MESSAGE FROM THE PRINCIPAL

2017 has already afforded us all some opportunity to pause and reflect on what it means to be a Canadian. Although I was only six years old at the time, I remember quite clearly the image of Canada that was trumpeted through the celebrations, the stories, the songs and the fair that surrounded that last great acknowledgment of Canadian confederation. Gazing at Canada through a sesquicentennial lens reveals a much, much different country than the one we knew in 1967. Canada has grown and evolved in myriad ways over this half century and much-needed conversations are unfolding about our relationship to indigenous peoples, our role in the world, and the nature of our democracy. The current, curious political sideshow attempting to leverage ‘Canadian values’ for votes should be cause for all of us to participate in these discussions about what it means to be a Canadian.

It is within this context that I am especially pleased to share with you the second edition of the King’s Cosmos. Designed with the modest goal of sharing a sampling of the excellent faculty research that is taking place at King’s, the editors of this edition of the Cosmos have raised the bar significantly. In selecting the theme of Intercultural and Intracultural Exchange, they have brought together the work of King’s research scholars that invites us directly into the conversation about the historic and emerging opportunities and challenges of living in an ever-changing country of immigrants. The intersection of cultures, languages, lived experiences, and faith perspectives is what animates our campus and our country, and exploring this reality is key to understanding who we are and what we could become.

Published as we head into the summer of Canada 150, this edition of the King’s Cosmos provides us with an opportunity to reflect a bit more deeply on the rich cultural diversity of our country. I am grateful for the foresight of the Cosmos faculty editors in developing this timely theme, and for our faculty contributors who generously adapted their research for this volume. I hope you will enjoy reading about their research as I did, and perhaps even use it as a source for those larger conversations that we are all now a part of.

David Sylvester, PhD
Principal
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CHILDLHOOD AND MIGRATION IN LOW GERMAN-SPEAKING COMMUNITIES OF SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO

SALLY MCNAMEE

My work is situated within the social study of childhood that developed partly out of a rejection within the disciplines of developmental psychology and sociology of a theory according to which children were seen as little more than simply moving from dependent, non-rational childhood to mature, autonomous rational adulthood. The emergent paradigm that replaced this theory was formulated predominantly by British and Scandinavian academics in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Children were to be placed at the centre of the research enterprise, rather than positioned as merely objects of it. They were to be seen as agents, and as meaning makers in their own lives rather than as passive objects of biosocial development. This shift in theory allowed an increasingly interdisciplinary study of the social structures and social institutions of childhood (the legal system, the family, school, and so on) and of the way that those structures and institutions acted upon the child. It also allowed scholars to see how the child acted back on those structures and institutions. From the disciplines of history, social geography, sociology and anthropology, among others, scholars are interested in highlighting current and past discourses and constructions of childhood, as well as justice for children and children’s rights—in general, what might be called the politics of childhood.
My recent research has focused on constructions of childhood in Low German-Speaking Mennonite communities in Southwestern Ontario. Part of the Anabaptist movement, Mennonites formed as a consequence of the Protestant Reformation during the sixteenth century. Religious beliefs in this culture emphasize believer's baptism, pacifism, and separation from the world. Originating in Switzerland, Germany and Holland, these followers of Menno Simons fled to Eastern Europe and Russia in search of freedom from persecution to practise their beliefs.

The migration to Canada began in the nineteenth century, and was primarily to the province of Manitoba, where the government had promised Mennonites land, freedom from state intervention and the right to educate their children as they wished and in their own language. However, as English settlers arrived in that region and placed pressure on the government to provide English-speaking education, the promises were not kept. The imposition of a provincially controlled curriculum required all children to be taught in English, and parents who did not send their children to the new state schools could be (and were) fined or imprisoned.

Thus began a huge migration of Mennonites from Manitoba to Mexico, Paraguay and Bolivia in search of the freedoms that they felt were now threatened in Canada. Importantly, this migration aimed to protect the future of the community through the continued ability to be able educate children, thus placing children at the heart of continuing tradition – a central positioning of childhood quite at odds with the experience of being a child in that culture, where children were to be neither seen nor heard, according to my interviewees. Full membership in the community is attained when the individual is baptised, usually just before marriage. Migration continues throughout South America as colonies split and reform, but currently the migration between Mexico and Southwestern Ontario is primarily prompted by the economic concerns of individual families and may be seasonal or more permanent.

Carrying out interviews with adults about their remembered childhoods growing up in the community, I heard about experiences of migration, school, home, and family. In the Mexican colonies, education ends around age twelve. Education may be in a one-room school where boys and girls sit on opposite sides of the room and where instruction takes place in Low German and is focused on the catechism. In addition, going to school happens only during the winter months as children are needed on the family farm during the summer. Children work alongside their family from an early age. Girls work inside the home performing child care, cleaning, cooking and laundry. Boys work is outdoors on the family farm or is hired out to a neighbour. While education in as far as it is useful for work is valued in this traditional culture, education outside of that is not. As one interviewee said, “There’s also a shame if you go to school past age of twelve in Mexico. It’s . . . if you go to school, you’re embarrassed. At age twelve, you start being a woman of the house. You start your cleaning, sewing; you do all that, and your toys get put away . . . and you take pride in your work.” This is not to say that children in Mennonite culture are seen as possessing more agency than Canadian children, because the data revealed few – if any – examples of agency within the family. However, the data do reveal the competence of children, a conception at odds with contemporary
Western constructions of childhood. Migrating from the colonies of Mexico to Ontario, attending school is the first point where the construction of childhood within the Mennonite population intersects with that of the dominant culture.

In Western culture, an eleven- or twelve-year-old is not seen as someone who has the capacity, capability and competence to work alongside adults, but as a still developing ‘becoming’ in need of adult care and protection, whose place is at school not at work. The lived experience of Mennonite children migrating to Southwestern Ontario does not resonate with this understanding. Well-meaning educators’ attempts to ‘fix’ the Mennonite school child in line with the dominant Western construction of childhood can lead to problems for the child and for the family. For example, one interviewee described how her family loudly disapproved of any homework she tried to do, and would destroy any school books brought home. In attempting to meet the expectations of both cultures, she suffered punishment at home and disapproval at school for work not done. The differences in constructions of childhood between the dominant Western construction in Canada and the Mennonite culture under discussion here are quite clear. The value of working within the social study of childhood is that this approach allows us to see how culture, tradition, gender, and education intersect to shape the experience of being a child. Hearing children’s voices on their experiences aids in the project of theorizing childhood and helps move our thinking towards a more nuanced understanding of the child in society.

**DR. SALLY MCNAMEE**

I am a sociologist who has worked in the social study of childhood since the early 1990s. My work has included an investigation into children’s leisure, specifically focusing on issues of gender, age and space in the ownership and use of computer and video games; research on the constructions of childhood employed by practitioners working with children in cases of divorce and separation; an evaluation of a British government fund aimed at dealing with child poverty; and a study that explored children’s understanding of the social organization of time. My recent book *The social study of childhood: an introduction* was published in August 2016 by Palgrave Macmillan.
CULTURE AND BIOETHICS

JOHN HENG

Why are you interested in this topic as a philosopher?

