners must conform. By positioning the learners as relatively powerless, passive and atomized recipients of the ESL programming, they are panoptimized as members of society. Fleming pointed to how the assessment and curriculum documents effectively contain and control the pedagogical choices of the teachers. He also decried how the benchmarks in the documents indicate full participation in the greater society only upon attaining the highest level of language proficiency. Aside from implying that opinions not written in English have little value, Fleming found it disturbing that so little is covered in the documents about voting and employment rights. The ESL status clearly signifies a particular hierarchical position as a member of the larger society. Under the panoptical gaze of the English-speaking majority, ESL positions these learners as “not Canadian” yet.

The identities of ESL learners are constructed and constrained within the socio-political discourses surrounding the English language and have implications on their places in the relations of power being enacted in schools and in society. In defining linguistic imperialism, Phillipson (1992) pointed out the socio-political nature of the English language in its global dominance. Connecting the language to the post-1800 imperial conquests of the British Empire, he stated that the implications of teaching English in the context of the inequality and oppression perpetuate the colonial agenda. Phillipson (2007) also posited that the English language cannot be detached from its wider imperial exploitative structure and its implicit use in legitimizing, effecting, and reproducing unequal power relations between groups. Skutnabb-Kangas (as cited in Hébert, 1992, p. 65) raised the spectre of linguistic imposition as structural and symbolic violence in minority education. English carries its own values and ideological positions that are often implicit and unspoken in the discourse on ESL. This refers to the history of linguistic imperialism deeply embedded in the discourse on the English language where language becomes the key to the structures of inequality in the world. Part and parcel of the expansion of colonial power is conferring its power to the language of the colonizer where those who “possess” it also possess its social, economic, cultural and political capital. The Official Language Movement² has evolved in different incarnations since World War I in order to spread the “doctrine of Anglo-Saxon superiority” (Tamura as cited in Willinsky, 1998, p. 201). English has become the primary tool for perpetuating the embedded order of the society and for the objectification of those who do not “own” it.

English has also been used both as a tool for symbolic power for assimilation and for exclusion. Willinsky (1998) pointed out the paradox that those who advocate the importance of ESL services are also the ones who act as gatekeepers. He contended that the teaching of the English language without the historical and current perspectives on language distribution and status confers on the “native” speakers of English a

² The Official Language Movement is a linguistic nationalism movement which regained momentum in the 1990s to make English the official language in the United States. It has passed in several states since then (Willinsky, 1998, p. 201)

position of privilege that ESL learners will never attain. As a concept in the field of ESL, Kubota & Lin (2006) described the “native” English speaker as White and possessing the linguistic characteristic of the North American in terms of accent and use of language. This racialized dichotomy of English speakers re-enacts the colonial rule of relations by asserting the status of the Anglo-Saxons. The complexity of language acquisition is simplified in the notion of the “native” speaker in order to serve as a political construct that ascribes a state of deficiency to the non-“native” speaker. The ESL learner then, is not only a “non-native” speaker, but is one who does not “possess” English and is considered unqualified for the “only medium of intelligible communication”. Reflective of the recurring deficiency theme of academic failure in education, the deficit of not “possessing” English is blamed on the ESL learners’ state of Otherness and has implications on their school experiences in and outside the classroom. Like the set up of the panopticon, the “non-native” speakers are always subject to the gaze of the “native” speakers. Lee (2008) pointed to this Othering process as limiting the ESL learners’ capacity to create, negotiate and contest the identities ascribed to them. The Othering process confines the otherwise tenuous and fluid identity of an ESL learner under a panoptical gaze that sees them only through the lenses of deficiency, powerlessness and foreignness. What are the pedagogical implications of the excluded learner who is discouraged from seeking academic assistance (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2006) and where ESL services are capped at five years (BC Ministry of Education, 2009)?

The ESL program also implicates the teachers as perpetrators in the linguistic violence inherent in the discourse on teaching English. In her study on the teaching of English, Ortmeier-Hooper (2006) problematized her position as an ESL teacher. Even with the best intention to be inclusive and to value diversity, the panoptification of those designated as “ESL learners” worked against her efforts. She discovered their pain of being essentialized and being an “object of need” where precious school funds are allotted.

When Ortmeier-Hooper asked a student about her experiences in ESL, the student replied:

“You feel like you are behind everyone else. That you are not maybe as intelligent. Which is not true at all. But you feel very behind. I felt like the ESL program is very isolating. They have their own little room that you

have to go to. At that age (junior high), it can really hurt a teen ... an adolescent's self-esteem"

Ortmeier-Hooper also asked another student about being signed up for ESL, the student answered:

"I don't really care. But I wouldn't. Because if you want to learn more ... better English, you're going to learn it from Americans, not the ESL students"

The negative reactions of Ortmeier-Hooper's students demonstrate the effects of being objectified and panoptimized in spite of the positive and practical purpose of the designation. The designation of ESL might help teachers become aware of the learning needs of their students in order to better facilitate their learning. But in diverse societies, is the illusion of the monolingual classroom still viable? Is ascribing institutional labels and markers the only way a teacher can teach students who come from diverse groups?

Being is predicated upon naming, because those who are named by others have no way to exist in and for themselves (Lorde in Perreault of Smith & Watson, 1998, p.192).

It is not that the labels are harmful. It is because labels are imbued with meanings that bear negative consequences on the lives of the students in the process of objectification. What does that imply for the ESL program as an aspect of equity pedagogy when being named as "ESL" has let-die consequences?

5.2.3. Subjugation of Knowledge and Normalization Mechanisms in Content Integration

September, 2006 *Sara is reading the novel Obasan as part of her high school Honours English class requirement. Written by Japanese-Canadian writer Joy Kogawa, Obasan is a semi-autobiographical novel on the experiences of a Japanese-Canadian family during World War II. A lover of literature, Sara appreciates the literary devices and the complexities of human emotions and motivations in the novel. It is particularly meaningful for Sara because her English teacher invites another teacher, Ms. Z, from the same school who is a Japanese-Canadian and whose own mother was interned.*

Ms. Z's story of the effects on her family makes the events real especially when she describes about how her mother could not talk about the internment without crying. Sara asks more questions that the English teacher did not cover in the class: Why were the Japanese-Canadians interned? Ms. Z's mother was born in Canada. Weren't they Canadians already?

This narrative demonstrates Foucault's mechanisms of subjugated knowledges and normalization. Subjugating knowledges function not only to exclude knowledges and to privilege particular knowledges; they also function to generate knowledges in order to discipline and regulate their circulation. Normalization determines how knowledge production is applied towards delineating which person or persons are legitimate and therefore escapes let-die functions.

I spent that night talking to my daughter about why the Japanese-Canadians were interned and I tried to answer her other questions that were not taken up in her class. That night also started me on a journey through the "silent" parts of Canadian history not found in history textbooks or the Citizenship Examination books, so I could one day answer the questions my two other children will ask me when they, too, read *Obasan* in their classes.

Obasan is a multi-award winning book recognized not only for its literary merits but also for the even-handed socio-political rendition of a sensitive moment in Canadian history. It was also on the BCTF recommended list of novels for anti-racism. Yet the word "racism" was never mentioned when my daughter was studying the novel. One year later, my other daughter was required to read *To Kill a Mockingbird* by Harper Lee. Atticus' strength of character impressed her so much that she wanted to be a lawyer. She went on to take Law 12 during her senior year. But I could not answer her question about why Atticus was alone in openly defending Tom Robinson. I knew the books were about racism. But both books did not help my children understand the nature of racism. Perhaps racism, like other difficult topics (sexism, homophobia, religion) should not be part of the core curriculum and need not be taken up. But – does it erase the questions my daughter had about racism? Or is it so we might not ask, or even think of these questions? Citing the importance of "rattling complacent cages", Boler (1999, p. 176) advocated for a "pedagogy of discomfort" where "both educators and students engage in

a critical inquiry regarding values and cherished beliefs and to examine constructed self-images in relation to how one has learned to perceive others". It entails challenging the normalized discourses and unearthing subjugated ones. How do we prepare teachers for discomfort?

Willinsky (1998) stated that as an institution grounded on a colonial legacy of domination and exploitation, schools have continued to operate under systems of knowledge that maintain the inequitable power relations. That one of the few key texts from a Canadian minority writer should be covered in an English class rather than a social studies class is an example of what Willinsky (1998) described as a colonial legacy in our schools. Citing Corson's work, Brass (2010) argued that literary studies as didactic pedagogies are limited because a "disciplined mind" will not foster people's active capacities to choose and act intentionally. The English class permits the sanitation and the silencing of what could have been a difficult yet meaningful discussion on the history of Canada and one of its diverse "Others". The Integrated Resource Package (IRP)³ for English Language Arts indicates one of its learning outcomes thus:

"Make reasoned judgments about aspects of the text and/or the text as a whole (e.g., "The characters of *Obasan* are more conflicted than those in *The Jade Peony*, but both novels shed light on the immigrant experience," "Patrick Lane's use of colloquial language enhances the realism of his poetry.") (BC Ministry of Education, 2007)

The focus on the affective and literary aspects of literature should not preclude a more critical examination of the issues that the literature presents. Perhaps it is more comfortable to teach about racial discrimination when the affective and literary agenda act as buffers for the teachers and students to negotiate the subject matter. Brass (2010) noted that in history classes, there are more opportunities for the contingency and limits of pedagogical arguments to posit an oppositional relation between power and freedom that could be challenged. Delving into the personal struggles of a group without

³ The Integrated Resource Package is the provincially prescribed functional curriculum overview for K-12 education for each subject (Ministry of Education)

interrogating its history and context normalizes the events. It permits the assumption that the events are regular acts of war instead of the de-normalized position ascribed on a particular group. The silence over the knowledge of the historical treatment of the racialized Others in Canada permits the denial and ignorance of profound structural inequities and social injustice. It is not surprising then that the surveillance on Muslims in North America since 9/11 is not seen as parallel to the internment of the Japanese during World War II. It is no wonder that we do not recognize it happening again to the Muslim-Canadians even after an official apology by the Canadian government has been issued to the Japanese-Canadians in recognition of the injustice. A segment of the population has been singled out again to be de-normalized. These instances of singling out of racialized populations for differential treatment outside the constitutional boundaries have become acceptable and unquestioned. As a matter of fact, new legislative measures were created in both instances to enable the state to exercise these let-die functions on its own people.

In Bainbridge, Skogen and Johnston's (2008) work with pre-service teachers in Alberta, they discovered that even as the pre-service teachers plan to use Canadian books in their teaching, the taken-for-granted notion of Canadian identity or stereotypes remains unquestioned. The superficial and uncontroversial understanding of the curriculum material fails to challenge the myths and assumptions embedded in the material since most pre-service teachers are not encouraged to "stir the pot" (p. 11). Banks (2006, p. 74) cautioned against conflict evasive pedagogy because it becomes a rationale for inaction and a justification for the status quo. It also presumes that pre-service teachers are not willing or able to negotiate difficult topics and are produced as non-critical and passive participants in their own education.

In benevolent but superficial displays of pluralist practices, multicultural literacy has been reified for its commodification where implicit values and subject positions remain problematic. Miki (as cited in Beauregard, 2001) argued that "visibility is no guarantee that racialized texts will perform liberatory effects on readers" (p. 6). By embedding the curriculum with content by non-native English writers, multicultural educators have fulfilled the "diversity" aspect of the multicultural curriculum without negotiating the gendered and racialized aspects of *Obasan*. Derman-Sparks and Edwards (2010) described this approach as the "tourist curriculum" where teachers

engage in “tokenism, trivializing, misrepresenting and stereotyping” (p. 9). They asserted that this superficial educational effort does not help make the diverse experiences and histories of the marginalized groups real to the students. By not connecting the content to the present day context and experiences, students can assume that patriarchy and racism are confined to the past and are not taking place in the present. In Sara’s experience of reading *Obasan* in her English class, the separation of the internment from the historical discrimination of minority groups avoids the complex and uglier aspects of Canadian history. This subjugation of the knowledge is ironic in that it is what Banks (2008) referred to as the “additive” nature of multicultural education where “non-canon” material has been added to the curriculum content, concepts and themes without changing the basic structure of how knowledge has been constructed. The pain of the Japanese-Canadians becomes “their” problem and not the misconduct of the nation (Beauregard, 2001). This normalizing practice of sedative politics “attempts to recognize ethnic differences, but only in a contained fashion in order to manage them” (Kambourelli as cited in Beauregard, 2001, p. 11).

An additive approach to multicultural education reinforces the normalized version of Canadian history by subjugating knowledges that undermine the prevailing narrative where the “poor” enemies of the state went through an unfortunate experience during wartime, “an isolated aberration” (Beauregard, 2001, p. 9) in Canadian history. Historical events like the Japanese internment would have elicited various experiences and perceptions that could have been made into a rich trove of discussion about multiple perspectives and dimensions of history. A nuanced understanding of historical events might capture the complex forces at work and the contradictory voices that produce histories. This discussion could have disrupted the master narratives one usually learns from the mainstream curriculum. An interdisciplinary approach might have provided students with multidimensional learning experiences where they could have made connections between events in history and how interpretations have been made (Miller, 1997). However, within the context of a history of colonialism, seemingly benign curricular material could have unanticipated counterproductive effects by reproducing the unexamined colonial relations (Kaomea, 2003). Ms. Z’s mother, like Lee’s (2008) mother during the Chinese Exclusion period, experienced institutional racism and humiliation. When we hear about how they buried their memories and repressed their

hostility, resentment and shame, we are reminded of Spivak's (1988) question: Should the subaltern speak? Not if the dominant society is not ready. Not if it makes possible further let-die functions by normalizing their experiences. So, who needs multicultural education? Banks (2006) posited that everyone needs multicultural education because it helps us understand ourselves and the social world we live in. It expands our knowledge of what it means to be "human" (p.63).