Culture influences how individuals and communities understand and approach health, disability, illness, suffering and death. When different cultures interact in health care, ethical questions and controversies often arise. In the era of globalization, such interactions occur frequently, even on the local level. Incorporating cultural considerations into bioethical thinking remains a challenge. We have become less aware of what it means to be responsible moral agents in health care and less apt to develop the capacities and resources in ourselves and in our cultures for adequate ethical deliberation. Instead of a dynamic exchange and integration of different cultural perspectives in bioethics, we tend uncritically towards extending one dominant culture in health care worldwide. One contributing factor is the proliferation of Western approaches to health care that depend increasingly on the use of technology. Another such factor is the growing acceptance of a narrow understanding of patient autonomy, based on some currents in Western philosophy that uphold free choices of individuals but fail to consider how they arrive at these choices and abstract from the familial, social, cultural, and religious supports that patients draw upon. An uncritical attachment to the application of technology in health care apart from the personal, inter-personal, cultural and spiritual aspects of care can risk treating patients primarily as objects to be acted upon or data to analyze. Ethical deliberations are then squeezed out of the healing relationship as decisions in health care are based primarily on “objective facts” that instruments and computer algorithms produce.
Patient autonomy can be linked unreflectively to moral subjectivism, the view that there is no valid basis for others to examine or dispute an individual's decision, and to libertarianism, which equates freedom with an individual's independence from the interventions of others in decision-making. While these trends might seem antithetical, they stem, in my view, from the same philosophical root: a dichotomy between what is regarded as objective and subjective in health care. One resource that I have found helpful in my reflections on bioethics is the work of the Canadian thinker Bernard Lonergan, who proposed that objectivity in knowing is the fruit of authentic subjectivity. In health care, subjectivity is manifested in a patient's or health care professional's acts of knowing that result in decisions. Objectivity is the other pole of decision making, the goal of health care, which is the good of the patient. There is a natural impulse in all human beings, in all cultures, to seek understanding through questions, to verify answers and to respond to values that transcend self-satisfaction. By following this impulse and performing well the various acts involved in knowing and doing, patients and health care professionals gradually become adept, through trial and error, at knowing what is good and worthwhile to do or refrain from doing in concrete health-care situations. That is, they attain what Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas called the habit or virtue of prudence. Promoting the conditions for authentic decision-making, as described, can be the basis of ethical discussions within and among various cultures. It provides a shared understanding and common vocabulary from which such discussions can proceed. It enables bioethicists to be respectful of and engage with the insights within different cultures while avoiding the trap of extending subjectivism into cultural relativism.

**What are some examples of this approach in bioethics?**

Last year, I was in the West Bank discussing ethical issues encountered by health-care professionals working with children who have been doubly traumatized by political and domestic violence. Their work is an example of the challenges of teaching healthy child development and promoting the well-being of children in a society in which harsh and repeated corporal punishment is the norm. The health-care professionals were able to help parents to understand what their children were likely communicating through their distressing behaviours and to consider a fuller range of values within the cultural and religious traditions of these parents and children to address behaviours in ways other than corporal punishment.

I was also in Colombia, China and Japan discussing with colleagues the issue of medically assisted suicide and voluntary euthanasia. They were struck by how this issue in Canada has been framed largely in terms of the libertarian concept of patient autonomy that I mentioned above. In their respective cultures, the support of
families and communities during disability and illness is valued. We explored questions regarding the effects of assisted suicide and euthanasia on families, communities, and on society; these are relevant questions that do not receive much attention in deliberations regarding medically assisted suicide and voluntary euthanasia in Canada.

**How do you go about your research in bioethics?**

Much research and writing in bioethics today tends to be done by individuals. For sixteen years, I have been privileged to collaborate in research and writing with a group of like-minded bioethicists from around the world, the International Association of Catholic Bioethics. We meet in person or virtually to tackle emerging questions that are often left to the side in mainstream bioethics, mainly concerning primary care and health promotion for various excluded groups in health care and society. We are from various cultures and include non-Catholic and non-religious experts; our work has been greatly enriched through encounter with diverse cultural and religious perspectives. We employ a unique methodology, based on extending Lonergan’s work on functional specialties for theology to bioethics. In addition to inter-disciplinary collaboration, Lonergan elaborated a way of organizing and integrating research on complex issues in terms of skills such as assembling and synthesizing data, interpreting them, understanding historical trends, probing the philosophical roots of controversies, discerning acceptable foundations for ethical stances, developing these stances into guidelines for practice and policies, judging the best ways to implement these guidelines in health-care systems, and communications. Individually no researcher excels at more than a few of these skills. We achieve better results in collaboration.

**PROF. JOHN HENG**

I teach in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, as well as the Foundations in Western Thought and Civilization Program, Thanatology Program, and the Disability Studies Program. My areas of teaching and research are eclectic and include philosophy of science (especially seventeenth-century neuroanatomy), early Christian philosophy (primarily Augustine), Confucian thought, bioethics, and the thought of Bernard Lonergan. In addition to my collaborations with the International Association of Catholic Bioethics, I am part of a network of researchers associated with the Developmental Disabilities Primary Care Program, which is funded by the Ontario government to enhance the health of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. I am a member of the Ethics Committee of the Board of St. Joseph’s Health Care in London, ON.
WHY INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXCHANGE?

LINDA WEBER

There is wide-spread agreement that there are benefits to university students studying on international exchange. Faculty and staff share the goal of preparing students to be globally minded citizens ready to live, work and lead in an interconnected, intercultural world that transcends national boundaries. Living abroad invites students to negotiate who they are on multiple fronts that can include citizenship, ethnicity, race, age, ability, gender, culture, socioeconomic status or sexuality. International exchange experiences are hailed as an indicator of grit and a demonstrator of an ability to thrive academically, professionally and personally; such experiences have effects lasting for the remainder of one’s life. Exchange students report their experiences as comprising some of their most enlightening or captivating learning as undergraduates.
Yet, despite glowing student evaluations and widespread public and institutional support, relatively few students take advantage of exchange opportunities. Only three percent of full-time Canadian university undergraduate participate in outgoing exchange where they study full-time for one or two semesters at an international partner university and transfer these credits to their home university (CBIE, 2015). What can be done to increase these numbers? As an international educator and manager of an international office, I need to know why I promote international exchange. One reason I promote exchange is because it makes a difference in students’ lives. I never tire of the stories students share of their intercultural learning and growth experiences, of the courage and stamina it takes to move thousands of kilometers from home, leaving family and friends and the familiarity of a known education system to be introduced to a different pedagogy, a fresh perspective on a given area of study, surprisingly different grading systems and learning expectations, and alternative ways of knowing and of being in the world.

I also educate and prepare students for international exchange, not just because this service is meaningful and fun for me but because I am aware of the shortfalls of exchange for those who are not prepared for its demands, knowing first-hand the emotional pitfalls of engaging in an experience for which one lacks cultural preparedness. After I completed my undergraduate degree, I moved to Japan and participated in the Japanese Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program. The JET Program had excellent pre-departure training, yet I still found myself ill-prepared for the experience of living in a rural mountain community where residents did not speak English, were not familiar with foreigners and knew little about me or where I came from. I began to comprehend that I was the visitor or outsider in their community. My limited knowledge of Japanese language, culture, history and society was problematic for communication and engagement in the community. I garnered great interest in this onsen village of Masutomi, Yamanashi prefecture where I lived, and children at the local pre-school wanted to touch my hair and skin, and the Obaa-san (grandmother) next door, considering herself my mentor, invited me to participate in ikebana (flower arranging), tea ceremonies, sushi-making and various cultural arts. I was in a rich cultural environment, rife with opportunities for learning, but I was unable to fully appreciate it because I was outside my comfort zone and unaccustomed to the visibility I had there and to being called a gaijin, a foreigner, a term with which I had no previous identification. When I tell students that intercultural learning is greatly enhanced by first learning the context of the society where they are re-locating – its history, culture, language and politics -- I know whereof I speak. Research has shown that successful intercultural learning does not happen by osmosis, by simply placing people from different cultures together and hoping for enlightenment. Beyond the exposure to another culture, active learning is necessary, learning that involves preparation and study, interaction with those from the host culture, language training, understanding of cultural stereotypes along with a willingness to critically examine them, an awareness of one’s own culture, and an ability to see and address power differentials and to reflect. The international student exchange process is a reciprocal one, and universities have the responsibilities and the benefits of both sending and receiving students. Exchange students, whether incoming or outgoing, learn more about the country where they are studying if they visit various locales. For more than ten years I have led student educational travel excursions for incoming exchange students, taking them to the cities of Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec. Recently I conducted a qualitative research study exploring how international students learned about Canadian society through their educational travel experience to French Canada. One impetus for my study was the lack of research available on experiential learning for exchange or international students studying within Canada. And so, I asked international students on my French Canada tour to critically reflect on how their experiences in these three cities influenced their understandings of Canadian history, politics, commerce, citizens and current events, as well as their identities and their conceptions of Canada.

One participant shared her enthusiasm for the trip saying, “I want to compare how Quebec is different from what we learned from the Chinese history books. I also want to learn the cultures you know. If I learn something from the textbook I usually memorize it, write it and speak it. But when you can really experience a place, you keep it in your memory forever. You can touch it, and you will enjoy it.”

Another participant reflected on her learning through art after her visit to the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts in Montreal stating, “One of the sculptures that is popular in Montreal is the Illuminated Crowd, which serves as the perfect illumination to express the
city’s diversification. Montreal is telling the visitors about social inclusion from this vivid work.” She also comments on Kent Monkman’s work Trappers of Men and the creation of Miss Chief Eagle Testickle. “Miss Chief is both male and female, a creature showing Monkman’s main concern about gender, aboriginal culture, and sexuality. That is what the local Canadian people care about. And the tolerance of the society can be found in such details.” Through art, this participant interpreted what she experienced as the values of the artist and ascribed these values to Canadian people. Open-mindedness, acceptance, non-judgement and an appreciation of commonalities and differences among cultures are intercultural values and learning that she and other students frequently mentioned when they described their learning.

I am a strong advocate of international student exchange. I also acknowledge that not all students have the inclination, the will or the resources to relocate to a university in another country for four to eight months. However, intercultural exchange also happens in various forms including faculty- led travel, internships abroad or through the engagement that happens at home when students from different cultures turn towards each other, recognize each other, and begin dialogue. These small seemingly insignificant connections make a difference and can turn into bigger interactions and actions. When new relationships across cultures are born there is no telling where they will lead or in which direction they will make the world spin.

CBIE 2015 http://cbie.ca/media/facts-and-figures/

---

**DR. LINDA WEBER**

My work and research interests focus on the student experience of intercultural learning. I prepare students for international exchange and provide advocacy and counselling services for students of higher education. Other research interests include cross-cultural counselling, intercultural communication, international relations, identity development, and education for diversity and inclusion. I have been crossing cultures all my life, moving fluidly between rural and urban cultures, between religious and ethnic communities, and, as a first-generation student, between communities with different educational backgrounds. In this regard I appreciate the rewards and challenges faced by those participating in intercultural exchange.
Is it possible for the Catholic Church to retrieve the concept of ‘mission’ in the so-called ‘secular age’ of the 21st century? Can this recovery be achieved in a way that is not considered offensive, self-righteous, oppressive, and even laughable? For many, the concept of Christian mission is laden with historical overtones of colonialism and the abuse of ecclesiastical and political power. The age of Christian mission is hopelessly dead, and in the eyes of many, it should remain so. For a good number of Christian theologians, however, mission is not an optional extra but is constitutive of ecclesial identity, and so the question is, what may be done to rehabilitate and re-conceive this notion for today? This question lay at the heart of my doctoral research, which sought to distill a shape for contemporary Catholic mission within Western, secular cultures through examining the work of Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor and Swiss theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar. The pairing of these two minds is, in the Catholic intellectual world, an unusual one, as the conventional understanding is that one falls within the proverbial category of ‘liberal’ or ‘progressive’ Catholics, while the other has been pulled into the ‘conservative’ camp of Catholic thinkers. In attempting to develop foundations for a local, contemporary, Canadian vision of the Church, I found that, despite their surface differences, both thinkers have something interesting to say about the challenge of renewing mission. I also chose these two thinkers to underscore the importance of people with vastly different orientations working collaboratively to think through mission in a secular age.
A key context for the focus on unity was the divisions within the Church that have emerged since the Second Vatican Council, the great gathering in Rome in the 1960s of bishops and theologians from around the globe to discuss the situation of the Church in the modern world. The aftermath of the Council, which famously introduced Mass in the vernacular among other things, led to varying and divisive interpretations, which seemed to show that the Church’s encounter with modernity was still rife with ambiguity for many people. Focusing on secularity and mission together was potentially a way to engage the best of Vatican II, a council that saw the Church espouse an openness to the modern world as well as an affirmation of tradition.

Why does the question of mission and secularization matter for the Church, and why should it matter for all Canadians, Catholic or non-Catholic?

For the Church

Mission matters for the Church because two key marks of the Church are universality and apostolicity. These mean that intrinsic to the Catholic tradition is a call to go out and to share the gospel, or good news, with the world. The goal of the Church is to give glory to God by drawing together all people in and through love. Sharing the news of God’s love for humanity is, in Catholic understanding, an invitation to the vocation to live out of love and to work to transform the world into a state of true peace and true justice. Secularization matters to the Church because it is the context in which mission now takes place. Modern theologians have recognized that doing theology without due attention to the social context of the Church undermines the efficacy of that theology.

For Canadians

Mission matters because Catholics are part of Canadian society. Freedom of religion is a constitutional right in Canada. However, there are many spaces and contexts in which this freedom is in reality hemmed in and foreclosed. Taylor describes this present situation as closed secularism, an espousal of neutrality that silences religious voices. In the spirit of the Canadian values of inclusivity and diversity, he encourages open secularism, where all religions are welcome in the public sphere.