...transformation of reality is no way passive. And a certain freedom of the mind is needed- freedom to press on, to enter currents of your thoughts like a glider pilot, knowing that your motion can be sustainedit has to question, to challenge, to conceive of alternatives, perhaps to the very life you are living at that moment. (Rich, 2001, p. 21)

Producing or transforming our knowledge is not comfortable or easy. But it sets us free to constitute and to question what we know.

5.3. Analysis of Narratives

5.3.1. Implications on Education

The three narratives illustrate some of the ways multicultural education has been practiced and three of Banks' (2008) dimensions for practicing multicultural education: prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy, and content integration. They demonstrate that even with well-intentioned policies, rigorous theoreticizations, and the commitment of teachers to the substance of the multicultural vision, multicultural education as commonly practiced without a mindful attention to the discourses and their effects could reproduce the same inequities it set out to reduce. The dimensions cannot be seen as isolated and discrete modes for practices. Instead, they should be seen as spokes on a wheel where they all work together to make multicultural education meaningful. The relative absence or the reluctance to take up the other two dimensions, knowledge construction and the empowerment of school and societal structures, is crucial when we examine multicultural education through Foucault's notion of power. Because the relationship between knowledge and power connects these last two dimensions, we cannot leave knowledge unexamined because of its power effects. From the analysis of the narratives, we learn that the understanding of the Other might not be possible, for

knowledge is as tenuous as the object of the knowledge. Knowledge is arbitrary. It is shaped by various social, political and economic factors. Knowledges could be silenced. Those who speak the loudest easily drown other voices. Knowledge is dangerous. It could be used to maintain a particular order of relations. So what kind of education is this when knowledge and power are subjugated areas of concern? What are the implications of this oversight?

Macedo (1993) argued that the practice of unexamined knowledge is a process of intellectual mechanization that he described as the “literacy for stupidification” (p. 183). He further argued that this “pedagogy of lies” (p. 186) grounds the notion of literacy on the basis of receiving knowledge where the “truth” we receive remains unacknowledged as a “pedagogy of lies”. Macedo (1993, p. 186) decried the lack of courses such as race relations, ethics and ideology in teacher preparation curriculum. He defined colonial education as an ideological one where the system rewards those who reproduce and do not question the dominant mechanisms. Freire (1970, p.72) called this practice the “banking” concept of education where students receive, file and store the deposits of knowledge. Ranciere (as cited in Bingham & Biesta, 2010, p. 67) similarly characterized this stultification process as when the student “... feels that on his own, he wouldn’t have followed the route he had just been led down; and he forgets that there are a thousand paths in intellectual space open to his will”. Foucault, (1996, p. 135) also described this situation with dissatisfaction:

A teacher is someone who says: “There are certain number of things you don’t know, but you should know”. He starts off by making the students feel guilty. And then he places them under an obligation, saying: “I’m the one who knows these things that you should know and I’m going to teach them to you. And once I’ve taught them to you, you’re going to have to know them. And I’m going to verify whether you really do know them.” So there’s a whole series of verification, a whole series of relationships of power.

When education is practiced where we are kept in our docile state of prescriptive thoughts and acts, and when we allow the let-die functions to deprive us of our power to produce knowledge, the danger is not only in our subjugation. The greater danger is in our repetition of the subjugation. If let-die is what we know, then let-die is what we will do because we act on what we know. Drawing on Butler’s work, Kumashiro (2002)

posited that the repetition of knowledge and practices traps us in a cycle that has become a common-sense ritual in our schools. Like the court's function during the monarchy, we re-enact the "permanent ritual operations" (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 175) that constitute practices to re-qualify and reinforce the power that produces the knowledge and truths we are given to reproduce. We participate in the "game of truth" (Foucault, 1985, p. 6) where we give away our capacities to make-live ourselves by producing our own truths. If there is anything we might take away from Foucault's contribution to our understanding of how bio-power works, it is that there is no more king. The mechanisms are positive acts of privileging certain knowledges and practices. They are tools we can use or not use; they are tools we can re-invent for make-live functions. How will these mechanisms help us practice make-live functions and shift the direction of power and its effects? Let us go through the mechanisms once again, and re-imagine how we can use our make-live capacities in multicultural education.

5.3.1.1. Objectification (and Subjectification)

Delpit (1995) described the effects of the stereotypical perception where Aboriginal teachers are often berated as "lacking a professional attitude" (p. 142), so schools often employ detailed management system procedures for them to follow. In one instance, a Native teacher stopped two of her students who were fighting in the hallway. The students asked her if the incident would be reported to the principal as mandated by the school policy. The teacher bowed her head and said, "I'd be ashamed to". The boys stopped fighting the rest of the school year, remembering their own embarrassment. The teacher refused to exercise her power of the let-die function on the students because she *knew* of another way to get the *effect* (stop fighting) she wanted other than doing what the school policy book mandated. She did not see the students as objects to pass through the administrative regulations but as knowing subjects who could be responsible upon the knowledge of the effects of their own actions.

5.3.1.2. Grid of Intelligibility

In her own practice of critical pedagogy, Ellsworth (1989) realized how the discourse on critical pedagogy was itself reproducing repressive practices in her classroom. Based on the grid of rationality, she discovered that critical pedagogy hides underneath a politicized vocabulary that operates under "a high level of abstraction" (p.

300). Critical pedagogy posits itself as a rational other against its irrational other, but Ellsworth contended that it does not help in recognizing the intersection of diverse social positions and political ideologies that undergird oppressive dynamics. Rationality does not leave room for the partial, imperfect and limit of all knowledges. It presumes that oppressive dynamics can be “theorized away” instead of engaging in the difficult processes of sustaining encounters where what we know is always being challenged and re-formed. What we know will always be constrained within axes of oppression where we are always both oppressor and oppressed. She concluded with an invitation to go beyond the grid of rationality by quoting Lorde: “The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house”. How then, might we re-invent the tools of bio-power?

5.3.1.3. Subjugation of Knowledges

For this mechanism, I write about the active excavation of subjugated knowledges by two scholars. John Willinsky has written *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire’s End* (1998), a book about how the colonial legacy is still shaping our education in different ways. His book traced all the different ways our academic institutions are reproducing the colonial relations through the management of history, geography, science, language, and literature. In his own war against the “learned forgetfulness” (p. 263) and the wilful blindness of education, we are reminded that schooling is never neutral or non-ideological. Timothy Stanley is the author of *Contesting White Supremacy: School Segregation, Anti-Racism, and the Making of Chinese Canadians* (2011). He wrote about the historically-produced “patterns of meaning” (p.231) embedded in the history of Chinese-Canadians who were victims of the way power always intervenes to “refix” binaries that partition. Against all the representations, the significant thing about his book is the focus on the acts of resistance by the Chinese-Canadians that history books will never include. What is notable about these two books is how those who have the power to re-enact let-die functions to reinforce their own positions could exercise their power in ways that make-live others. They illustrate the power of turning the gaze back on the norm by producing knowledge that has been subjugated.

5.3.1.4. Normalization

In her career as a white middle class teacher, Pennington (2007) narrated about how it took her over twelve years of teaching in a disadvantaged school before she realized the effect of her own racial positioning on the students and their families. It was only when she taught a class of pre-dominantly white pre-service teachers that she was able to see her normalized, invisible positionality vis-à-vis the students that she taught for twelve years. Using autoethnography as a pedagogical tool where she joined the pre-service teachers in writing their narratives, she saw herself mirrored in the “custodial positioning” of her fellow teachers as their students’ saviours or conquerors. In their role of a “traditional pedagogue”, the focus of pre-service teacher education was on teaching; race was not an issue. Quoting Mahoney, Pennington (2007) stated:

White women see ourselves as acting as individuals rather than as members of a culture in part because we do not see much of the dominant culture at all. Our own lives are therefore part of a racialized world in ways we do not see. This happens when we interact with people of color thinking we are acting as individuals but are in fact acting as part of a White pattern (p. 98).

The normalization process has successfully rendered their own race invisible, along with the unawareness of the implications on the students. Pennington (2007) contended that their identities as privileged teachers did not force them to explore the roles they played in the institution of the school that mimicked the roles they played in the wider society. They realized that they have been producing the marginalized children from a mistaken, patriarchal and misguided position; they have been “norm-referencing” (p.98) the student’s lives by their own lives. Pennington saw the pattern of their passive and powerful roles: they could blame the difficult issues of the children to their family situations; and yet they could also control how power was to be exercised through the school. Their pre-service teacher education did not disrupt the normalized “White rituals” (Feagin & Vera as cited in Pennington, 2007, p. 99) that were re-enacted daily in their roles as the saviours who “maintained distance but remained helpful”. She realized that these rituals go unnoticed by whites but not by the people of colour. Stating that “we saved them before we even got there by our own histories” (p. 97), Pennington and her pre-service teachers became conscious of their privileged positions. Coming out of her white silent normalized position, she broke the “fourth wall” in the classroom

and talked to the pre-service teachers about race and its implications in their profession. She dropped her “detached persona of professionalism and political correctness” (p. 100) to address the impact of her racial position on the learning experiences of their students. In a process of counter-narrative bridging, she led the pre-service teachers to resituate race at the forefront and to be conscious of telling their stories as white persons. The journey was not easy. It was bumpy. But it opened up a space for her and the pre-service teachers to acknowledge the issues they had with teaching children from other cultures. Gone were the ritual enunciations of “they have such hard lives”, the use of code words like “underclass”, “welfare mothers”, “inner city”, “illegal aliens”, “terrorist” or simply the words “they” or “their”. Acknowledging their power positions, they got out of the insulated white space where they did not have to tackle the issue of race and to recognize their privilege. By transferring the gaze to their invisible and normal whiteness instead of ignoring it, Pennington and her class of pre-service teachers became more aware of their impact on their students by knowing what they know differently and acting differently.

5.3.1.5. Divide and Rule (Disciplinary Partitioning and Hierarchical Regulation)

The management of the Aboriginal peoples was institutionalized in the Indian Act of 1876 (Mackey, 2002). By segregating them into reserves, the Indian Act was a powerful knowledge apparatus that produced who was Aboriginal and who was not. This essentialization and the conflation of the complex diversity of the different Aboriginal nations still carries profound effects on their lives today by creating division and alienation that have impeded their negotiations with the government. The genocidal aftermath of the residential schools also resonates in Aboriginal education today. St. Denis' (2007) work on the revitalization of the Aboriginal cultural identity through education over the past thirty years has demonstrated the inherent struggle after centuries of let-die functions. She contended that Aboriginal education suffers the same fate as multicultural education in the limited scope of the practices like equity pedagogy through funding and accessibility, like content integration where they have their own curriculum, and like prejudice reduction through the celebration of their art and artefacts. All these practices have not changed the colonial relations of power. However, Fraser Institute researcher Peter Cowley (2006) published an article decrying the refusal of all

the Aboriginal nations in Canada (with the exception of BC and Yukon) to make available the academic test results of band-operated schools. Repeated requests have been denied. In light of the Fraser Institute's proclivity for accumulating knowledge and producing their own knowledge in order to divide and hierarchize students in BC through the FSAs, the Aboriginal leaders and their respective ministries of education should be lauded for asserting their make-live functions against the Fraser Institute, an institution bent on exercising the mechanism to sort and order the Aboriginal students.

5.3.1.6. Panopticism

Lam's (1996) story, "The Green Teacher", depicted the experiences of an Asian-Canadian teacher, Rose. Rose attended school as an ESL student from Grade 3 to Grade 5 when she first immigrated to Canada. Eschewing the stereotype of the ESL student who struggles with English, Rose chose to major in the French language in university. On her first day in school, the professor singled her out and questioned her ability to cope with instruction in school. Nevertheless, she graduated as a French major and went on to teach core French as a public school teacher. She ended up requesting for a transfer so she could teach the ESL class at her school, which the principal referred to as the "ESL problem". She had become very frustrated by her experiences of being panoptimized based on her skin colour, where her differences have accorded her "mistrust, marginalization, and in more power-driven contexts, exclusion, scape-goating and discrimination" (p. 19). Realizing that her racial identity will always interfere with her role as a teacher, she decided to focus on helping others like her survive and cope with a panoptimized existence. Rose encouraged her students with her own make-live choices because the power to be Canadian is in the hands of others when you are racialized. She encouraged them to talk back and not recoil, to insist instead of concede, and to not allow others to diminish them. She told them, "Things will not change; you have to change". She closed her interview with these words: "Just putting a green teacher in a school full of green kids does not make them happy green kids" (47). Because as Kermit sang: "It's not easy being green"; or any colour, for that matter. Being colourless or invisible would have been easier for those who are panoptimized. Yet ESL programs continue to treat them as a homogeneous group whose deficit can be "corrected".

I use examples of disrupting the mechanisms because when we are faced with particular opportunities to exercise power to make-live ourselves or someone else, there are no formulas, but only opportunities to choose make-live functions rather than let-die functions. The mechanisms are tools. How might we use them? It begins with what we know.

Entrenched between the different discourses that intersect and overlap, the egalitarian practices remain elusive to multicultural education because they are premised on the liberal fantasies of a democratic illusion and infused with discourses from various historical, political and social positions. These discourses have shaped our understanding of and our practices in multicultural education. By unquestioningly repeating the privileged practices of the discourse, we end up reproducing the same rule of relations that defeats what we try to do in providing “real equity of opportunity for all” (BCTF, p. 14) (see Appendix D).