For Catholic Canadians

Secularization matters because Catholics in a post-Vatican II era have been charged with engaging the modern world and with “reading the signs of the times.” It would be irresponsible for theologians to ignore the concept of secularization when it is a clear ‘sign of the time’ that has implications for how the Church can and may encounter the world with openness, as well as discernment.

For non-Catholic Canadians

Secularization and mission matter because Catholic Canadians and non-Catholic Canadians share a polity, and shared social existence requires, according to Taylor, a shared set of principles, a way of proceeding. Citizenship within a democratic polity requires mutual understanding and assent.

So, how may Taylor and Balthasar help us with the challenge of mission in a secular age?

In my study of their work I have found that Taylor gives us an example of one who does not judge secularity to be intrinsically bad, but offers a historical rendering of the development of secularization in the North Atlantic West over five hundred years (See A Secular Age). Providing an extensive account of the intellectual, social, and cultural forces that comprised the genesis of secularism as we know it today, Taylor suggests that we think of secularity as simply the condition of our belief today. We cannot opt out of secularity to some degree. Taylor asserts that it is a foundational horizon whether we are believers or unbelievers. Taylor does show, though, that belief is possible in a secular age, and cites the lives of Teresa of Calcutta and Jean Vanier as proof that modernity does not condemn one to a “spiritual lobotomy.” Taylor also illustrates how the historical evolution of secularization involved “inputs” from the Church. Both these considerations have implications for how mission may be conducted today.

Beyond his insights into the Western form of secularity, Taylor is also an astute cultural anthropologist of modern moral selfhood and thereby helps the Church to understand and appreciate the goodness within contemporary desires and values, as well as consider how it may participate in the healing of modern malaise.
If Taylor sheds light on the cultural dimension of the equation, Balthasar helps to clarify the ecclesiological element of contemporary Catholic mission. Balthasar’s theology includes a rich anthropology that outlines the way in which freedom is found in intimate friendship with God. Balthasar emphasizes the moment of an infant receiving the smile of her mother as a key moment of personhood, an awakening of selfhood through an experience of profound belovedness. The choice to live one’s life as total self-gift in an ongoing way is the key to full personhood. The latter, according to Balthasar, comes about through one’s encounter with Christ. With this theological anthropology, Balthasar presents an ecclesiology that challenges the Church to rethink its identity at core. Is the hierarchical, institutional dimension of the Church its deepest reality? Or is the ability to work with the freedom of God to help all persons find freedom in self-giving love its most profound nature? I read Balthasar as saying that it is the capacity of the Church to form persons for self-gift, to form good and holy persons, that is most essential to the identity of the Church and its mission, particularly in this age. Seeing the Church as humble servant and responsive face of mercy to the challenges of a secular world is the way in which Balthasar helps light a path for Catholic mission in a secular age.

While problems and critiques attend the thought of each Catholic thinker, my research shows how, taken together, they may illuminate an approach to mission grounded in mercy, compassion, and an appreciation of the goodness of the world.

**DR. CAROLYN CHAU**

My research attends to questions at the intersection of faith and culture, particularly those concerning the shape of Catholic mission and moral formation in contemporary post-Christian secular societies. My book *Solidarity With the World: Charles Taylor and Hans Urs von Balthasar on Faith, Modernity and Catholic Mission* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Press, 2016) considers the question of church-world engagement fifty years after the Second Vatican Council. In addition to the question of the meaning of secularization for the Catholic Church in Canada, I explore the contribution of the Church in Asia to Global Catholicism and various ways in which Christian faith transforms social practices of peacemaking and reconciliation.
Canada, in the opinion of many early explorers, was a vast abyss. In Norse myth, the tumultuous waters off the coast of Labrador, where the Arctic and Atlantic ocean currents collide, is *ginnungagap*, the gaping abyss that, depending on the author, is a frozen void or the site of primeval chaos which gave birth to the world. Canadian literature, by extension, must be abysmal. So why study it? Because unique skills and perspectives accrue from navigating this expansive, shifting conceptual space, which constantly makes and unmakes itself. A vortex that draws in diverse currents, that is simultaneously a beginning and an end, can be a powerful and generative force. However, media commentators and government agencies continue to seek a stable definition of Canadian culture, or a formative historical moment (the War of 1812? Confederation? Vimy Ridge?), that would consolidate Canadian unity. Theirs is an impossible task.
Identifying the origins of Canada is as difficult as pinpointing the beginning of Canadian literature. Students usually arrive at university equipped with the certainty, derived from Heritage Minutes and high school lectures, that the term “Canada” comes from the Iroquois word “kanata,” meaning “village.” This interpretation is tied to Jacques Cartier’s 1535 exploration of the St. Lawrence River and his encounter with some Aboriginal youths who gestured toward the village of Stadacona, near modern-day Quebec City, and called it something that sounded like “Canada.”

Yet, as W.H. New notes, there are other interpretations of the word’s origin that most Canadians never learn: “The country’s name has been variously interpreted to mean ‘nothing here’ (Spanish, a ca nada) [or acá nada], ‘castle’ (Mohawk, canadahgi), ‘clean land,’ ‘hunting castle,’ ‘narrow land,’ ‘narrow road,’ and ‘river mouth.’” Choosing “kanata” over “acá nada” favours the French tradition of naval exploration, which can be easily assimilated into our national narrative, over the Spanish one, while ignoring rival Aboriginal claims altogether. Canada, then, begins with problems of intercultural communication and a slippery signifier. Researching “Canada” will not reveal what the term definitively means, but the study of Canadian literature will illustrate how different meanings are generated through intercultural contact, how patterns of cultural inclusion and exclusion evolve over time, and how structures of power influence the determination of literary value.

Take the word “Canadian.” To French explorers in the sixteenth century, a “Canadian” was an Aboriginal from the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Over the next century, settlers in New France began to use the term to distinguish their collective identity from that of their counterparts in France. When the British conquered New France in the eighteenth century, they understood the term “Canadian” to refer to the French settlers in the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes regions, not to Aboriginals. As for the British, they did not generally identify as “Canadian” until Confederation in 1867. Over the course of the twentieth century, anglophone Canadians began to appropriate the motifs and anthems of French Canadian nationalism, such as the Maple Leaf flag and “O Canada,” but no sooner had this transition begun than many francophones responded by distancing themselves from the traditional symbols of French Canada and calling themselves Québécois. Key literary example of this Quiet Revolution is the ironic rendition of “O Canada” at the end of Michel Tremblay’s most famous play, Les Belles-soeurs. The singing of the national anthem while the “sisters” fight over stamps is a kind of performance within a performance that the French call a mis-en-abyme (placing in the abyss). This technique of embedding different levels of signification (the play-within-the-play, the artwork-within-the-artwork) makes the term “Canada” seem both complex and empty. The play’s conclusion simultaneously critiques the cultural decline of Canada (the francophone nation) through the kitsch pursuits of its bingo-playing representatives on stage, while mocking the modern state of Canada that has reduced the francophone working class to poverty and internal division, and highlighting the discrepancy between the formal French of the anthem and the distinctly Québécois language used in the play.

To study Québécois literature from the late twentieth century is thus to study how meaning can be made, unmade, and remade. Works of art are more powerful when they do all these things simultaneously, and Canadians have slowly come to realize that such motility can also be a powerful attribute of statecraft. Our capacity to adapt the idea of Canada to evolving economic and demographic conditions, and to reinvent our communal identity with an ever-expanding set of cultural resources, increasingly stands in contrast to the narrow notions of national identity—determined by birthplace, skin colour, and language—which are tearing apart Trump’s America and post-Brexit England.

The productive tension between cosmopolitanism and nationalism is what initially drew me to Canadian literature. I studied Norse myths about the North Atlantic in Norway. I taught Canadian Studies in Germany. I investigated the intersection of anglophone and francophone literary traditions in Montreal. Along the way, I published a book, From Cohen to Carson: The Poet’s Novel in Canada, about authors such as Leonard Cohen, Michael Ondaatje, and Anne Carson who specialize in hybridizing literary genres and combining disparate cultural resources. Yet, in the process, my interest in Canadian nationalism shifted toward “glocalism,” the study of particular places in relation to global flows of capital and culture. I noticed that the Canadian literary projects I most admired involved writers who had travelled extensively, often establishing a literary reputation abroad, before devoting themselves to a specific locale: writing it,
researching it, and investing it with their imaginative powers and vast experience. Mordecai Richler, for example, spent years composing novels and TV scripts in England before returning to Montreal to devote himself to telling stories about a predominantly Jewish neighbourhood near his childhood home. Likewise, our current poet laureate, George Elliott Clarke, spent his formative years trying to understand Black Nova Scotian literature in the context of African American conventions before a period of teaching at Duke University in North Carolina convinced him of the uniqueness of what he now calls Africanadian literature. Even our first Nobel Laureate in Literature, Alice Munro, spent years running a bookstore in British Columbia and publishing in The New Yorker before returning to Huron County, Ontario, to make fictionalizing that place her life’s work. I decided to follow these precedents when I returned to Southwestern Ontario to teach at King’s. I have since devoted much of my critical energy to a thorough reconsideration of my hometown of Stratford, Ontario, site of North America’s largest theatre festival. This research takes diverse forms: I am writing an interdisciplinary cultural history of Stratford; I am contesting some of the myths about the origins of the Stratford Festival; I am conducting archival research to understand how Stratford positioned itself as the Canadian hub of an international circuit of theatre, film, and music festivals in the 1950s; and I am developing a course on ecocriticism and the Thames River system (of which Stratford’s Avon is a tributary).

It is a huge project but, in the words of T.S. Eliot:

We shall not cease from exploration  
And the end of all our exploring  
Will be to arrive where we started  
And know the place for the first time.

---

**DR. IAN RAE**

I am an Associate Professor of Modern Languages at King’s University College at Western University, author of the monograph From Cohen to Carson: The Poet’s Novel in Canada (2008), and editor of George Bowering: Bridges to Elsewhere (2010), a special issue of the journal Open Letter. In 2012, I earned a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Insight Development Grant for my Mapping Stratford Culture project, which aims to develop an interdisciplinary cultural history of this arts hub. In 2016, I received a Moore Institute Fellowship at the University of Ireland, Galway, for work on the Stratford Festival and the Irish Literary Revival.
Constructive intergroup exchanges are facilitated by a context of equality. Social psychology contributes to the goal of fostering egalitarian relations between groups by uncovering the myriad ways by which people's attitudes, beliefs, and behavior shape and are shaped by the social context. In line with this tradition, my research describes how people's attitudes toward policies and practices that affect the well-being of others can at times serve as barriers to equitable relations between groups. In particular, I have examined how unconstructive efforts to maintain inequality manifest in several unexpected ways, including in attitudes toward employment equity programs, the ways by which people are willing to help immigrants, decision-making about human and environmental protection, and more unusually, beliefs about the relationship between humans and non-human animals. My hope is that identifying barriers to equality serves the goal of achieving it by pointing toward directions for progressive change.

Attitudes toward employment equity programs.

Social changes involving greater equality can generate feelings of threat to the familiar status quo. At times, such feelings lead people to resist vehicles of change such as employment equity programs. People who oppose employment equity programs often explain their position in terms of commitment to the ideal of meritocracy in which social rewards follow directly from hard work and talent, as these programs tend to be viewed as violating principles of fairness by recognizing group identity. Despite the popularity of this view, because equity programs were developed to address systemic biases that violate meritocracy, a number of social psychologists have proposed that resistance to them can at times reflect subtle prejudice against beneficiary groups or opposition to the creation of equality. I tested this latter idea by questioning university students about the strategies they were willing to endorse to achieve greater gender parity in employment domains dominated by either men or women. Consistent with the view that attitudes toward equity programs may at times reflect intergroup bias, I found that attitudes toward these programs were gendered. Although generally students preferred the use of merit alone rather than any type of equity program, the type of intervention they were willing to support depended on the gender of the beneficiary group. Remedial education to address perceived deficits in qualifications was deemed suitable for women seeking entrance to male dominated jobs, whereas a change to job structure to entice and support men was viewed as appropriate for men seeking entrance into domains dominated by women. This paternalistic notion that women are more mutable than men are may reflect a broader barrier to equality – a tendency for people to think that progress requires change by underprivileged groups rather than to social structures.

Willingness to help immigrants.

As part of an initiative to understand how to facilitate constructive relations between immigrants and established residents, my colleague Victoria Esses and I examined people's willingness to support different approaches to helping immigrants adjust to life in Canada. Despite the known economic benefits of immigration, many people in North America report believing that immigration is a source of economic drain, and this view is prevalent in public discourse. This belief, even if misguided, is consequential. For example, a large body of research shows that when people think that immigration creates economic challenges for the host population they prefer closed-door policies and express animosity toward immigrants themselves. Our work on the topic shows that media presentations of immigration that imply a zero-sum economic relationship between new immigrants and other Canadians shape how people are willing to help support newcomers. In particular, we
found that exposure to this type of communication led people to resist supporting empowering forms of help such as language education. In contrast, it did not negatively impact people’s willingness to support useful but non-empowering forms of help such as provision of supportive housing. This contrast suggests that the all too common – and arguably unsupported – refrain that immigration threatens jobs can serve to undercut the very forms of help that are most likely to promote the independent social and economic participation of new residents.

Decision-making about human and environmental protection.

Recently, I have studied how human factors may contribute to environmental inequality, the disproportionate exposure to high levels of pollution and environmental degradation faced by members of groups that are socially and economically disadvantaged. In Canada, as elsewhere, the placement of pollution-generating industries and hazardous waste sites disproportionately affects Indigenous communities as well as recent immigrants and refugees. It is a serious problem, as damages to these groups include higher rates of serious physical health problems as well as challenges to mental health and cultural and spiritual quality of life.