It is through knowledge that our consent is “manufactured” to sustain a seemingly totalizing system where we become the “docile bodies” (Foucault, 1977, p. 138) moving within our locations. The disciplining techniques of bio-power serve to order and to regulate multiplicities through knowledge that objectifies who we are as individuals and influences what we do. Yet more often than not, we are not even aware of how we reproduce the dynamics with the mundane and “banal” practices that we were taught. How do we challenge what we know? By discovering how the mechanisms work and what their effects in multicultural education look like, how might we, through multicultural education, “promote new forms of subjectivity... and refuse the kind of individuality which has been imposed on us” (Foucault, 1982, p. 785)? How might we be able to blur the lines between “Us” and “Them”, to re-define the notion of the “Other” and the “ESL” student, and to interrupt the linear logic of history as we know it? Inside the classroom, the blurring of boundaries might even raise new questions: Who teaches? Who learns? Who has what knowledge? It matters not whether multicultural education is good or bad, or if ESL designation is good or bad.

What I think is important is to shift the boundaries, to make them indefinite, to shake them up, make them fragile, to allow crossovers and osmosis. It isn't possible not to think in terms of good and evil, true or

false. But you have to say every time: and if it were the opposite, what if the lines were elsewhere ... (Foucault, 1996, p. 137)

Have I limited my own options? Silenced my own questions? What might it look like had I been more conscious of the implications of my own actions? What if I had questioned what I knew? What could I have done differently?

5.3.2. What Might It Look Like

I remember my first course here at the university. The professor gave us a copy of an anthropological report published in the *American Anthropologist* in 1956 called "Body Ritual among the Nacirema". A satirical report of a "tribe", it described the peculiar habits of a group of people in the United States. Most of us did not get it until the end of the article. The professor was carefully observing our reactions. He winked and put his finger to his lips conspiratorially when I wagged a finger at him after I finished the article. Several classmates needed him to ask them to spell "American" backwards. It was a brilliant technique to use another pair of lenses to interrogate our common-sense assumptions. To make the most powerful and civilized nation look like a primitive tribe is an epistemological jolt, if only for a few seconds. But it is a disruption to the unitary order of things and to what we know we know. Where we take this disruption is usually up to us.

Looking back now, I am aware of my complicity in participating in the divisions of the grid. In Matthew's Multicultural Day, I helped enlarge the space between "Canadian" and "Filipino-Canadian" instead of making it smaller. Instead of a showcase of Filipino culture, I could have focused on one aspect and created a theme where I could make connections with the local Canadian culture. I could have used the "bayanihan" spirit, or the communal way of life there, and connected it to how the same sense of community is promoted in Canada. That way, there is a link between cultures that may narrow, rather than widen, the gap between the different ways of being Canadian. I would have blurred the boundaries between the partitions. In Bascia's (1996) work with Edgar Culver, an ESL teacher, she pointed out the importance of creating these bridges to minimize cognitive dissonance and to provide a space for transitions between differences. Might I have minimized the effect of the de-normalizing objectification?

As for Daisy being labelled as “ESL” at that point in time, I could not see any option for me but to encourage my daughter to strive to be better than good. There is no other way to disprove the ascribed identity than by playing by the rules of the system. Or might there be another way? She did go on to become a top academic student and a student leader of her peers in secondary school. There is a measure of redemption and satisfaction in besting those who used to see her as “deficient”. Yet the ironic thing is, it also affirmed how well the ESL program “worked” because one of its “products” went on to succeed academically. While complicit instead of disruptive of the grid of intelligibility imposed, it does explain the “model minority” phenomenon of those identified as Asians where they are raised to higher standards – because of the epidermalization of their personhood. It was a rude awakening for my daughter to experience the socio-political reality at the intersection of language and race (not to say the logic of public school funding), but it did signal my need as a parent to educate my children in the nuances of bio-power from a historico-political perspective. Might understanding the nuances of how knowledge constructs labels foster ways wherein Daisy might be able to resist the ascriptions imposed on her?

If *Obasan* or a canonical material like *To Kill a Mockingbird* are to become required reading for high school students like Sara, they cannot be stripped of their historical and political contexts without essentializing the events or the experiences of the characters in the book. Grounding curriculum within power relations prevents the commodification of cultures and identities. Instead of consuming curriculum material or cultural displays, these could be taken up as opportunities for students to construct their own knowledge and to explore the societal structures that shape events, institutions and relations. Cultures could be explored as dynamic and contingent, and identities could be constructed as fluid and contested. Within a wider social and political discourse, assumptions could be unpacked and interpretations could be multiplied. Things are not just *the way they are* even in fiction. We should not underestimate the students’ abilities to think. Perhaps we might not have the answers to questions they might ask, but we should not stop them from asking. Might excavating the alternate versions of the Japanese internment reveal subjugated knowledge and expand the grid wherein history is articulated? Or have we become like the doctors and psychiatrists in Foucault’s (1996, p. 138) study of the mental institution, who do not act out of hostility towards the

“madmen”; it is only they no longer hear their words and cries because their established knowledge and information act as filters to the pain of others.

Like Foucault, I cannot give specifics on how to disrupt the mechanisms. I only offer examples from Foucault’s works, from the discourses surrounding multiculturalism and multicultural education and from my own experiences. But Adrienne Rich (2001, p. 21) “whispered” to those who will listen: “Our imagination is subversive. It is free. Let it soar – for if the imagination is to transcend and transform experience, it has to question, to challenge, to conceive of alternatives”. After reading Foucault’s work, there is no way I could set limits to your imagination.

In this chapter, I have clarified the reasons behind my use of narratives for this research. Aside from helping me articulate questions and the reasons behind my questions, the narratives helped me understand my own role in the objectification processes of bio-power within the practice of multicultural education. The three narratives and their analyses demonstrate how multicultural education is practiced in the space where these discourses intersect and overlap. I end with an analysis of my experiences of multicultural education, their implications on education and how I might have disrupted the mechanisms of bio-power.

In the next chapter, I end this thesis by describing what I have learned and what it has meant for me to examine multicultural education through the lenses of Foucault’s notion of power. What questions have I not asked? What questions do I still have?

6. Making Meaning: Making a Difference

I end this study with the three contradictions in multicultural education that started me on this inquiry by restating the contradictions and juxtaposing them with the rationale for their practices. Then I narrate a story to meaningfully connect them to what I have learned. The contradictions are:

- Prejudice Reduction through exposure to other knowledges: How might multicultural celebrations create more cultural distance rather than bridge it?
- Equity Pedagogy by providing knowledge to enable inclusion: How may the English as a Second Language (ESL) program, a basic tool for integration under the multicultural initiative, constitute a new group of Other?
- Content Integration by inclusion of other knowledges: How may the addition of multicultural content to the school curriculum become a reduction in knowledge and a barrier to meaningful learning?

In my work with the XXX City, I help different cultural groups develop their own websites, which are hosted by the city. The city provides the platform while I teach them the technological skills so they can build their websites by putting their own content to showcase their cultures to the public. Like the multicultural classroom, the city provides the (web) space for each organization *to display and share* their cultures. On behalf of the city, I teach them the skills to use the (technical) *language to enable them* to share *their content* so the public may learn about them and their culture. Like multiculturalism, it was a highly touted project ahead of its time because it was a noble undertaking that was officially funded and widely publicized. My experience with one particular group enabled me to see more clearly how the mechanisms of bio-power function through knowledge and power even in relations we often perceive as benign and neutral.

One of the groups I worked with, the *WWW Cultural Society*, had a hard time launching their website despite the regular meetings we had to assist them through the process. Their ambivalence about how to use the website for their organization was manifested in the numerous times we had to re-design the lay out as their objectives for the website changed. Their concerns regarding the security and rights to their website content were evident by their reluctance to learn the platform. Their skepticism about the city's intentions was apparent in their hesitance to put the content they spoke of with pride. It was compounded by the ongoing political tension in their country of origin that has divided their society into different factions. It was frustrating for me because I knew it was not a matter of their competence. Something changed when I went to one of their poetry nights. I went because I just happened to like that particular poet. The reaction of the group to my presence was a surprise and a revelation to me. I was introduced as the "person from the City doing the website for our organization". I had to clarify that "I do work for the City. But Mr. Q and his group are creating the website to share your organization with the community". I also had to explain that it was because of the information on their website that I was able to be there that night to learn about the poet with others who also love his work. They were surprised that I was really interested in learning about the poet from people who knew his work well. They were surprised that their art could be appreciated by people outside their community. Witnessing their passion and pride in their culture first hand also touched me. The depth and history of what I have seen of their web content developed new meaning. I could never see the content they have tentatively put on their website the same way again.

That night helped ease our way through the barriers we have been encountering. I realized that as an employee of the city, I am always embedded in the power relations between the city and its diverse groups. Even if the website project was part of the multicultural outreach to the diverse communities within the city, it was still infused with all the discourses on the group involved, on multiculturalism, and on the city's relationship with its diverse Others. These intersecting discourses will always affect the relationship we have. None of the work I did was more powerful than that night I went to the poetry festival. Although I did not go as a city representative but as a member of the public, I was able to create fissures in the objectified identities we have ascribed on ourselves and on each other. We could not stand outside the ongoing power relations

between us as individuals embedded within the institutions and the communities we are in. Yet we could stand in front of each other in ways that shifted the normalized way we had been positioned. They were not just one of the multicultural group. They were *WWW Cultural Society*, a name they thoughtfully created and imbued with meanings they had chosen. Their website content could never fully capture who they are as a people. We disrupted the grid within which we saw our roles and the purpose of our relations. That night shifted our working relationship. They became more enthusiastic about what information they wanted to share because there is an audience out there who might really want to know. They learned the platform and figured out their own way of using it to constitute themselves as a community to the public. They trusted that they could control the content (knowledge) that they wanted to share with the community and that the knowledge would not be misappropriated by the city by taking more control over their website. They also saw the website as a way to open up opportunities for other projects in the city with regards to their organization's role in the community.

As in multicultural education, power undergirds the relationships and these relationships are informed by the discourses surrounding us. Knowledge that is shared or produced is never neutral. The more aware we are of our level of participation, the more we exercise our power to constitute ourselves within the discourses. Since all relations are infused with power, being aware helps us be more mindful about how we convey power. We cannot avoid participation in the discourses. Even if we do not create them, our participation or non-participation plays a role through the mechanisms of bio-power to reinforce or weaken them. In Burbules and Rice's (1991, p. 395) discussion on the postmodern critique of educational institution, we are not "answerable only to our disciplinary standards of truths, evidence and accuracy". As embedded participants within the discourses, which are saturated with power and dominance, we should examine our relations within a system of power and privilege where even the most apparently benign relations "might instantiate and perpetuate broader patterns of social and political dominance" (p. 396). That is why prejudice is not reduced by mere exposure to knowledge about the Other, equity is not about simply providing the same tool, and integration is not necessarily inclusion. The question that remains is: how, then, should we participate in the discourses that surround multicultural education?

I started this study by introducing the different discourses that shape how we practice multicultural education because I wanted to explore how our practices are informed by our knowledges and unexamined assumptions. I wanted to examine how this “philosophy of engaging differences” (Ley, 2007) called multiculturalism has been conceived and has been enacted to produce its effects in education. I wanted to understand why it had been dotted by so many contradictions. It was quite easy to define “multicultural”: its pros and cons, its celebrations and its costs. It took me quite some time of “exercising myself in the activity of thought” (Foucault, 1985, p. 9) to be able to excavate what is not known about multicultural education in order to be able to think differently. What has not been asked or even mentioned about the practices? When people agree with it or disagree with it, are they agreeing and disagreeing on the same assumptions of what multicultural education is about? Are they even talking about the same thing? Or are they participating in the “game of truth” (Foucault, 1985, p. 6) where those who produce more “truths” or the “Truth” win and are able to define multicultural education and its practices?

By framing the various discourses that surround multiculturalism and education with Foucault’s concept of power, I capture the pattern that connects these “ensembles of discursive events” (Foucault, 1971, p. 23) such as the ones that shaped the practices in multicultural education. These practices have been shaped by:

1. the discourse surrounding the state-initiated multiculturalism when it was introduced over 40 years ago;
2. the discourse on Canada’s history with some of its diverse groups of Others: Quebec Nationalists, Aboriginal peoples, and Immigrants;
3. the discourse on Canada’s history of colonialism;
4. the discourse on culture;
5. the discourse on new racism and white privilege;
6. the discourse on multicultural education by its major proponent: James A. Banks;

7. the discourses surrounding the debates on multicultural education: its value for non-ethnic students, its divisiveness and anti-West approach, its challenge to the traditional curriculum and standards, and its value for a neo-liberal globalized world.

The influences on the practices in multicultural education are not limited by these discourses. Some of the other discourses we can examine are the policy on funding and the ideological position of the prevailing political party. These would be important aspects to explore for future research because they reflect the broader patterns of social and political discourses.

However, the discourses I discussed have shed light on the contradictions I wished to address in this study: Why have the multicultural practices in education resulted in reproducing the unequal power relations despite decades of theoreticization and research that proliferated the past few decades? By drawing on Foucault's conceptualization of bio-power and six of its mechanisms, I focus on schools as a powerful site where we examine how knowledge and power have institutionalized these mechanisms of bio-power. The narratives demonstrate the let-die effects of the common practices in multicultural education that we do not question. The analyses of the different discourses and narratives reveal the mechanisms of bio-power that permeate them. They demonstrate that even benign, neutral practices such as celebrating a cultural event, teaching the English language, and adding to curriculum content are not as innocuous as they seem. Our practices within the educational institution are fraught with meanings produced through the various discourses that we reproduce. Foucault's conception of the mechanisms and his description of how they function enable us to avoid theoretical abstractions like liberalism and the five dimensions of multicultural education in order to understand the material ways our knowledge and actions are shaped by powers far removed from where the effects take place. This understanding of how the mechanisms function in power relations that are embedded in discourses allows us to perceive the real effects of multicultural education and how its practices shape the dynamic of relations. How has multicultural education produced knowledge that reproduces unequal relations? How have the practices resulted in let-die functions when the objectives of the Multicultural Policy and its various conceptualizations appear noble and benign?

Might the real question behind multicultural education be: How does what I know and what I do affect others? Is it to make-live or let-die? How do we work through the power in multicultural education as a space to engage our differences, yet not engage in let-die practices? Power relations are never even. They are always “an equilibrium and interplay of proportions, a stable dissymmetry or a congruent inequality” (Foucault, 1997/2003, p. 29). By disrupting the direction and de-centering the effects of power in multicultural education, might we prevent the reproduction of de-normalized objects? Might we expand or disrupt the grid of intelligibility and destabilize or shift the panoptical gaze? Might we break the lines that divide, and unpack or excavate the knowledges that shape our relations? In what ways might we interrupt the mechanisms of bio-power so power moves in different ways where we can make subjects of others and ourselves? What is our role in our own subjugation and the subjugation of others?

Multicultural education has not “failed”. Banks (2008, p. 67) noted major curricular changes made in the past two decades, like Taba’s conceptual curriculum, where higher-level powerful concepts like socialization and values are being problematized in the social studies curriculum for grades 1 to 8. Others researchers focus on pre-service teacher education (Gay, 1997; Gay and Howard, 2000; Sleeter, 2001), where subjugated knowledges like Whiteness and teacher epistemologies are being problematized. Being treated as agentic knowers instead of neutral technicians to deliver curricular material enable teachers to resist their own objectification. In Canada, the Canadian Education Trend Report listed the current activities by the federal, provincial, and non-governmental organizations that addressed issues in multicultural education and anti-racism education. They ranged from policy instruments to research and educational initiatives like the Quebec Ministry of Education’s project, which is an inventory of best practices that included parental involvement. There were also grassroots events like the *Stop Racism Youth Tour* and private initiatives like Enid Lee’s anti-racism manual called “Letters to Marcia” that consists of practical advice for teachers.

Multicultural education is no magic bullet for bridging differences. It poses both risks and opportunities for engaging with differences. The three narratives I have given in the previous chapter illustrate the risks of multicultural education. Despite the best of intentions, our actions reflect what we know as individuals embedded within the multiple

discourses of the institutions and society we live in. But multicultural education could also provide plenty of make-live opportunities if viewed as subversive, as what Kazmi (1997, p. 331) suggested:

The pedagogical value and significance of teaching multiculturalism lies in its ability to subvert the given, the established, the same, the dominant cultural domain, by foregrounding the other, the different, the subjugated cultures without attempting to assimilate that which is unlike and alien in order to preserve and guarantee human freedoms.

As a space to engage with differences, multicultural education could be the space where the rule of relations might regard differences as educational opportunities instead of as intimidating barriers (Burbules & Rice, 1991, p. 415). In keeping with Foucault's notion that power is everywhere and is infused within all relations, perhaps we should focus on our relations and how we exercise power through them. After looking into how the mechanisms of bio-power are at work in the different discourses that shape multicultural education, we may better understand how what we do know or what we do not know shapes our practices in the classroom and how we may better understand how to resist. Let us not mistake the mechanisms of power for power itself, for "power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations" (Foucault, 1978 p. 94). Richardson and Villenas (2000) contended that resistance is not just about the struggle of removing power from the center but also about disrupting the workings of power by re-appropriating it. It is not looking for power outside us but viewing power in the form of our own agency as individuals embedded in a dynamic of relations with many others. In the multicultural classroom, which I believe every classroom is to a certain extent, we can exercise our power to disrupt the mechanisms. When we are aware of how we objectify students based on what we know or how we name them, perhaps we might provide the space for them to let them introduce or name themselves. If we think out of the grid that positions our students to a specific spot, perhaps we might give them the space or time to reposition themselves. If we dare challenge what we know and explore what we do not know, perhaps we might, together with our students, discover the world anew. If we look beyond what is common sense and is considered default knowledge that is often taken for granted, perhaps we might learn they are not as common after all. When knowing or teaching our students entail dividing them in a static manner and ordering them within a fixed hierarchy, we

should remember we can always re-arrange and re-order them or they might even do it themselves. When the panoptical gaze is turned towards a student or a group of students, perhaps we may find ways to relieve them of the constant gaze or even let them return the gaze. It is up to us to resist the effects of bio-power by disrupting the mechanisms.

Stanley (2011) characterized resistance not as a simple inclusion or the acquiring of equal power. He pointed out that at the heart of these struggles is the “struggle over what it meant to be human, to have shared humanity recognized and real rather than imagined differences engaged” (p. 230). When political philosopher Charles Taylor (1992) wrote his much acclaimed book on multiculturalism and the recognition of differences, it took a decade before he voiced the unasked questions on multiculturalism that might have elicited a more meaningful engagement with difference: when we have had enough of “enrichment” through the presence of the Other, what do we do next? Are we willing to see the Other’s value as human? (Taylor, 2002) It troubles me that he claimed that “understanding” the Other is the next step. If that is even possible, what happens while we have not and if we do not arrive at the point of this “understanding”? Do we continue the let-die functions, because the “pain” of acknowledging of the Other’s existence and value is too much? Another decade has gone by. The world is still diverse and full of Others. Multiculturalism is still a sociological fact in Canada. Are we getting any closer to approaching it as a social ideal?

The words of Lester B. Pearson, the 14th Prime Minister of Canada and the winner of the 1957 Nobel Peace Prize, are on the banner of every page of the *United Nations Association in Canada Peace and Security* website, such as:

- Of all our dreams today there is none more important - or so hard to realize - than that of peace in the world. May we never lose our faith in it or our resolve to do everything that can be done to convert it one day into reality
- The stark and inescapable fact is that today we cannot defend our society by war since total war is total destruction. And if war is used as an instrument of policy, eventually we will have total war.

As one of the earliest members of the Peace and Security Commission of the United Nations, Canada is one of the most active peacekeeping nations in the world. Yet, it continues to wage its “perpetual wars” against its Others at home who have been

portrayed consistently as a threat to the national cohesion. When the notion of “Canada” implies the exercise of the State’s let-die functions, could any policy, no matter how noble, fulfill its dream of a cohesive national identity? When being Canadian, even a multicultural Canadian, subjects one to exclusionary practices, what do we truly mean by cohesion and inclusion? Where does multicultural education fit into this task of narrowing the gap between the sociological reality and the social ideal?

References

- Abdi, A. A. (2009). Recentring the philosophical foundations of knowledge: The case of Africa with a special focus on the global role of teachers. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 55(3), 269-283.
- Abowitz, K. K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 653-690.
- Abu-Laban, Y., & Nath, N. (2007). From deportation to apology: The case of Maher Arar and the Canadian state. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 39(3), 71-98.
- Abu-Lughod, L. (2000). Locating ethnography. *Ethnography*, 1(2), 261-267. DOI: 10.1177/14661380022230778.
- Aiken, S. (2007). From slavery to expulsion: Racism, Canadian immigration law, and the unfulfilled promise of modern constitutionalism. In V. Agnew (Ed.), *Interrogating Race and Racism* (pp. 55-111). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Anderson, B. R. O. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Apple, M. W. (1993). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Applebaum, B. (2009). Is teaching social justice a "Liberal bias"? *Teachers College Record*, 111(2), 376-408.
- Arat-Koc, S. (1999). Neo-liberalism, state restructuring and immigration: Changes in Canadian policies in the 1990s. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 34(2), 31-56.
- Archibold, R. C. (2010 April 23). *Arizona enacts stringent law on immigration*. New York Times. Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/24/us/politics/24immig.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print
- Aveling, N. (2004). Being the descendant of colonialists: White identity in context. *Race Ethnicity & Education*, 7(1), 57-71.
- Aveling, N. (2006). 'Hacking at our very roots': Rearticulating White racial identity within the context of teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 9(3), 261-274. doi: 10.1177/0022487101052002002.

- Bainbridge, J. M., Skogen, R., & Johnston, I. (2008). 'Benign simplistic multiculturalism': Pre-service teachers' understandings of Canadian identity in Canadian picture books. *English Quarterly*, 40(3/4), 4-13.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. (2001). Globalization, multiculturalism, and other fictions: Colonialism for the new millennium? *Organization*, 8(4), 683-722.
- Banks, J. A. (1991). *Multicultural education: For freedom's sake*. Educational Leadership, 49(4), 32-36.
- Banks, J. A. (1996). *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (Multicultural Education Series). New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Banks, J. A. (2002). Race, knowledge construction, and education in the USA: Lessons from history. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 5(1), 7-27.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, 68(4), 295-305.
- Banks, J. A. (2006). *Race, culture and education. The selected works of James A. Banks*. New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to multicultural education*. New York: Pearson.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2002). Race, knowledge construction, and education in the USA: Lessons from history. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 5(1), 7-27. doi: 10.1080/13613320120117171.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). The paradox of diversity: The construction of a multicultural Canada and "women of colour". *Women's Studies International Forum*, 23(5), 537-560.
- Banting, K. G., Courchene, T. J., & Seidle, F. L. (2007). *Belonging? : Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Banting, K. G., & Kymlicka, W. (2006). *Multiculturalism and the welfare state : Recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bascia, N. (1996). Teacher leadership: Contending with adversity. In D. Thiessen, N. Bascia, & I. Goodson (Eds.), *Making a difference about difference: The lives and careers of racial minority immigrant teachers* (pp. 79-101). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Garamond Press.
- Bateson, M. C. (2000). *Full circles overlapping lives: Culture and generation in transition*. New York: Random House.

- Bauder, H., & Sharpe, B. (2008). Residential segregation of visible minorities in Canada's gateway cities. *Canadian Geographer*, 46(3), 204-222.
- Baumeister, A. T. (2000). *Liberalism and the 'politics of difference'*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
- Beauregard, G. (2001). After Obasan: Kogawa criticism and its futures. *Studies in Canadian Literature*, 26(2), 5-22. Retrieved from: http://godot.lib.sfu.ca.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/GODOT/hold_tab.cgi?genre=article&sid=Pr oQ:&atitle=AfterObasan:Kogawacriticismanditsfutures&title=StudiesinCanadianLiterature&issn=0380-6995&date=2001-01-01&volume=26&issue=2&spage=5&au=Beauregard,Guy
- Bedard, G. (2000). Deconstructing whiteness: Pedagogical implications for anti-racism education. In A. Calliste, & G. J. S. Dei (Eds.), *Power, knowledge and anti-racism education: A Critical Reader* (pp. 41-56). Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada : Fernwood.
- Belanger, A., & Malenfant, E. (2005.) Ethnocultural diversity in Canada: Prospects for 2017. *Canadian Social Trends: Statistics Canada*, 18-21.
- Bentz, V. M., & Shapiro, J. J. (1998). *Mindful Inquiry in Social Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bingham, C. W., & Biesta, G. (2010). *Jacques Rancière: Education, truth, emancipation*. New York: Continuum.
- Bissoondath, N. (2004). The tolerant society versus the accepting society. In E. Cameron (Ed.). *Multiculturalism and immigration in Canada: An introductory reader*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Bloom, L. R. (1996). Stories of one's own: Nonunitary subjectivity in narrative representation. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(2), 176-197. doi: 10.1177/107780049600200203.
- Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2007). Multiculturalism's narratives in Singapore and Canada: Exploring a model for comparative multiculturalism and multicultural education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39(6), 629-658.
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: emotions and education*. [electronic resource]. New York : Routledge, 1999. Retrieved from: <http://site.ebrary.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/lib/sfu/docDetail.action?docID=10094083>.
- Boloz, S. A. (2008). The educator's voice or the "club". In D. T. Trent (Ed.), *The authentic dissertation : alternative ways of knowing, research, and representation* (pp. 187-190). New York: Routledge.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (3rd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Brass, J. (2010). The sweet tyranny of creating one's own life: Rethinking power and freedom in English teaching. *Educational Theory*, 60(6), 703-717.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2001). *English as a Second Language: Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/esl/>
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2009). *English as a Second Language: Policy and Guidelines*. Retrieved from <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/esl/>
- BC Ministry of Education (2007). *English Language Arts 8 to 12*. Integrated Resource Package 2007. Retrieved from: http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/irp/course.php?lang=en&subject=English_Language_Arts&course=English_Language_Arts_8_to_12&year=2007.
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. (2011). *Student Statistics - 2011/12 Province - Public and Independent Schools Combined*. Retrieved from: <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/reporting/>
- British Columbia Ministry of Education. *Foundational Skills Assessment*. Retrieved from: <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/assessment/fsa/>
- British Columbia Teacher's Federation. (2011). *Better schools for BC: A plan for quality public education*. Retrieved from: bctf.ca/uploadedFiles/Public/Publications/BetterSchoolsForBC.pdf
- Burbules, N. C., & Rice, S. (1991). Dialogue across differences: Continuing the conversation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(4), 393-416.
- Calliste, A. M., & Dei, G. J. S. (2000). *Power, knowledge and anti-racism education: A critical reader*. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.: Fernwood.
- Canadian Multiculturalism Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)) Retrieved from : <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-18.7/>
- Canadian Press (2009 September 16). *B.C. cuts back autism funding*. CBC News British Columbia. Retrieved from: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/story/2009/09/16/bc-autism-funding-cut.html>
- Cardoso, A., & Pendakur, R. (2008). Canada's visible minority population: 1967-2017. *Working Paper Series, No 08-05*. Metropolis British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://riim.metropolis.net/wp_2008.html
- Carr, P.R., & Lund, D.E. (2009). The unspoken color of diversity: Whiteness, privilege and critical engagement in education. In S. Steinberg (Ed.), *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader* (pp. 45-56). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Carroll, W. K. (2004). *Critical Strategies for Social Research*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.