Undeniably, political and economic factors contribute importantly to the problem of environmental inequality. Research I have conducted along with former King’s student Lisa Bitacola and our colleagues Victoria Esses and Leslie Janes explores how people’s intergroup attitudes play an additional role by shaping the decisions people are willing to make about the placement of environmentally damaging industries. Using decision-making scenarios, we found that people who endorsed an ideology of social dominance – a preference for hierarchical relationships between groups – were willing to locate environmentally degrading industries in locations populated by members of disadvantaged groups because prejudice against these persons tends to go hand-in-hand with indifference toward the environment. Those who made such decisions justified their stance in compelling ways such as appealing to job opportunities for those groups, yet the justifications were offered primarily in support of anticipated benefits to their own group. These findings suggest that an additional barrier to equality may be the masking of intergroup biases by discourse about environmental, economic, and human justice considerations.

Beliefs about relations between humans and non-human animals.

Some of my most recent research examines parallels between the forms and functions of human intergroup attitudes and people’s thoughts and feelings about non-human animals. This work suggests that efforts to maintain inequality between human groups are supported by a hierarchical world-view that ranks living beings, human and non-human, in value. Empirically, those who show less respect for disadvantaged human groups are more inclined than others to expressive dismissive attitudes about the value of non-human animals, and regard for humans and non-human animals tend to correspond. Also, people who endorse prejudice against human groups tend to rely on common but questionable beliefs about animals (e.g., animals feel pain less than humans do) as a means to legitimize the human treatment of animals in animal industries. Together with former King’s student Aaron Gibbings, I have shown that many popular views about non-human animals function as legitimizing myths in the same manner that stereotypes of underprivileged groups do.

Critical examination of our stances toward non-human animals may benefit the cause of equality more broadly. Consider dehumanization. Comparisons between
some human groups and animals provoke hostility: colonized groups have been compared to beasts in an effort to justify aggressive control; genocide victims and other ethnic minority groups have been represented as vermin requiring extermination; representations of women as meat imply an expectancy of exploitation, and so on. Despite the illogic of comparing only some members of the category homo sapiens (a bipedal primate) with other species of animals, dehumanization has great power because of the deeply rooted hierarchical assumption in Western culture that non-human animals deserve less respect than humans do. As a number of critics of human vanity have observed, it is the denial of respect to the non-human other that gives the malignant power to dehumanizing imagery.

Though superficially disparate, these four lines of research share common themes: attitudinal barriers to equality extend well beyond Trump-style bigotry to normative attitudes about policies and practices that affect others; these attitudes are often driven by efforts to maintain privileges; and they are embedded in a broad web of beliefs about hierarchy that extends beyond the human. Promoting the cause of equality may be aided by ensuring that strategies for change are genuinely empowering to disadvantaged groups, acknowledging the scope of the human capacity for pride and protectionism, and by cultivating instead our capacities for compassion toward other people, other beings, and the environment that sustains us.

DR. LYNNE JACKSON

My research examines how people’s attitudes and beliefs about social groups and social issues can serve to maintain or challenge inequality. In my book, The Psychology of Prejudice: From Attitudes to Social Action (APABooks, 2011), I examine parallels between human intergroup relations and human interactions with the environment and non-human animals. I have published widely on issues of sexism, attitudes toward immigrants and immigration, and religious intergroup attitudes. I am an Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology, where I teach The Introduction to Psychology, The Psychology of Prejudice, and other courses related to applications of social psychology.
POST-MIGRATORY EXPERIENCES OF IMMIGRANT/REFUGEE WOMEN IN CANADA: A PHOTOVOICE PROJECT

BHARATI SETHI
Twenty years later I vividly remember the day of Bidai. The sun was just setting when I bid my family, friends, and India farewell. Young and single, I travelled for three days, changing two flights along the way, before I arrived at sunrise in Canada. It was cold. Oh, so cold! Every now and then I glance at my Canadian citizenship certificate firmly secured in a gold-bordered frame. It decorates the walls of my home. I feel safe. I am in Canada. On most days, I wear the Canadian-citizen identity with pride. Often, though, my heart aches. I paid a heavy price for freedom. For seven and a half years I struggled to survive in Canada; my immigration status went through multiple transformations--student visa, foreign worker, and non-status person--before I finally received my landed-immigrant status. A few years after becoming a landed immigrant, I swore my allegiance to the Queen.

My photovoice doctoral project that explored the post-migratory lives of visible minority immigrant/refugee women is fuelled by my passion, pain, and pursuit of social justice. We share our individual stories. We also share a collective story of migration as visible-minority immigrant/refugee women. As a visible minority and immigrant, I share an insider perspective with these women. As an academic I am an outsider to them. Somewhere between an insider and outsider there is a fuzzy space, undefined, and untouched.

### Photovoice

Within the qualitative project, I selected an arts-based inquiry in the form of photovoice. In keeping with the key tenets of photovoice, I gave seventeen women cameras to record their post-migratory experiences. I found that photovoice -- an image-based methodology -- has the potential to empower the marginalized and vulnerable populations by giving them voice and visibility. What differentiates photovoice from other qualitative methodology is that the participants are fully in charge of the creation of their images and the narratives that emerge from the photographic process. Through self-generated photographs participants were able to shed light on the varied crevices of society’s structures and provide a new insight into the political, cultural, and historical issues that impact their post-migratory lives.

### Post-Migratory Experiences of Immigrant/Refugee Women

Through the “Open Door” photograph (figure 1) Janavi, originally from India, expressed joy and anguish. She was excited that Canada opened her doors for her. However, like many other immigrants she faced hardships in having her credentials recognized. She was deskilled; that is, she was working in jobs that did not necessarily require a university education.

![Figure 1: Open door – “You open a door and you think you are moving ahead, only to find another closed” - Janavi from India](image-url)
All the women in the study shared Janavi’s experience of starting at the bottom. Rudo, a government-sponsored refugee from Zimbabwe, took the photo of the stairs (figure 2) to show how in her post-migratory journey she had to take one step at a time to reach her economic, health, and social goals. Often she was disheartened, but she reminded herself to focus on one step at a time.

Figure 2: Stairs – “In Canada I had to start at the bottom. When I see so many stairs in front of me I sometimes feel disheartened. But I remind myself to take just one step at a time” - Rudo from Zimbabwe

Women’s photographs highlight that it was disheartening when the human and social capital obtained in their countries of origin was not recognized in Canada. For several years after migration, they worked in precarious jobs. They were largely employed in factories or as caregivers in a nursing/retirement home – jobs that many Canadians do not want to do. Many of them had to maintain two or three part-time jobs to survive. Their job descriptions included physically demanding and repetitive tasks that could cause illness and injuries. Being deskilled negatively impacted their sense of identity and their physical and mental health.

Participants’ narratives suggest that it was arduous for them to locate critical information related to job search, dealing with landlord-tenant disputes, and/or accessing a social worker/counsellor. Their experiences of racialization dampened their spirits. They were often viewed as the Other (visible-minority immigrant/refugee). Despite these difficulties, as months rolled by, they fell in love with their new home, Canada. Their photographs portrays fierce resilience. They learned English, retrained, upgraded their professional credentials, and found meaningful employment. Like the tortoise (figure 3) they continued to persevere.

For example, having successfully completed the Canadian nursing degree, at the time of the interview, Ruvashe was looking forward to her new life. She was very grateful to a community social-worker who helped her navigate the economic and social terrain of her new home in Canada.