- Case, R. E., Ndura, E., & Righettoni, M. (2005). Balancing linguistic and social needs: Evaluating texts using a critical language awareness approach. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(5), 374.
- Champion, C. P. (2006). A very British coup: Canadianism, Quebec, and ethnicity in the flag debate, 1964-1965. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 40(3), 68-95.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2010). *Facts and figures 2010 - Immigration overview: Permanent and temporary residents*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2010/index.asp>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2011). *Discover Canada: The rights and responsibilities of citizenship- Study Guide*. (Ci1-11/2011E 978-1-100-18210-0). Retrieved from: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/discover/index.asp>
- Cockrell, K. S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D.H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with diversity and multiculturalism in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 351-366.
- Cohen, T. (2011 December 12). Feds ban veils at citizenship ceremonies. *Edmonton Journal*. Retrieved from: <http://www.edmontonjournal.com/news/Feds+veils+citizenship+ceremonies/5846938/story.html>
- Council of Ministers of Education Canada (1997). *The UNESCO recommendation against discrimination in education: The status in Canada*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cmec.ca/9/Publications/index.html?searchCat=24&searchYr=1997>
- Council of Ministers of Education Canada. (2000). *Education in a global era: Development in education in Canada plus Responses of school and public health systems in Canada to prevent HIV/AIDS*. Report prepared for the 14th Conference of Commonwealth Education Ministers. Theme: Education in a global era- Challenges to equity, opportunity for Diversity. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, November 27-30, 2000. Retrieved from: <http://www.cmec.ca/9/Publications/index.html?searchCat=24&searchYr=2000>
- Cowley, P. (2006 April 15). *A conspiracy of silence hurts Aboriginal children*. Fraser Forum. Retrieved from: <http://www.fraserinstitute.org/research-news/research/display.aspx?id=10423>
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., & Leoni, L. (2005). Timelines and Lifelines: Rethinking literacy instruction in multilingual classrooms. *Orbit*, 36(1), 22-26.
- Curtis, K. (2001). Multicultural education and Arendtian conservatism: On memory, historical injury, and our sense of the common. In M. Gordon (Ed.), *Hannah Arendt and education: Renewing our common world*. (pp. 127-152). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Day, R. J. F. (1998). Constructing the official Canadian: A genealogy of the mosaic metaphor in state policy discourse. *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 2, 42–66.
- Day, R. J. F. (2000). *Multiculturalism and the history of Canadian diversity*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Day, R. J. F., & Sadik, T. (2002). The BC land question, liberal multiculturalism, and the spectre of aboriginal nationhood. *BC Studies*, 134 (Summer 2002), 5-34.
- Dei, G. J. S. (1993). The challenges of anti-racist education in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 25(2), 36-51.
- Dei, G. J. S., Karumanchery, L. L., & Karumanchery-Luik, N. (2007). *Playing the race card: Exposing white power and privilege*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Delpit, L. (1994). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Department of Justice Canada (2011). *Canadian Multiculturalism Act RSC 1985, c 24 (4th Supp)*. Retrieved from: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-18.7/page-1.html>
- Derman-Sparks, L., & Edwards, J. O. (2010). *Anti-bias education for young children and ourselves*. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Dewing, M., & Leman, M. (2006). *Canadian Multiculturalism*. Political and Social Affairs Division, Parliament Research Branch. Library of Parliament. Retrieved from: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb0920-e.htm>
- Dhamoon, R. (2009). *Identity/Difference politics: How difference is produced and why it matters*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Dhamoon, R., & Abu-Laban, Y. (2009). Dangerous (internal) foreigners and nation-building: The case of Canada". *International Political Science Review*, 30(2), 163-183.
- Dickinson, H., & Wotherspoon, T. (1992). From assimilation to self-government: Towards a political economy of Canada's Aboriginal policies. In V. Satzewich (Ed.), *Deconstructing a nation: Immigration, multiculturalism and racism in '90s Canada* (pp. 405-421). Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Dimitriadis, G. (2001). Coming clean at the hyphen: Ethics and dialogue at a local community center. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(5), 578-597. doi: 10.1177/107780040100700504.
- Dion, K. L., & Kawakami, K. (1996). Ethnicity and perceived discrimination in Toronto: Another look at the personal/group discrimination discrepancy. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 28(3), 203-213.

- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk: One hundred years later* [electronic resource] edited with an introduction by Dolan Hubbard. Columbia: University of Missouri Press. Retrieved from:
<http://site.ebrary.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/lib/sfu/docDetail.action?docID=10048216>
- Dua, E., Razack, N., & Warner, J. N. (2005). Race, racism and empire: Reflections on Canada. *Social Justice*, 32(4), 1-10.
- Dudley-Marling, C. (2004). The social construction of learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37(6), 482-489.
- Duncan, H. (2005). Multiculturalism: Still a viable concept for integration? *Canadian Diversity*, 4(1), 12-14.
- Durst, D. (2006). *Social welfare and social work education in Canada: Implications for Canada's North*. Proceedings from International Co-operation In Social Work and Social Policy, Bodo, Norway June 12-14, 2006. Retrieved from :
www.uarctic.org/Paper_by_Douglas_Durst_WYU7L.pdf
- Edwards, J. (1992). Multiculturalism and multicultural education in contemporary context. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 24(3), 23-34.
- Elliot, J. L., & Fleras, A. (1992). *Unequal relations : An introduction to race and ethnic dynamics in Canada*. Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Prentice-Hall Canada.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I : A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297-324.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fausset, R. (2011 June 10). Alabama enacts anti-illegal-immigration law described as nation's strictest. Los Angeles Times. Retrieved from:
<http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/10/nation/la-na-alabama-immigration-20110610>
- Fenwick, F. (2001). Residential school update. *Law Now*, 25(3), 33-36.
- Findlay, S.; & Köhler, N. (2010 November 10). The enrollment controversy. MacLean's. Retrieved from: <http://www2.macleans.ca/2010/11/10/too-asian/>
- Fleming, D. (2010). Becoming citizens: Racialized conceptions of ESL learners and the Canadian Language Benchmarks. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(3), 588-616.
- Fleras, A., & Kuntz, J. L. (2001). *Media and minorities: Representing diversity in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Thompson Education Publishing.

- Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Social Science Information*, 10(7). doi: 10.1177/053901847101000201
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* [Surveiller et punir.]. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978a). About the concept of the "dangerous individual" in 19th-century legal psychiatry. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 1, 1-18.
- Foucault, M. (1978b). *The history of sexuality: An Introduction. Volume I*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality: The use of pleasure. Volume II*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1993). About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self: Two lectures at Dartmouth. *Political Theory*, 21(2), 198-227.
- Foucault, M. (1997/2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2004/2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M., & Lotringer, S. (1996). *Foucault live: (interviews, 1961-1984) [Interviews]*. New York: Semiotexte.
- Foucault, M., & Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Frie, R. (2008). *Psychological agency: Theory, practice, and culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Garnett, M. (2004). *The snake that swallowed its tail*. Charlottesville: Imprint Academic.
- Gay, G. (1983). Why multicultural education in teacher preparation programs. *Contemporary Education*, 54(2), 79-85.
- Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural education for the 21st century. *The Teacher Educator*, 36(1), 1-16.
- Ghosh, R. (2004). Public education and Multicultural Policy in Canada: The special case of Quebec. *International Review of Education*, 50(5/6), 543-566.

- Ghosh, R. (1996). *Redefining multicultural education*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Harcourt Brace Canada.
- Ghosh, R., Zinman, R., & Talbani, A. (1995). Policies relating to the education of cultural communities in Quebec. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 27(1), 18-31.
- Giroux, H. A. (1990). Rethinking the boundaries of educational discourses: Modernism, postmodernism, and feminism. *College Literature*, 17(2/3), 1-50.
- Grahame, P. R. (2004). Ethnography, institutions, and the problematic of everyday world. In W. K. Carroll (Ed.), *Critical Strategies for Social Research* (pp. 181-190). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Grant, M. L. (1999). Evidence of new immigrant assimilation in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Economics*, 32(4), 930-955.
- Green, L. (2010). *Mayday, mayday: Curb immigration and stop multiculturalism, or it's the end of Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Spruce Ridge Publishing.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (1993). Diversity and inclusion: Toward a curriculum for human beings. *Teachers College Record*, 95(2), 211-221.
- Hage, G. (2000). Hansonism and the discourse of white decline. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 1(1), 85-96.
- Hage, G. (2002). Multiculturalism and white paranoia in Australia. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3(3&4), 417-437.
- Harding, R. (2006). Historical presentations of aboriginal people in Canadian news media. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 205-235.
- Hare, J. (2007). First Nations educational policy in Canada. In R. Joshee & L. Johnson (Eds.), *Multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States* (pp. 51-68). Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Harris, C. (2001). Postmodern patriotism: Canadian reflections. *Canadian Geographer*, 45(1), 193-207.
- Harvey, E. B., Siu, B., & Reil, K. D. (1999). Ethnocultural groups, period of immigration and socioeconomic situation. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 31(3), 95-95. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/215639390?accountid=13800>
- Hébert, Y. M. (1992). Multicultural education and the minority language child. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 24(3), 58-74.
- Hébert, Y. M. (2002). *Citizenship in transformation in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Henry, F. (2002). Canada's contribution to the "management" of ethnocultural diversity. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27, 231-242.
- Henry, F., Tator, C., Mattis, W., & Rees, T. (1995). *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Harcourt Brace Canada.
- hooks, bell (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- James, C. E. (2008). RE/presentation of race and racism in the multicultural discourse of Canada. In A. A. Abdi, & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 97-112). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Jedwab, J. (2008). The rise of the unmeltable Canadians? Ethnic and national belonging in Canada's second generation. *Canadian Diversity*, 6(2), 25-34.
- Johanson, K., & Glow, H. (2009). Honour bound in Australia: From defensive nationalism to critical nationalism. *National Identities*, 11(4), 385-396.
- Johnson, L. (2007). Diversity policies in American schools: A legacy of Progressive school leadership and community activism. In R. Joshee & L. Johnson (Eds.), *Multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States* (pp. 28-41). Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Kailin, J. (1999). How white teachers perceive the problem of racism in their schools: A case study in "liberal" Lakeview. *Teachers College Record*, 100(4), 724-750.
- Kambourelli, S. (2008). The politics of the beyond: 43 theses on autoethnography and complicity. In E. Ty & C. Verduyn (Eds.), *Asian Canadian writing beyond autoethnography* (pp. 31-54). Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Kaomea, J. (2003). Reading erasures and making the familiar strange: Defamiliarizing methods for research in formerly colonized and historically oppressed communities. *Educational Researcher*, 32(2), 14-25.
- Kazmi, Y. (1997). Foucault's genealogy and teaching multiculturalism as a subversive activity. *Studies in Philosophy & Education*, 16, 331-345.
- Kehoe, J. W. (1994). Multicultural education and anti-racist education: The debate in Canada. *Social Education*, 58(6), 354-358.
- Kernerman, G. P. (2005). *Multicultural nationalism: Civilizing difference, constituting community*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- King, J. E. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 133-146.

- Kirby, S., & McKenna, K. (2004). Methods from the margins. In W. K. Carroll (Ed.), *Critical Strategies for Social Research* (pp. 67-74). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race And TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(3), 471-493.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). Against repetition: Addressing resistance to anti-oppressive change in the practices of learning, teaching, supervising, and researching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(1), 67-92.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship : A liberal theory of minority rights*. New York: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007a). *Multicultural odysseys: Navigating the new international politics of diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007b December 1). *Well done, Canada: Multiculturalism is working*. The Globe and Mail, D.22. Retrieved from: <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/arts/well-done-canada-multiculturalism-is-working/article134702/>
- Kymlicka, W. (2003). Being Canadian. *Government and Opposition*, 38(3), 357-85.
- Kymlicka, W. (2004). Marketing Canadian pluralism in the international arena. *International Journal*, 59(4), (Autumn, 2004), 829-852.
- Kymlicka, W. (2005). The uncertain futures of multiculturalism. *Canadian Diversity*, 4(1), 82-85.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- LaDuke, A. E. (2009). Resistance and renegotiation: Preservice teacher interactions with and reactions to multicultural education. *Multicultural Education*, Spring, 37-44.
- Lam, C. (1996). The green teacher. In D. Thiessen, N. Bascia & I. Goodson (Eds.), *Making a difference about difference: The lives and careers of racial minority immigrant teachers* (pp. 15-50). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Garamond Press.
- Lee, E. (2008). The "other(ing)" costs of ESL: A Canadian case study. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 91-108.
- Lee, E. Y. (2007). Racism masquerading as nationalism: Wars, Japanese- Americans, and Arab-Americans. In V. Agnew (Ed.), *Interrogating race and racism* (pp. 270-295). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Lee, K. V. (2008). White whispers. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(6), 896-900. doi: 10.1177/1077800408321581.

- Lemke, T. (2001). The birth of bio-politics: Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society*, 30(2), 190–207.
- Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2011). *The crises of multiculturalism: Racism in a neoliberal age*. London: Zed Books.
- Ley, D. (2007). Multiculturalism: A Canadian defence. *Working Paper Series, No 07-04*. Metropolis British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://riim.metropolis.net/wp_2007.html
- Li, P. S. (1981). *Social research methods*. Toronto : Butterworths.
- Li, P. S. (1998). *The Chinese in Canada* (2nd ed.). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Li, P. S. (2008). Reconciling with history: The Chinese-Canadian Head Tax redress. *Journal of Chinese Overseas*, 4(1), pp. 127-140.
- Lin, A., Grant, R., Kubota, R., Motha, S., Sachs, G. T., Vandrick, S., & Wong, S. (2004). Women Faculty of Color in TESOL: Theorizing our lived experiences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 487–504.
- Ljunggren, D. (2009, September 25). *Every G20 nation wants to be Canada, insists PM*. Reuters. Retrieved from: <http://www.reuters.com/assets/print?aid=USTRE58P05Z20090926>
- Macedo, D. P. (1993). Literacy of stupidification: The pedagogy of big lies. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(2), 183-206.
- Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference : Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Macklin, A., & Crepeau, F. (2010). *Multiple Citizenship, Identity and Entitlement in Canada*. IRPP Study, No. 6. Retrieved from: http://www.irpp.org/pubs/IRPPstudy/IRPP_Study_no6.pdf
- Majhanovich, S. (1992). *Multicultural education: A Canadian perspective*. Proceedings from the AACTE Conference in San Antonio, Texas.
- Mata, F., & Pendakur, R. (2010). Social capital formation and diversity in Canadian cities: impacts of individual and place-related characteristics. *Working Paper Series, No 10-02*. Metropolis British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://riim.metropolis.net/wp_2010.html
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. (2010). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, (July/August), 10-12.

- Meneley, A., & Young, D. J. (2005). *Auto-ethnographies: The anthropology of academic practices*. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press.
- Merryfield, M. M. (2000). Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity and global interconnectedness? A study of lived experiences in the making of multicultural and global educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 16, 429-443.
- Meyers, M. (2006). Myths and delusion: English language instruction in Canadian schools. *Education Canada*, 46(2), 31-34.
- Miller, H. M (1997). Middle ground: Beyond "Multicultural Moments". *English Journal*, 86(5), 88-90.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Transnationalism, neo-liberalism, and the rise of the shadow state. *Economy and Society*, 30(2), 165-189.
- Mitchell, K. (2003). Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: From the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(4), 387-403.
- Mitchell, K. (2004). Geographies of identity: Multiculturalism unplugged. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(5), 641-651.
- Mitchell, K. (2007). Geographies of identity: The intimate cosmopolitan. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(5), 706-720.
- Moodley, K. A. (1983) Canadian multiculturalism as ideology. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 6(3), 320-331.
- Moodley, K. A. (1986). Multicultural education in Canada: Promises and practices. In J. A. Banks, & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Multicultural Education in Western Societies* (pp. 51-75). London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Moodley, K. A. (1995). Multicultural education in Canada: Historical development and current status. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Morrison, T. (2008). *What moves at the margin: Selected nonfiction*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.
- Multicultural Advisory Council. *2005/2006 Report on Multiculturalism*. Province of British Columbia. Retrieved from:
http://www.embracebc.ca/embracebc/multiculturalism/report_on_multiculturalism/index.page?
- Multicultural Advisory Council. *2006/2007 Report on Multiculturalism*. Province of British Columbia. Retrieved from:
http://www.embracebc.ca/embracebc/multiculturalism/report_on_multiculturalism/index.page?

- Multicultural Advisory Council. *2007/2008 Report on Multiculturalism*. Province of British Columbia. Retrieved from:
http://www.embracebc.ca/embracebc/multiculturalism/report_on_multiculturalism/index.page?
- Multicultural Advisory Council. *2009/2010 Report on Multiculturalism*. Province of British Columbia. Retrieved from:
http://www.embracebc.ca/embracebc/multiculturalism/report_on_multiculturalism/index.page?
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education (3rd ed.)*. New York: Longman.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Nugent, A. (2006). Demography, national myths, and political origins: Perceiving official multiculturalism in Quebec. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 38(3), 20-34.
- Ontario Ministry of Education & Training (1993). *Antiracism and ethnocultural equity in school boards: Guidelines for policy development and implementation*. Retrieved from: www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/curricul/antiraci/antire.pdf
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). "English may be my second language, but I'm not 'ESL'". *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389-419.
- Osborne, K. (1996). Education is the best national insurance: Citizenship education in Canadian schools -past and present. *Canadian and International Education*, 25(2), 31-58.
- Paley, V.G. (1992). *You can't say you can't play*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Paquet, G. (1989). Multiculturalism as national policy. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 13(1), 17-34.
- Paras, E. (2006). *Foucault 2.0: Beyond power and knowledge*. New York: Other Press.
- Paul, I. (2009). *Quebec Separatism: An overview*. Canadian Points of View: Quebec Separatism, 1-1.
- Pearson, L. B. (2007). *United Nations Association in Canada Peace and Security*. Retrieved from : <http://www.unac.org/peacekeeping/en/>

- Pellerin, B. (2006 May 11). Where spoon etiquette matters. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from:
<http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/pqdweb?did=1035977101&sid=1&Fmt=3&clientId=3667&RQT=309&VName=PQD>
- Pennington, J. L. (2007). Silence in the classroom/whispers in the halls: Autoethnography as pedagogy in White pre-service teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 10(1), 93-113. doi: 10.1080/13613320601100393.
- Perreault, J. (1998). Autography/Transformation/Asymmetry. In S. Smith & J. Watson (Eds.), *Women, autobiography, theory: A reader* (pp.190-196). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Peters, M. A. (2007). Foucault, biopolitics and the birth of neoliberalism. *Critical Studies in Education*, 48(2), 165-178.
- Phillion, J. (2002). *Narrative inquiry in a multicultural landscape: Multicultural teaching and learning*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishig.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2007). Linguistic imperialism: A conspiracy, or a conspiracy of silence? *Language Policy*, 6, 377-383. doi: 10.1007/s10993-007-9058-3.
- Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175–96.
- Platt, T. (2002). Desegregating multiculturalism: Problems in the theory and pedagogy of diversity education. *Social Justice*, 29(4), 41-46.
- Pipher, M. (2006). *Writing to change the world*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Penguin.
- Porter, J. (1965). *The vertical mosaic*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from:
<http://proxy.lib.sfu.ca/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/sfu/Doc?id=10226324>
- Prain, V. (1997). Textualizing your self in research: Some current challenges. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(1), 71-85.
- Reed-Danahay, D. (1997). *Autoethnography: Rewriting the self and the social*. New York: Berg.
- Reitz, J. G., & Sklar, S. M. (1997). Culture, race, and the economic assimilation of immigrants. *Sociological Forum*, 12(2), 233-277.
- Rich, A. (2001). *Arts of the possible: Essays and conversations*. New York: Norton.

- Richards, R. (2008). Writing the othered Self: Autoethnography and the problem of objectification in writing about illness and disability. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(12), 1717-1728. doi: 10.1177/1049732308325866.
- Richardson, T., & Villenas, S. (2000). "Other" encounters: Dances with whiteness in multicultural education. *Educational Theory*, 50(2), 255-273.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- San Juan, E. (2000). The multiculturalist problematic in the age of global capitalism. *Social Justice*, 27(1), 61-75.
- Sandercock, L., & Brock, S. (2009). Inventing a multicultural nation: Canada's evolving story. In L. Sandercock, G. Attili, & S. Brock (Eds.), *Where strangers become neighbors. Volume 4, Part 1* (pp. 3-33). Urban and Landscape Perspectives 4. Netherlands: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-9035-6_1
- Satzewich, V. (2011). *Racism in Canada*. Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Satzewich, V., & Liodakis, N. (2007). *Race and ethnicity in Canada : A critical introduction*. Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Saul, J. R. (2004). Strength in diversity: An address by His Excellency John Ralston Saul. *Education Canada*, 44(2) (Spring 2004), 43-45.
- Schick, C., & St. Denis, V. (2005). Troubling national discourses in anti-racist curricular planning. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 295-317.
- Schugurensky, D. (2002). The eight curricula for multicultural citizenship education. *Multicultural Education*, 10(1), 1-6.
- Scott, F. B. (2001). *Teaching in a multicultural setting: A Canadian perspective*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Prentice Hall.
- Sears, A. M., & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2006). The lonely citizen : Democracy, curriculum, and the crisis of belonging. In G. H. Richardson, & D. W. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 13-24). New York: Peter Lang Pub., Inc.
- Sensoy, O., Sanghera, R., Parmar, G., Parhar, N., Nosyk, L., & Anderson, M. (2010). Moving beyond dance, dress, and dining in multicultural Canada. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 12(1), 1-15. Retrieved from: <http://ijme-journal.org/index.php/ijme/issue/view/14>
- Shaker, P., & Heilman, E. E. (2008). *Reclaiming education for democracy: Thinking beyond no child left behind*. New York: Routledge.
- Shariff, S. (2006). Balancing competing rights: A stakeholder model for democratic schools. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 476-496.

- Sidorkin, A. M. (2004). *Panopticon of the second kind: Self-reforming during the era of excellence*. Faculty Publications. Paper 13. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/facultypublications/13>
- Simmons, A. B. (2010). *Immigration and Canada: Global and transnational perspectives*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholar's Press, Inc.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as a social activism*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(94), 94-106. doi: 10.1177/0022487101052002002
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C.A. (2009). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic : a feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, D. G. (2006). *Trying to teach in a season of great untruth: Globalization, empire and the crises of pedagogy*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Soroka, S. N., & Johnson, R., & Banting, K. (2007). Ties that bind: Social cohesion & diversity. In K. G. Banting, T. J. Courchene, & F. L. Seidle (Eds.), *Belonging? : Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada* (pp. 1-40). Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy. Retrieved from: <http://troy.lib.sfu.ca/search~S1?/abanting%2C+k/abanting+k/1%2C3%2C29%2C2C/B/frameSet&FF=abanting+keith+g&19%2C%2C21>
- Spivak, G. C. (2010). Can the subaltern speak? In R. C. Morris (Ed.), *Reflections on the history of an idea: Can the subaltern speak?* (pp. 21-80). New York: Columbia University Press.
- St. Denis, V. (2007). Aboriginal education and anti-racist education: Building alliances across cultural and racial identity. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(4), 1068-1092.
- St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing Aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 33(4), 306-317.
- Stanley, T. J. (2009). The banality of colonialism: Encountering artifacts of genocide and white supremacy in Vancouver today. In S. R. Steinberg (Ed.), *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader* (pp. 143-159). New York: Peter Lang.
- Stanley, T. J. (2011). *Contesting white supremacy: School segregation, anti-racism and the making of Chinese-Canadians*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.

- Statistics Canada (2006a). *Aboriginal identity population by age groups, median age and sex, 2006 counts for both sexes, for Canada, provinces and territories - 20% sample data (table)*. "Aboriginal Peoples Highlight Tables, 2006 Census". "2006 Census: Highlight Tables." Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. : 92-594-XWE Retrieved from: <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-558/pages/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=PR&Code=01&Table=1&Data=Count&Sex=1&Age=1&StartRec=1&Sort=2&Display=Page>
- Statistics Canada (2006b). *Visible minority groups, 2006 counts, for Canada, provinces and territories - 20% sample data (table)*. "Ethnocultural Portrait of Canada Highlight Tables, 2006 Census". "2006 Census: Release topics." Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue number: 97-562-XWE2006002. Retrieved from: <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-562/pages/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=PR&Code=01&Table=1&Data=Count&StartRec=1&Sort=2&Display=Page>
- Steinberg, S. R. (2009). *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stroud, C., & Wee, L. (2007). A pedagogical application of liminalities in social positioning: Identity and literacy in Singapore. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 33-54.
- Taber, N. (2010). Institutional ethnography, autoethnography, and narrative: An argument for incorporating multiple methodologies. *Qualitative Research*, 10(1), 5-25. doi: 10.1177/1468794109348680.
- Tator, C., Henry, F., Smith, C., & Brown, M. (2006). *Racial profiling in Canada: Challenging the myth of "a few bad apples"*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Taylor, C., & Gutmann, A. (1994). *Multiculturalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, C. (2002 July 19). *The Other and Ourselves: Is Multi-culturalism Inherently Relativist?* The Worldly Philosophers. Retrieved from: <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/taylor2/English>
- Texeira, C. (2012). The housing experiences and coping strategies of recent immigrants in the suburbs of Vancouver (Surrey and Richmond). *Working Paper Series, No 10-02*. Metropolis British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://riim.metropolis.net/wp_2012.html
- Thayer-Bacon, B. J. (2008). *Beyond liberal democracy in schools: The power of pluralism*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Toyosaki, S., Pensoneau-Conway, S. L., Wendt, N. A., & Leathers, K. (2009). Community autoethnography: Compiling the personal and resituating whiteness. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, 9(1), 56-83.
- Trifonas, P. P. (2003). *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Troyna, B. (1987). Beyond multiculturalism: Towards the enactment of anti-racist education in policy, provision and pedagogy. *Oxford Review of Education*, 13(3), 307-320.
- Troyna, B. (1993). *Racism and education: Research perspectives*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Troyna, B. (1994). Critical social research and education policy. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 42(1), 70-84.
- Troyna, B., & Williams, J. (1986). *Racism, education, and the state*. Dover, NH: Croom Helm.
- Tucker, M. (Interviewer) & Banks, J. A. (Interviewee) (1998). *Multiculturalism's five dimensions*. NEA Today. Retrieved from: <http://www.learner.org/workshops/socialstudies/pdf/session3/3.Multiculturalism.pdf>
- Ungerleider, C. S. (1992). Immigration, multicultural, and citizenship: The development of the Canadian social justice infrastructure. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 24(3), 7-22.
- Urciuoli, B. (2005). Team diversity: An ethnography of institutional values. In A. Meneley, A.; & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Auto-ethnographies: The anthropology of academic practices* (pp. 159-172). Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press.
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2010). Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing communities, conditions and contexts of diversity. *International Social Science Journal*, 199, 83-95.
- Wagner, T. S. (2007). Boutique multiculturalism and the consumption of repulsion: Re-disseminating food fictions in Malaysian and Singaporean diasporic novels. *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 42(1), 31-46.
- Ward, W. P. (2002). *White Canada forever: popular attitudes and public policy toward Orientals in British Columbia, Third Edition*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Warren, J., & Sue, C. A. (2011). Comparative racisms: What anti-racists can learn from Latin America. *Ethnicities*, 11(1), 32-58.