Often women found themselves at the cross road (figure 4) and were faced with difficult decisions. However, women with children, in particular, felt that their decision to migrate, persevere, and stay in Canada was worth every tear they shed along the way. They migrated for their children. They expected that their children, especially the girl child, would have a better life in Canada than in the country of origin.

Figure 3: Tortoise – “This resembles two things, the slow and long process of trying to reach for your dream and also resilience” - Ruvashe from Zimbabwe

Figure 4: Crossroad - “In Canada I was faced with different options. I question, where to go?” - Cindy from China
Revelations Emerging from this Study

Fifty percent of new immigrants coming to Canada are women, primarily from the visible-minority population. Failure to leverage a competitive advantage and tap into a growing skilled, university-educated, and culturally diverse female population in Canada will lead to loss of employer productivity and labour market skills deficiency;

While diet and exercise are important to maintain health, it is important to pay attention to Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) that are unique to women, immigrants, and refugees (such as institutionalized racism); Photovoice principles of placing the participants' standpoints at the forefront of the research process, social change, and social justice align with the Canadian Association of Social Work (CASW) code of ethics, which emphasizes respect for the inherent dignity and worth of persons and the pursuit of social justice. Social workers and other health-care practitioners might consider using arts-based methods such as photovoice to address complex research questions that provide answers from a specific community’s historical, economic, social, health, and geographical standpoint. I found that the “eye of the camera” captured emotional images that illuminated participants’ lived experiences from their perspectives.

Creating a Space for Uncomfortable Discussion

In collaboration with the participants I converted the participants’ photographs into twenty-one art pieces. These pieces were displayed at various venues in different parts of Ontario. One of the purposes of these exhibits has been to create safe spaces for uncomfortable discussion about citizenship, and in doing so, to reveal the power structures hidden in the discourses of Citizenship and the Other. Indeed, the relationship between a “visible minority immigrant” and the “Canadian state” has been complex for hundreds of years.

Moving forward as an academic and activist, I will continue to strive to bring their voices to the policy makers. Nevertheless, ensuring women’s full participation in economic, social, and political life entails much more. It requires a “deliberate collaboration” between service providers, all levels of government, and academics. If we are to sustain our vision of multiculturalism and enrichen the evolving Canadian mosaic, we must go beyond tolerating diversity to celebrating diversity.

DR. BHARATI SETHI

My research interests are focused on issues affecting immigrants to Canada’s urban and rural communities. I am currently a co-investigator in three grants (two funded by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council [SSHRC] and one by both SSHRC and the Canada Institute of Health Research) that amount to $350,000. My research has earned several prestigious awards, including the Ontario Women’s Health Scholarship, the Tutor-Primary Health Care Fellowship, the Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship, and the Hilary M. Weston Scholarship. My arts-based doctoral work on photovoice with immigrant/refugee women earned a Governor General’s Award. In 2013, due to community advocacy efforts, I received the Citizen’s Award from the Member of the Provincial Parliament. In 2012 I was nominated as one of the “top 25” immigrants to Canada.
I grew up with history at the dinner table, where I was first exposed to stories of my parents’ migration routes. My mother, along with her siblings and parents, left war-torn Holland in the search for a more peaceful life in Canada. My father’s path, along with his parents and his uncle Jeno, was quite different. They fled for their lives in order to escape the Russian invasion of Hungary in 1945.

Their captivating stories of migration and integration, marked by the desire to exercise human agency amid turmoil, helped me to realize the power and the meaning of history from an early age. It is why I ultimately came to my own research trajectory – the writing and teaching of history that listens and is responsive, that makes a tangible difference in people’s lives, and that emphasizes a responsibility to the public by creating a vital link between the study of the past and an understanding of our present.
As an activist historian of Canada’s past, I write about people, organizations, and communities that challenged what was considered to be “common sense.” Principally, I focus on the concept of agency, the idea that not all members of minority groups were passive victims of prejudicial treatment. I emphasize dissent and the voices of protest. My research illuminates a long history in Canada of attempts to overcome racial disadvantage and efforts to create a more open society. Consider, for example, an aspect of the wartime incarceration of persons of Japanese ancestry in Canada – the use of Japanese-Canadian men as labourers on the sugar-beet farms of southern Ontario over the course of the 1942 growing season. What I found most useful about the idea of agency is that it enabled me to investigate how Japanese Canadians and local community members in southern Ontario dealt with the forced issue of having to negotiate the terms of wartime restrictions. In fact, what I discovered was that far from being oppressed as prisoners of the state, many of the Japanese-Canadian men demonstrated incredible foresight in establishing cooperative events such as baseball games with local folk that eventually served to foster goodwill and thus changed the way small-town Ontarians conceptualized the so-called enemy in their midst. By focusing on agency, these four hundred or so Japanese-Canadian men would emerge more individually out of the characteristic framework that rarely differentiates among the 22,000 who were interned or incarcerated. Moreover, campaigns by Japanese-Canadian, Japanese-American and non-Asian activists against the wartime policies of the governments of the US and Canada that affected persons of Japanese ancestry in North America exemplify the strength of dissent and the importance of agency. Much of the literature on this issue is dominated by an interpretation that presents persons of Japanese ancestry as passive victims of racist and oppressive government policies. That they were affected is true; that they were passive is false. Many were involved directly in the campaign to protest the Canadian and American government’s policies regarding the wartime incarceration of persons of Japanese ancestry, particularly the protest of the deportation, or more accurately, the expatriation policy in Canada. Members of the affected minority groups were a significant part of the cooperative efforts to change racist and discriminatory practices in Canadian public policy. Thus, Canada’s early human rights movement must be understood as a venture that involved, and was often initiated by, the affected communities. The work of politicians and documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights form only a limited understanding of our modern-day rights revolution. Canadians, whether they were Asian, Jewish, or Black, were integral architects of the emerging human-rights discourse before, during and after the Second World War.

In 1956 it was the Canadian people, acting in concert with humanitarian and voluntary agencies (the Canadian Red Cross [CRC] in particular), who called on the government of Louis St. Laurent to take in Hungarians fleeing the violent Soviet repression of the Hungarian revolution. In response to significant public pressure, Canadian immigration officials reinforced the number of immigration officers at the Canadian Embassy in Vienna, loosened the normal requirements concerning proper travel documentation, medical exams and security clearances, and enlisted commercial airplanes to transport the refugees out of Austria. The Canadian government increased monetary aid to the CRC by emphasizing that substantial emergency relief would serve as a replacement for military intervention. The effort produced impressive results: by the end of 1957, more than 37,000 Hungarians had been accepted into Canada. Public opinion ignored any conflict between this immigration initiative and the rising unemployment rate at the time, perhaps because the reception of the Hungarian refugees played well into the Cold War rhetoric of the time. Thanks to this wellspring of Canadian support, my great aunt and uncle came to Canada in January of 1957 following a harrowing crossing over the Hungarian-Austrian border. It was actually my great uncle’s second try; he was arrested the first time and sent to a Soviet work camp for six months. His friend who accompanied him was not so lucky; he was shot by a Russian border guard.