- Watkins, W. H. (1994). Multicultural education: Toward a historical and political inquiry. *Educational Theory, 44*(1), 99-116.
- Welsch, W. (1999). Transculturality: the puzzling forms of cultures today. In S. Lash, & M. Featherstone (Eds.) *Spaces of culture: city, nation, world*. London: Sage.
- Westheimer, J. (2010). No child left thinking: Democracy at risk in Canada's schools. *Education Canada, 50*(2), 5-8.
- Wilkes, R., Guppy, N., & Farris, L. (2007). Canadian attitudes towards immigration: Individual and contextual influences. *Working Paper Series, No 07-08*. Metropolis British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://riim.metropolis.net/wp_2007.html
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Wu, F. H. (2002). *Yellow: Race in America beyond black and white*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wu, Z., Schimmele, C. M., & Hou, F. (2010). The social integration of immigrants and their children in Canada's urban neighborhoods. *Working Paper Series, No 10-10*. Metropolis British Columbia. Retrieved from: http://riim.metropolis.net/wp_2010.html
- Wyatt, J. (2008). No longer loss: Autoethnographic stammering. *Qualitative Inquiry, 14*(6), 955-967. doi: 10.1177/1077800408318324.
- Young, J. C. (1987). *Breaking the mosaic: Ethnic identities in Canadian schooling*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Garamond Press.
- Zizek, S. (1997). Multiculturalism, Or, the cultural logic of multinational capitalism. *New Left Review, 225*(September-October), 28-51.
- Zuberi, T., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). *White logic, white methods*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Appendices

Appendix A. Canadian Multiculturalism Act



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Canadian Multiculturalism Act

Loi sur le multiculturalisme canadien

R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)

L.R., 1985, ch. 24 (4^e suppl.)

NOTE

[1988, c. 31, assented to 21st July, 1988]

NOTE

[1988, ch. 31, sanctionné le 21 juillet 1988]

Current to March 24, 2011

À jour au 24 mars 2011

Published by the Minister of Justice at the following address:
<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca>

Publié par le ministre de la Justice à l'adresse suivante :
<http://lois-laws.justice.gc.ca>

OFFICIAL STATUS
OF CONSOLIDATIONS

CARACTÈRE OFFICIEL
DES CODIFICATIONS

Subsections 31(1) and (2) of the *Legislation Revision and Consolidation Act*, in force on June 1, 2009, provide as follows:

Les paragraphes 31(1) et (2) de la *Loi sur la révision et la codification des textes législatifs*, en vigueur le 1^{er} juin 2009, prévoient ce qui suit :

Published
consolidation is
evidence

31. (1) Every copy of a consolidated statute or consolidated regulation published by the Minister under this Act in either print or electronic form is evidence of that statute or regulation and of its contents and every copy purporting to be published by the Minister is deemed to be so published, unless the contrary is shown.

31. (1) Tout exemplaire d'une loi codifiée ou d'un règlement codifié, publié par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi sur support papier ou sur support électronique, fait foi de cette loi ou de ce règlement et de son contenu. Tout exemplaire donné comme publié par le ministre est réputé avoir été ainsi publié, sauf preuve contraire.

Codifications
comme élément
de preuve

Inconsistencies
in Acts

(2) In the event of an inconsistency between a consolidated statute published by the Minister under this Act and the original statute or a subsequent amendment as certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments under the *Publication of Statutes Act*, the original statute or amendment prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

(2) Les dispositions de la loi d'origine avec ses modifications subséquentes par le greffier des Parlements en vertu de la *Loi sur la publication des lois* l'emportent sur les dispositions incompatibles de la loi codifiée publiée par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi.

Incompatibilité
— lois

NOTE

This consolidation is current to March 6, 2012. The last amendments came into force on April 1, 2003. Any amendments that were not in force as of March 6, 2012 are set out at the end of this document under the heading "Amendments Not in Force".

NOTE

Cette codification est à jour au 6 mars 2012. Les dernières modifications sont entrées en vigueur le 1 avril 2003. Toutes modifications qui n'étaient pas en vigueur au 6 mars 2012 sont énoncées à la fin de ce document sous le titre « Modifications non en vigueur ».

Section	Page	Article	Page
An Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada		Loi sur le maintien et la valorisation du multiculturalisme au Canada	
	2	TITRE ABRÉGÉ	2
1	2	1	Titre abrégé
	2	DÉFINITIONS	2
2	2	2	Définitions
	3	POLITIQUE CANADIENNE DU MULTICULTURALISME	3
3	3	3	Déclaration
	5	MISE EN OEUVRE DE LA POLITIQUE CANADIENNE DU MULTICULTURALISME	5
4	5	4	Coordination
5	5	5	Mandat du ministre
6	6	6	Attributions des autres ministres
7	6	7	Comité canadien du multiculturalisme
	7	DISPOSITIONS GÉNÉRALES	7
8	7	8	Rapport annuel
9	7	9	Suivi par un comité parlementaire



R.S.C., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)

L.R.C., 1985, ch. 24 (4^e suppl.)

An Act for the preservation and enhancement
of multiculturalism in Canada

Loi sur le maintien et la valorisation du
multiculturalisme au Canada

Preamble

WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada provides that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination and that everyone has the freedom of conscience, religion, thought, belief, opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association and guarantees those rights and freedoms equally to male and female persons;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada recognizes the importance of preserving and enhancing the multicultural heritage of Canadians;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada recognizes rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada and the *Official Languages Act* provide that English and French are the official languages of Canada and neither abrogates nor derogates from any rights or privileges acquired or enjoyed with respect to any other language;

AND WHEREAS the *Citizenship Act* provides that all Canadians, whether by birth or by choice, enjoy equal status, are entitled to the same rights, powers and privileges and are subject to the same obligations, duties and liabilities;

AND WHEREAS the *Canadian Human Rights Act* provides that every individual should have an equal opportunity with other individuals to make the life that the individual is able and wishes to have, consistent with the duties and obligations of that individual as a member of society, and, in order to secure that opportunity, establishes the Canadian Human Rights Commission to redress any proscribed

Preamble

Attendu :
que la Constitution du Canada dispose que la loi ne fait acception de personne et s'applique également à tous, que tous ont droit à la même protection et au même bénéfice de la loi, indépendamment de toute discrimination, que chacun a la liberté de conscience, de religion, de pensée, de croyance, d'opinion, d'expression, de réunion pacifique et d'association, et qu'elle garantit également aux personnes des deux sexes ce droit et ces libertés;

qu'elle reconnaît l'importance de maintenir et de valoriser le patrimoine multiculturel des Canadiens;

qu'elle reconnaît des droits aux peuples autochtones du Canada;

qu'elle dispose, de même que la *Loi sur les langues officielles*, que le français et l'anglais sont les langues officielles du Canada et que ni l'une ni l'autre ne portent atteinte aux droits et privilèges des autres langues;

que la *Loi sur la citoyenneté* dispose que tous les Canadiens, de naissance ou par choix, jouissent d'un statut égal, ont les mêmes droits, pouvoirs et avantages et sont assujettis aux mêmes devoirs, obligations et responsabilités;

que la *Loi canadienne sur les droits de la personne* dispose que tous ont droit, dans la mesure compatible avec leurs devoirs et obligations au sein de la société, à l'égalité des chances d'épanouissement et que, pour assurer celle-ci, elle constitue la Commission canadienne des droits de la personne, laquelle est chargée de remédier à toute discrimination constituant une distinction fondée sur

discrimination, including discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin or colour;

AND WHEREAS Canada is a party to the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, which Convention recognizes that all human beings are equal before the law and are entitled to equal protection of the law against any discrimination and against any incitement to discrimination, and to the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, which Covenant provides that persons belonging to ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities shall not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion or to use their own language;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada;

NOW, THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

SHORT TITLE

Short title 1. This Act may be cited as the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*.

INTERPRETATION

Definitions 2. In this Act,
 "federal institution" means any of the following institutions of the Government of Canada:
 (a) a department, board, commission or council, or other body or office, established to perform a governmental function by or pursuant to an Act of Parliament or by or un-

"federal institution"
 « institutions fédérales »

des motifs illicites tels que la race, l'origine nationale ou ethnique ou encore la couleur;

que le Canada est partie, d'une part, à la *Convention internationale sur l'élimination de toutes les formes de discrimination raciale*, laquelle reconnaît que tous les hommes sont égaux devant la loi et ont droit à une égale protection de la loi contre toute discrimination et contre toute incitation à la discrimination et, d'autre part, au *Pacte international relatif aux droits civils et politiques*, lequel dispose que les personnes appartenant à une minorité ethnique, religieuse ou linguistique ne peuvent être privées du droit d'avoir leur propre vie culturelle, de professer et de pratiquer leur propre religion, ou d'employer leur propre langue;

que le gouvernement fédéral reconnaît que la diversité de la population canadienne sur les plans de la race, de la nationalité d'origine, de l'origine ethnique, de la couleur et de la religion constitue une caractéristique fondamentale de la société canadienne et qu'il est voué à une politique du multiculturalisme destinée à préserver et valoriser le patrimoine multiculturel des Canadiens tout en s'employant à réaliser l'égalité de tous les Canadiens dans les secteurs économique, social, culturel et politique de la vie canadienne,

Sa Majesté, sur l'avis et avec le consentement du Sénat et de la Chambre des communes du Canada, édicte:

TITRE ABRÉGÉ

1. *Loi sur le multiculturalisme canadien.* Titre abrégé

DÉFINITIONS

2. Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent à la présente loi.
 « institutions fédérales » Les institutions suivantes du gouvernement fédéral:
 a) les ministères, organismes — bureaux, commissions, conseils, offices ou autres — chargés de fonctions administratives sous le

Définitions
 « institutions fédérales »
 "federal institution"

der the authority of the Governor in Council, and

(b) a departmental corporation or Crown corporation as defined in section 2 of the *Financial Administration Act*,

but does not include

(c) any institution of the Council or government of the Northwest Territories or of the Legislative Assembly or government of Yukon or Nunavut, or

(d) any Indian band, band council or other body established to perform a governmental function in relation to an Indian band or other group of aboriginal people;

«Ministre»
« ministre »

“Minister” means such member of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada as is designated by the Governor in Council as the Minister for the purposes of this Act.

R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.), s. 2; 1993, c. 28, s. 78; 2002, c. 7, s. 129.

MULTICULTURALISM POLICY OF CANADA

Multiculturalism
policy

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

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

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

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

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

régime d’une loi fédérale ou en vertu des attributions du gouverneur en conseil;

b) les établissements publics et les sociétés d’État au sens de l’article 2 de la *Loi sur la gestion des finances publiques*.

Ne sont pas visés les institutions du conseil ou de l’administration des Territoires du Nord-Ouest, celles de l’assemblée législative ou de l’administration du Yukon ou du Nunavut, ni les organismes — bande indienne, conseil de bande ou autres — chargés de l’administration d’une bande indienne ou d’autres groupes de peuples autochtones.

« ministre » Le membre du Conseil privé de la Reine pour le Canada chargé par le gouverneur en conseil de l’application de la présente loi.

L.R. (1985), ch. 24 (4^e suppl.), art. 2; 1993, ch. 28, art. 78; 2002, ch. 7, art. 129.

« ministre »
“Minister”

POLITIQUE CANADIENNE DU MULTICULTURALISME

3. (1) La politique du gouvernement fédéral en matière de multiculturalisme consiste :

Déclaration

a) à reconnaître le fait que le multiculturalisme reflète la diversité culturelle et raciale de la société canadienne et se traduit par la liberté, pour tous ses membres, de maintenir, de valoriser et de partager leur patrimoine culturel, ainsi qu’à sensibiliser la population à ce fait;

b) à reconnaître le fait que le multiculturalisme est une caractéristique fondamentale de l’identité et du patrimoine canadiens et constitue une ressource inestimable pour l’avenir du pays, ainsi qu’à sensibiliser la population à ce fait;

c) à promouvoir la participation entière et équitable des individus et des collectivités de toutes origines à l’évolution de la nation et au façonnement de tous les secteurs de la société, et à les aider à éliminer tout obstacle à une telle participation;

d) à reconnaître l’existence de collectivités dont les membres partagent la même origine et leur contribution à l’histoire du pays, et à favoriser leur développement;

	<p>(e) ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;</p> <p>(f) encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character;</p> <p>(g) promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;</p> <p>(h) foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;</p> <p>(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada; and</p> <p>(j) advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada.</p>	<p>e) à faire en sorte que la loi s'applique également et procure à tous la même protection, tout en faisant cas des particularités de chacun;</p> <p>f) à encourager et aider les institutions sociales, culturelles, économiques et politiques canadiennes à prendre en compte le caractère multiculturel du Canada;</p> <p>g) à promouvoir la compréhension entre individus et collectivités d'origines différentes et la créativité qui résulte des échanges entre eux;</p> <p>h) à favoriser la reconnaissance et l'estime réciproque des diverses cultures du pays, ainsi qu'à promouvoir l'expression et les manifestations progressives de ces cultures dans la société canadienne;</p> <p>i) parallèlement à l'affirmation du statut des langues officielles et à l'élargissement de leur usage, à maintenir et valoriser celui des autres langues;</p> <p>j) à promouvoir le multiculturalisme en harmonie avec les engagements nationaux pris à l'égard des deux langues officielles.</p>
<p>Federal institutions</p>	<p>(2) It is further declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada that all federal institutions shall</p> <p>(a) ensure that Canadians of all origins have an equal opportunity to obtain employment and advancement in those institutions;</p> <p>(b) promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the ability of individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to the continuing evolution of Canada;</p> <p>(c) promote policies, programs and practices that enhance the understanding of and respect for the diversity of the members of Canadian society;</p> <p>(d) collect statistical data in order to enable the development of policies, programs and practices that are sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada;</p> <p>(e) make use, as appropriate, of the language skills and cultural understanding of individuals of all origins; and</p> <p>(f) generally, carry on their activities in a manner that is sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality of Canada.</p>	<p>(2) En outre, cette politique impose aux institutions fédérales l'obligation de :</p> <p>a) faire en sorte que les Canadiens de toutes origines aient des chances égales d'emploi et d'avancement;</p> <p>b) promouvoir des politiques, programmes et actions de nature à favoriser la contribution des individus et des collectivités de toutes origines à l'évolution du pays;</p> <p>c) promouvoir des politiques, programmes et actions permettant au public de mieux comprendre et de respecter la diversité des membres de la société canadienne;</p> <p>d) recueillir des données statistiques permettant l'élaboration de politiques, de programmes et d'actions tenant dûment compte de la réalité multiculturelle du pays;</p> <p>e) mettre à contribution, lorsqu'il convient, les connaissances linguistiques et culturelles d'individus de toutes origines;</p> <p>f) généralement, conduire leurs activités en tenant dûment compte de la réalité multiculturelle du Canada.</p>

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
MULTICULTURALISM POLICY OF
CANADA

MISE EN ŒUVRE DE LA POLITIQUE
CANADIENNE DU
MULTICULTURALISME

General
responsibility
for coordination

4. The Minister, in consultation with other ministers of the Crown, shall encourage and promote a coordinated approach to the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada and may provide advice and assistance in the development and implementation of programs and practices in support of the policy.

4. Le ministre, en consultation avec ses collègues fédéraux, suscite et encourage la coordination de la mise en œuvre de la politique canadienne du multiculturalisme, et peut fournir conseils et assistance pour l'élaboration et la réalisation de programmes et actions utiles à cette fin.

Coordination

Specific
mandates

5. (1) The Minister shall take such measures as the Minister considers appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may

5. (1) Le ministre prend les mesures qu'il estime indiquées pour mettre en œuvre la politique canadienne du multiculturalisme et peut notamment :

Mandat du
ministre

(a) encourage and assist individuals, organizations and institutions to project the multicultural reality of Canada in their activities in Canada and abroad;

a) encourager et aider les particuliers, les organisations et les institutions à refléter la réalité multiculturelle du Canada dans leurs activités au pays et à l'étranger;

(b) undertake and assist research relating to Canadian multiculturalism and foster scholarship in the field;

b) effectuer ou appuyer des recherches sur le multiculturalisme canadien et stimuler l'amélioration des connaissances dans le domaine;

(c) encourage and promote exchanges and cooperation among the diverse communities of Canada;

c) encourager et promouvoir les échanges et la coopération entre les diverses collectivités du Canada;

(d) encourage and assist the business community, labour organizations, voluntary and other private organizations, as well as public institutions, in ensuring full participation in Canadian society, including the social and economic aspects, of individuals of all origins and their communities, and in promoting respect and appreciation for the multicultural reality of Canada;

d) encourager et aider les entreprises, les organisations patronales et syndicales, les organismes bénévoles et autres organismes privés ainsi que les institutions publiques à assurer la pleine participation des individus et des collectivités de toutes origines à la société canadienne, notamment à la vie sociale et économique du pays, et à promouvoir à la fois le respect et une meilleure connaissance de la réalité multiculturelle du Canada;

(e) encourage the preservation, enhancement, sharing and evolving expression of the multicultural heritage of Canada;

e) encourager le maintien, la valorisation, le partage et l'expression dynamique du patrimoine multiculturel du Canada;

(f) facilitate the acquisition, retention and use of all languages that contribute to the multicultural heritage of Canada;

f) faciliter l'acquisition et la rétention de connaissances linguistiques dans chacune des langues qui contribuent au patrimoine multiculturel du Canada, ainsi que l'utilisation de ces langues;

(g) assist ethno-cultural minority communities to conduct activities with a view to overcoming any discriminatory barrier and, in particular, discrimination based on race or national or ethnic origin;

g) aider les minorités ethnoculturelles à œuvrer en vue de faire échec à toute discrimination, notamment celle qui est fondée sur la race ou sur l'origine nationale ou ethnique;

	<p>enhancing and promoting multiculturalism in Canada; and</p> <p>(i) undertake such other projects or programs in respect of multiculturalism, not by law assigned to any other federal institution, as are designed to promote the multiculturalism policy of Canada.</p>	<p>h) prêter assistance aux particuliers, groupes ou organisations en vue de maintenir, valoriser et promouvoir le multiculturalisme au Canada;</p> <p>i) prendre toute initiative ou mettre en œuvre tout programme non attribué de droit à une autre institution fédérale et visant à promouvoir la politique canadienne du multiculturalisme.</p>	
Provincial agreements	(2) The Minister may enter into an agreement or arrangement with any province respecting the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada.	(2) Le ministre peut conclure des accords ou arrangements avec toute province pour la mise en œuvre de la politique canadienne du multiculturalisme.	Accords provinciaux
International agreements	(3) The Minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into an agreement or arrangement with the government of any foreign state in order to foster the multicultural character of Canada.	(3) Le ministre peut, avec l'approbation du gouverneur en conseil, conclure avec tout gouvernement étranger des accords ou arrangements de nature à promouvoir le caractère multiculturel du Canada.	Accords internationaux
Responsibilities of other Ministers	6. (1) The ministers of the Crown, other than the Minister, shall, in the execution of their respective mandates, take such measures as they consider appropriate to implement the multiculturalism policy of Canada.	6. (1) Les autres ministres fédéraux prennent, dans le cadre de leur mandat respectif, les mesures qu'ils estiment indiquées pour appliquer la politique canadienne du multiculturalisme.	Attributions des autres ministres
Provincial agreements	(2) A minister of the Crown, other than the Minister, may enter into an agreement or arrangement with any province respecting the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada.	(2) Les autres ministres fédéraux peuvent conclure des accords ou arrangements avec toute province pour la mise en œuvre de la politique canadienne du multiculturalisme.	Accords provinciaux
Canadian multiculturalism advisory committee	7. (1) The Minister may establish an advisory committee to advise and assist the Minister on the implementation of this Act and any other matter relating to multiculturalism and, in consultation with such organizations representing multicultural interests as the Minister deems appropriate, may appoint the members and designate the chairman and other officers of the committee.	7. (1) Le ministre peut constituer un comité consultatif chargé de l'assister dans l'application de la présente loi ou pour toute question liée au multiculturalisme. Il peut, en consultation avec les organisations de son choix parmi celles qui représentent des intérêts multiculturels, en nommer les membres et en désigner le président et les autres dirigeants.	Comité canadien du multiculturalisme
Remuneration and expenses	(2) Each member of the advisory committee shall be paid such remuneration for the member's services as may be fixed by the Minister and is entitled to be paid the reasonable travel and living expenses incurred by the member while absent from the member's ordinary place of residence in connection with the work of the committee.	(2) Les membres ont droit à la rémunération fixée par le ministre pour leurs services et aux frais de déplacement et de séjour entraînés par l'accomplissement, hors du lieu de leur résidence habituelle, des fonctions qui leur sont confiées à ce titre.	Traitement et frais
Annual report	(3) The chairman of the advisory committee shall, within four months after the end of each fiscal year, submit to the Minister a report on the activities of the committee for that year and	(3) Le président du comité consultatif présente au ministre, dans les quatre premiers mois de chaque exercice, un rapport sur les activités du comité pour l'exercice précédent et, dans la	Rapport annuel

on any other matter relating to the implementation of the multiculturalism policy of Canada that the chairman considers appropriate.

mesure où il l'estime indiqué, sur ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre du multiculturalisme.

GENERAL

DISPOSITIONS GÉNÉRALES

Annual report

8. The Minister shall cause to be laid before each House of Parliament, not later than the fifth sitting day of that House after January 31 next following the end of each fiscal year, a report on the operation of this Act for that fiscal year.

8. Dans les cinq premiers jours de séance de chaque chambre du Parlement, suivant le 31 janvier, le ministre fait déposer devant elle un rapport sur l'application de la présente loi au cours de l'exercice précédent.

Rapport annuel

Permanent review by a Parliamentary committee

9. The operation of this Act and any report made pursuant to section 8 shall be reviewed on a permanent basis by such committee of the House, of the Senate or of both Houses of Parliament as may be designated or established for the purpose.

9. Le Parlement désigne ou constitue un comité, soit du Sénat, soit de la Chambre des communes, soit mixte, chargé spécialement de suivre l'application de la présente loi et d'examiner tout rapport établi en application de l'article 8.

Suivi par un comité parlementaire

Appendix B. Diversity in BC Schools: A Framework (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 8)

Ministry of Education

Strategic Context

The Ministry of Education is influenced by the social, economic, and contextual factors of life in British Columbia. Examples include declining student enrolment, labour relations, children's health, special needs, and technological advances. Identifying those factors likely to affect the Ministry's ability to achieve its goals allows the Ministry to anticipate challenges and act on opportunities.

A Changing World

- Students are growing up in a world that is increasingly connected and reliant on technology. Communication is instantaneous and information is available from anywhere at any time.
- Many of today's career opportunities did not even exist a decade ago. Students need to have the skills to adapt to a rapidly changing world.
- Today's employers are looking for workers with well-developed skills in areas such as critical thinking, communication, innovation, problem solving, and teamwork.
- There is a global movement to transform education systems to ensure learners are prepared for success in the 21st century.
- Increased competition in the global economy makes improving the productivity of B.C.'s workforce a necessary and urgent priority.
- Government continues to build relationships with Asia-Pacific nations through transportation links, cultural exchanges, and educational partnerships.
- British Columbia's real gross domestic product (GDP) shrank by 2.3 per cent in 2009, as part of the far-reaching impact of the global recession. The Economic Forecast Council estimates that B.C.'s GDP growth for 2010 was 3.3 per cent, and for 2011 it is projecting 2.6 per cent growth.

A Changing Population

- With an aging population and shrinking workforce, British Columbia will face skills shortages in its labour market, particularly in high-skill occupations and high-growth industries,¹ putting added pressure on B.C. graduates.
- The aging population means less tax revenue to invest in services such as health and education.
- Over the past 25 years, the number of obese adolescents ages 12–17 has tripled.²
- Almost 40 per cent of adult British Columbians are unable to understand complex printed information in their choice of Canada's official languages.³

1 *Skills for Growth—BC's Labour Market Strategy to 2020*. www.workbc.ca/docs/Skills_for_Growth_Strategy.pdf

2 Shields, M. (2005). *Measured Obesity: Overweight Canadian children and adolescents*. Statistics Canada (Catalogue no. 82-620-MWE2005001). www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-620-m/2005001/pdf/4193660-eng.pdf#page=2

Appendix C. 2011 Service Plan (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 15)

Ministry of Education

Objective 2.3: Identify and better serve students who need extra help

Success in school is one of the cornerstones of a better life and a B.C. graduation certificate is proof of the skills and knowledge needed to compete with the best in the world. But it is clear that almost one in five students don't succeed, either by not graduating or graduating without critical skills. All of B.C.'s education partners have to do a better job of finding students who are struggling, identifying their challenges, and helping them to succeed before they fail.



Strategies

- Ensure that every student with special needs entitled to an individualized education plan has a current, fully implemented plan, developed in consultation with his or her parents.
- Expect all school districts and schools to address the needs of under-performing students in achievement contracts and annual school plans.
- Increase the effectiveness of interventions designed to help under-performing students through the work of the Ministry's superintendents of achievement and district superintendents.
- Provide targeted supplemental funding for instruction tailored to Aboriginal students, including bringing Aboriginal content into the classroom.
- Provide funding to support immigrant or refugee students learning English or French as an additional language.

Appendix D. Better Schools for BC: A Plan for Quality Public Education (British Columbia Teachers' Federation, 2011, p. 14)

Respect for diversity and equal opportunities for all

Teachers work hard to provide real equity of opportunity for all, but historical factors and systemic barriers mean equity remains a distant goal.

Profound social injustice and deeper economic disparities mean that children in care, Aboriginal children, and those with special needs are often first to fall through the gaps in our social-safety net. A top priority must be increasing support for these students at risk. When children are hungry, when their families are fractured, when a parent is ill, when home is scary and not secure, then it's next to impossible for children to learn. Schools must be free from sexism, racism, homophobia, and any other forms of bullying, harassment, and discrimination. They must be safe places where all children are free to learn and grow.

The needs of Aboriginal students continue to go unmet. The devastating legacy of residential schools must be acknowledged and understood in order to move forward together. Having more Aboriginal teachers in classrooms to provide strong role models for all students is vitally important. The BCTF is encouraging locals and school districts to reach employment equity agreements so that Aboriginal teachers can assume the important role they need to play within our school system. More Aboriginal students need to be encouraged and supported to go into teaching to be role models for all students.

Furthermore, the needs of immigrant and refugee students must also be addressed before learning and integration can take place. Immigrant children who struggle to communicate in English find great friends in their ESL teachers, who continue to lobby for an end to the arbitrary cap of five years of ESL instruction. Refugee children may come from war-torn countries where they experienced terrible trauma and loss. They, too, find trusted adult allies in their teachers at school.

Keeping youth in schools to graduation must be a priority. Secondary schools should offer a wide variety of curriculum choices that are both relevant and engaging—trades and technical programs, for example. Such courses must be adequately funded and accessible to students in all communities.