Still, the Hungarian refugee crisis is telling in terms of the limits of what individuals can do in an international system founded on the primacy of the nation-state. While the response of Canadians was an important catalyst for mobilizing action in support of refugee rights, the crisis had the unanticipated effect of permanently raising unrealistic expectations; for some groups, the Hungarian crisis
was not a “one-off,” but rather the standard to which future national responses to humanitarian crises should aspire. Indeed, the success of the Hungarian resettlement program for Canada served as a convenient precedent when in subsequent years individuals and groups urged the government to act on other refugee crises.

As Muriel Kitagawa noted, there “are many ways in which to act. Progressive action lies not only in organizational work, but in the day-to-day living of us all.” Put another way, as Margaret Mead so wisely reminded us, “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.” The study of agency and of dissent in Canadian history is of intrinsic value to me both as a researcher and in my role as a university professor. History is a humanizing discipline but it is also an empowering one. Learning about the historical power of dissent and the role of agency in forwarding change in society motivates us in the present. We know, for example, that we have the capacity to welcome many more Syrian and other refugees today because of our experiences of the past. We know that policies built on fear, as in the case of Japanese Canadians in World War II, will not make us safer. We know the dangers of injustice that is racially motivated and how fragile our rights become in times of crisis. But we also know, thanks to those who raised their voices in protest, that dissent is possible and necessary yesterday, today, and in the future. We cannot now be smug with “sunny ways.” Xenophobia is back and history teaches us that we must not stay quiet.

**DR. STEPHANIE BANGARTH**

I’m an Associate Professor of History at King’s University College at Western University. My research explores the history of human rights advocacy and social movements in addition to Canada’s history of immigration and refugee reception. I am currently working on two book projects, one which employs a biographical approach to the study of Canada’s refugee history and the other which is a study of Canadian social and political movements via the life history of a Canadian activist. Outside of academia I can be found making a difference in the world by volunteering for Girl Guides of Canada and the Cambridge Trails Advisory Committee, and appreciating the world while on a run or in a kayak.
Prime Minister Theresa May, in her first address to the United Nations in September, 2016, said the UK would spend eighty million pounds to help provide a hundred thousand jobs in Ethiopia, thirty thousand of which must be for migrants from Eritrea. This, together with her other commitments at the Refugee Summit of twenty million pounds more, is aimed at reducing the flow of migrants, many of whom are Eritreans, attempting to enter European countries such as the UK. Ethiopia originated the plan to build two industrial parks and grant refugees employment rights, which they currently lack.

Research which I have conducted since 2005 provides a context for assessing May’s initiative. This research has focused on the question of how employment by foreign direct investors (FDI) in less developed countries might inhibit or support emigration to their more developed neighbours. The FDI on whom my investigation focused established maquiladoras in Baja California, Mexico; maquiladoras or maquilas are factories that produce for export. These companies import materials duty-free and pay taxes only on the value added, which is mostly labour. In debates preceding NAFTA, then Mexican President Salinas pointed to the maquiladoras as a pilot project for the treaty, which would make such industries an economic engine for the country, turning Mexico into an exporter of goods instead of people.

I began with a secondary analysis of people returned to Mexico by the US Border Patrol from 1993 to 1997, combined with results from in-depth interviews. I found a stream of Mexican emigrants to the US who differed from the flow of male agricultural workers, who had been the subject of several decades of research. Those with maquiladora work-experience, in comparison with former farm-workers, were significantly more likely to be women, single, heads
of households, younger, more highly educated, born at the border and with work-experience in urban areas. The main factor motivating emigration of maquila workers is wage differences and their inability to get by on their income. Workers used the maquiladora to help them get documents to enter the US, since it is necessary to have a statement confirming employment to acquire and renew visas. For those who had risen above the worker level in maquiladoras, the experience served as a trampoline for their emigration, allowing them to accumulate human and social capital to get a similar job in the US. Women migrated more often because there is less gender- and age-discrimination in the US, and they were more likely to go with documents due to the danger of crossing illegally.

The next stage was to distinguish different types of emigrants who had worked in maquiladoras. Former and current maquila workers in Tijuana tended to be recurrent migrants, particularly commuters, who often became emigrants over time. More skilled maquila employees become immigrants and recurrent migrants through a diaspora process in which the multinational corporation plays a key role, providing an organizational structure through which they move while crossing borders. Return migration was rare due to borderlander identities and fewer opportunities in Mexico. Many living on either side of this border identify it as one region, crossing frequently, so that they need not return in a permanent sense.

With an expanded research team, the project became comparative, looking at how the same kind of FDI in the Tangiers-Tetouan region of Morocco might impact emigration to Europe. The comparison allowed us to begin to separate the effects of export-industry employment and other factors, such as different borders and cultures. The Strait of Gibraltar is more difficult to cross than the US-Mexican border, and Mexican emigration was more likely to be motivated by a political culture of corruption. However, despite greater difficulty in crossing the border and less political alienation, Moroccan export-industry employees also emigrated. In fact, the region of Tangiers-Tetouan was found to be a migration hub because it brings together job-seeking internal and international migrants at a border location that has historically been a place of departure with a culture of migration. The export industries there connect internal Moroccan migrants, international ones, and those in transit with global commodity chains.

Women workers have been the focus of the most recent publications. At both research sites, young women were found to use export-industry employment in gender bargaining, gaining more freedom from family by giving them all or large portions of their wages. Freedoms gained include permission to continue schooling, moving away from family to another city, and refusing arranged marriages. Former women Mexican maquila workers were far more likely than their Moroccan counterparts to emigrate alone because the latter country's gender norms negatively sanction women's independence. In a Bourdieusian-style analysis of Moroccan women, social class, place of origin, and household composition were used to identify points of intersection that shape symbolic spaces. Single women from the south of Morocco with little education were the most numerous and tended to have the worst jobs and to live with others like them. The research team is preparing an anthology on globalization and migration, and work is in progress with a new comparison of how export employment in the interior locations of Casablanca, Morocco and Puebla, Mexico might impact migration.

FDI in our research was all in the private sector, but similar investment by governments might have the same impact on migration. Perhaps the main lesson from this work for Europeans investing in African industries in an attempt to reduce immigration is that the jobs created must be sufficiently remunerated to adequately support people. Like many of the participants in our research, the Eritreans that the UK says must be employed have already migrated at least once and are therefore more likely to do so again if not satisfied. If the work available is not perceived to reduce inequality enough, even borders that are strong natural and artificial barriers will not stop people from choosing emigration over working in poverty where they are.

Kathryn Kopinak and Rosa Maria Soriano Miras, 2013, Types of Migration Enabled by Maquiladoras in Baja California, Mexico: The Importance of Commuting Journal of Borderlands Studies. 28 (1), 75-91.


---

**DR. KATHY KOPINAK**

I have a B.A. in History and an M.A. in Sociology from Western University and a Ph.D. in Sociology from York. I taught Sociology at King’s for thirty-seven years, during which time I won an Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations’ teaching award, was the first woman promoted to the rank of Full Professor, and became Professor Emerita in 2013. I continue research and writing transnationally, spending five months annually at the Centers for Comparative Immigration Studies and U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego. The funding for this research was provided by the University of California Institute for Mexico and the United States, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación.