Critical Multiculturalism:

Indigenous and Newcomer Relationships in the Context of the Canadian Settler State

Ashley Vols*

Abstract

This review looks at the current literature within Indigenous and newcomer relationships under the contemporary Canadian multicultural framework. The ever-increasing prevalence of Indigenous social movements and instances of cross-continental migration position the topic at the forefront of social policy since the inception of multiculturalism as a governmental policy in the 1970s. Traditional multiculturalism positions newcomer populations in support of the ongoing formation of the Canadian settler state due to factors of misinformation and hierarchized measures of a newcomer group's ability to successfully integrate. Considerable efforts are required to diminish the discursive gap between the historically oppressed social groups. The literature posits structural change within the theory of critical multiculturalism to support nuanced binationalism and increased instances of social interaction. These efforts are required to facilitate a potentially transformative relationship between each group in relation to the greater multicultural project.

Keywords: multiculturalism, settler, critical multiculturalism, reconciliation, indigenous, migration

Canada is highly regarded around the world as a multicultural and diverse nation. It is an aspirational reference point for policy-making in an increasingly globalized world. This literature review explores critical multiculturalism to understand better two elements of diversity in the Canadian settler state, Indigenous Peoples and newcomer populations. Research suggests that, despite sharing historical experiences of colonization and displacement to the benefit of colonial powers, Indigenous Peoples and newcomer populations demonstrate little intergroup contact and mutual understanding (Bauder 2011; Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker, and Garcea 2013). A lack of

communication, mutual consideration, and presence of friction diminishes the potential for a cohesive society despite multiculturalism's claim of diversity. The result is an ongoing formation of the Canadian settler state—one that privileges integration into the broader society, leaving Indigenous and newcomer perspectives to the periphery and subsequently bolstering tension between the two marginalized groups. The literature review concludes with a summary of initiatives that aim to bridge the discursive gap between Indigenous Peoples and the newcomers of Canada.

Use of Terminology

'Indigenous Peoples' are Indian, Metis, or Inuit, according to Section 35, Article 2 of the Constitution Act (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms 1982). 'Newcomer' acts as an umbrella term and refers to all new persons entering Canada based on voluntary or forced migration. 'Settler' denotes a specific context in which persons who are not Indigenous to Canada benefit from the Canadian settler state. Newcomers become settlers through their distinct relationship with the Canadian settler state and as beneficiaries of Indigenous lands.

Traditional and Critical Multiculturalism

The popular conception of Canadian multiculturalism is positive and culturally driven. It provides the framework responsible for social coexistence in a pluralistic society among diverse community members. David Macdonald (2014:67) offers a definition:

> Multiculturalism is a system of beliefs and behaviours that recognize and respect the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or society, acknowledge and value their socio-cultural differences, and encourage their continued contribution within an inclusive cultural context which empowers them all within the organization or society.

Multiculturalism is significant in the construction of a positive Canadian national imaginary (Bauder 2011; Chung 2010). A national imaginary considers the historical and contemporary material needs of human mobility and membership within the nation-state. Benedict Anderson (2006) conceptualizes the national imaginary in the context of imagined communities. He writes, "It [the national community] is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds

of each lives the image of their communion"(Anderson 2014:6). Despite the various inequalities or exploitations of a society, the national imaginary structures the state and its citizens as horizontally-oriented and as a cohesive whole (Anderson 2014). Thus, the concept ambiguously defines a state's image relative to its citizens, government, and other nations (Bauder 2014).

Herald Bauder (2011) argues that there is a mutually reinforcing relationship between the national imaginary and the traditional multicultural narrative. Multiculturalism fits neatly into the public political and cultural discourse of social organization because of its organizational behaviour. Societal heterogeneity, as opposed to homogeneity, and diversity, as opposed to unity, take precedent because multiculturalism presumes society to be a cohesive whole from which diverse actors incorporate their differences (Hartmann and Gerteis 2005). Hartman and Gerteis (2005) refer to the metaphor of musical difference wherein notes complement one another to produce a cohesive sound. However, not all combinations of notes (diversities) will act cohesively. Some forms reinforce the national imaginary, while others strain the social order. The diversity introduced into the multicultural narrative will either strengthen or weaken a nation's national imagination (Hartmann and Gerteis 2005). Hence, Canada's national imaginary involves welcoming immigrants by successfully integrating them into mainstream culture to reinforce the image of a pluralistic and open society.

It is important to note a robust debate within the public, political, and academic discourses concerning a standard definition of multiculturalism. Theoretical definitions can vary by geography, political, cultural, economic, and social affiliation, as well as temporal (Hartmann and Gerteis 2005). Pertinent to the current discussion, progressive interpretations advocate for multiculturalism based upon the "politics of equity, economic redistribution, and social restructuring"(Hartmann and Gerteis 2005:221). Critical multiculturalism calls for a recognition of political, cultural, and social differences and the subsequent structural redistribution of resources. The theory acknowledges that a marginalized community's inclusion often comes with the cost of social injustice and inequality and allows researchers in the field of Indigenous and newcomer relationships a critical foundation (Hartmann and Gerteis 2005; MacDonald 2014).

Two dichotomized conceptions of societal organization situate the multicultural narrative in a contentious state and citizen relations. Indigenous worldviews of social, economic, and political organization rely on the perpetuation and sustainability of kinship ties and political freedoms as tied to an individual's relations with the land (Taiaiake Alfred 2009). Gerald Taiaiake Alfred (2009) contrasts Indigenous perceptions against the foundations of the liberal democratic state as proponents of rights-bearing citizenship. Here, the function of the state and subsequently

the multicultural narrative is to integrate social and political diversities into systems of distant, bureaucratic, and falsely representative notions of singular patriotic identities, separated from rooted land.

The critical multicultural theory argues that the multicultural project uniquely excludes Indigenous voices in Canada's ongoing creation as a settler society. Indigenous relationships with multicultural projects are negatively affected by the state's unwillingness to acknowledge the inherent land claims of the first peoples (Lawrence 2011). Melissa Chung argues, "Such pluralism, while utopian in intent, marginalizes decolonization struggles and continues to obscure the complex ways in which people of colour have participated in projects of settlement" (2010:19). The immigration narrative defines the Canadian state wherein newcomers can participate by acquiring culturally homogenized standards of skills and attributes. In doing so, the multicultural narrative marginalizes Indigenous agency in creating the contemporary Canadian state (Bauder 2011; Hartmann and Gerteis 2005).

Settler Colonialism and institutional barriers to state participation that manifest through alienating public policies complicate Indigenous and newcomer relationships. The historical and contemporary colonial, racial, and patriarchal realities of Canadian society are yet to shift the Canadian national public policy paradigm towards one that acknowledges the ongoing marginalization of Indigenous Peoples within migration and integration services (Macdonald 2014). The incorporation of a multicultural framework that considers the distinct historical and contemporary relationships between Indigenous Peoples, settler peoples, and the Canadian state is imperative in a nation making claims to reconciliation. The United Church of Canada's formal apology in 1986, the former Prime Minister Stephen Harper's national apology on behalf of Canada in 2008, the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and the Liberal Party's acknowledgement at the federal level of the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls Report of 2019 are examples of discursive support for reconciliation through acknowledgement (Younging, Dewar and DeGagné 2009). However, a lack of tangible action to alter the structural processes that reproduce settlement within the context of colonial relations renders gestures of reconciliation and acknowledgement meaningless.

What Makes a Settler?

Critical multiculturalism situates Indigenous and newcomer relationships as a process of settler colonialism. Economic, political, refugee or family reunification migrant experiences develop in a less politically-dense discourse than settler-colonial projects (Veracini 2015). Thus, the language of migration and subsequent integration of diverse groups directs attention away from ongoing settler projects by softening the newcomer experience into defined categories. According to Lorenzo Veracini, "Migrant experiences interact and overlap, the distinction between settler and migrant 'realities' should be retained... [as multicultural] policy in colonial settler settings is crucially dedicated to *enable* settlers and *neutralize* migrants"(2015:43). The state re/defines migrants' distinct experiences through a lens of sameness, making a difficult case for the distinct presence of settler culture within various migrant identities such as refugees or economic migrants.

Indigenous attitudes on Canadian immigration policy are a significant theme from the literature on multiculturalism. In light of the ongoing multicultural project to settle Indigenous lands, Bonita Lawrence (2011:254) offers a statement:

> Aboriginal peoples are caught between a rock and a hard place: either get implicated in the anti-immigration racism of white Canadians that has always targeted native people for extinction or support the struggles of people of colour that fail to take seriously the reality of ongoing colonization.

Questions concerning what designates settler status are at the heart of Lawrence's position. Melissa Chung expands the debate by asking, "If people of colour are settlers, then are they settlers in the same way that the French and British were originally the settlers in Canada? And what does being a settler mean"(2010:21)? Sharma (2011) and Chung (2010) agree with Veracini (2015) about the danger in conflating the experiences of refugees (non-autonomous) and migrant workers (autonomous). Many newcomers come with their own distinct and complex backgrounds of colonization and marginalization. According to Phung (2011), it is irresponsible to blame refugees for settling to fulfill their basic needs for survival. Chung (2010) agrees that contemporary newcomer groups should not be labelled the same as settlers of the past. However, they must recognize and consider their capacity to participate and disrupt the ongoing formation of the settler state.

Modernity and Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism occupies and develops Indigenous lands for the cause of modernity, development, and progress. Alexander Ervin writes, "Modernity is multidimensional emerging since the sixteenth century—generated by ideologies, practices, and technologies coming out of the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, capitalism, and the emergence of the nation-state as the principal sociopolitical unit" (2014:78). Ervin (2014:81) includes

another definition of modernization from Woods (1975) and Robbins (1973):

> The process whereby an individual's patterns of behavior and culture changes from a traditional way of life oriented to the past and the present, to a more complex, technologically complicated and rapidly changing style of life oriented to the future, the antecedents of which are his increased exposure to and identification with: 1) residence and subsistence in urban areas; 2) formal education; 3) commercialization of land, labor, goods and services; 4) a widening scale of social and cultural contacts, relations, and involvements; 5) cosmopoliteness; 6) mass communication media; and 7) small and large scale innovations.

A pertinent feature of modernity is its disembedded nature from the temporal and spatial contexts of its operations. According to Ervin (2014) and Giddens (1990), a four-dimensional and intersecting set of relations serve as the basic structure of modern society. Capitalism, industrialism, a nation-state monopoly on violence, and the control of information and social supervision through surveillance contrast Indigenous People's desire for intimate and personal kinship ties (Ervin 2014; Giddens 1990). A typology of existing societies relative to Western contexts marks the point where Indigenous societal structures become oppositional to modernity. Ervin (2014) argues that first-world societies are advanced capitalistic or mixed economic systems. In contrast, fourth world societies are made of Indigenous peoples and minorities surviving in first, second, or third-world spaces (Ervin 2014). The separation of the mutually dependent relationships between first and fourth world societies neglects to acknowledge the embedded nature of settler colonialism as a driver of modernity. It stifles the ability of Indigenous Peoples to respond to and resist development projects.

Settler colonialism is a historical and contemporary regime that reproduces inequality through the organizing paradigm of race. According to Patrick Wolfe (2006), the motive for eliminating a racial group is not race itself but access to land or resources. Indigenous Peoples' inherent connection to the land as its original occupants becomes the central and foremost aspect of identity formation and the basis for contention in colonial projects. Therefore, the complex relationship between Indigenous Peoples and settler colonialism does not rely on formal state institutions or functions but the pursuit of modernity. Projects of settler colonialism perceive Indigenous Peoples as existing in opposition to modernity (Veracini 2015). The societal embodiment of modernity is thus partially contingent upon the destruction of Indigenous identity systems deemed impervious to private ownership, the rise of agriculture, capitalism, and formalized legal systems, all of which rely on land as an operative structure (Veracini 2015; Wolfe 2006). Access to land becomes increasingly important as a vector for settler-colonial values. Modernity does not have a prerequisite or point of resolution; the concept speaks to the unrelenting nature of colonial relations in Canada. Patrick Wolfe writes, "Through its ceaseless expansion, agriculture progressively eats into Indigenous territory, primitive accumulation that turns native flora and fauna into a dwindling resource and curtail the reproduction of Indigenous modes of production" (2006:395). Settler colonialism always requires more land because no single economic sector is sufficient. Individual sectors (i.e., agriculture, forestry, fossil fuels) cooperate to foster a culture that promotes a constant, unrelenting desire and necessity for expansion (Wolfe 2006).

Paradoxically, settler colonialism requires the continual expansion of immigration onto traditional lands while newcomers are often colonially displaced and landless, and share with Indigenous Peoples their dependence on the modern economy (Veracini 2015). Lorenzo Veracini (2015) draws upon metaphor to make a critical distinction between forms of colonialism and settler colonialism in viral and bacterial forms, respectively. He writes, "While both viruses and bacteria are exogenous elements that often dominate their destination locales, viruses need living cells to operate, while bacteria attach to surfaces and may or may not rely on the organisms they encounter" (Veracini 2015:15). The application to colonial and settler colonial forms of dominance follows a similar pattern of behaviour. Colonial systems of relationships require the presence and exploitation of subjugated 'others' (Veracini 2015). Colonialism and settler colonialism are not mutually exclusive and interact within and across space, and are subject to various economic, political, social, and cultural influences to construct structural dissimilarities of the race (Veracini 2015; Wolfe 2006).

The Canadian settler state regulates the relationships between Indigenous and settler peoples as the occupants of traditional lands. Multiculturalism situates settlers within a multitude of identities based upon various temporal, physical, economic, cultural, and political contexts. Without accounting for such considerations, settlers may become culturally undifferentiated (Chung 2010; Smith 2010). Lorenzo Veracini (2015) contextualizes contemporary settler identity through a discussion of its perceived interchangeability of terminology. Two dimensions of analysis create the distinction between settlers and migrants: permanency and the locality of the destination. Patrick Wolfe agrees, "settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure, not an event. In its positive aspect, elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded)

occurrence" (2009:388). Multiculturalism integrates newcomers into a settler-colonial structure as an assimilatory paradigm to benefit from the new locale (Veracini 2015). Colonial regimes reappraise the meanings of land as localized concepts of displacement while perpetuating the supposed betterment of sociopolitical life as a hegemonic undertaking (Veracini 2015). Still, the land remains a critical dimension of Indigenous-settler relations.

The Indigenous-Newcomer Paradox

There is a discursive gap between the experiences of Indigenous Peoples and newcomers' experiences in a multicultural Canada. Indigenous Peoples are treated as an ethnic minority, rather than a sovereign group with distinct and inherent agreed-upon political rights. Bauder (2011) argues that the two groups have similar colonization and settlement backgrounds but are separated within academic, political, and public discourses. Similarly, the groups suffer from marginalization in the social, political, and economic spheres of Canadian society (Bauder 2011; Chung 2010). The literature describes this paradox as a "parallax gap." Bauder (2011:517) and Chung (2010:12) define the parallax gap as:

> The representation of 'two closely linked perspectives between which no neutral common ground is possible.' When these seemingly incompatible perspectives are brought into discursive contact, common reactions range from confusion and discomfort to disapproval and taking offence.

Bohaker and Iacovetta (2009) argue that the creation of a cohesive Canadian society positions Indigenous Peoples in a distinct category alongside the newcomers. MacDonald (2014) makes a similar point, arguing that the power of Canadian society relies on the majority-minority complex, where the two groups are designated to a minority status. There is little effective intergroup communication despite their shared experiences and relative positionality to the Canadian settler state (Chung 2010). Multiculturalism represents Indigenous Peoples and newcomers as minority members and integrates them on behalf of the dominant society through the multicultural framework. Multiculturalism supports a contentious political relationship between Indigenous Peoples and the state by neglecting to acknowledge their distinct political rights and by welcoming newcomers into a contemporary manifestation of settler colonialism.

Ghorayshi (2010) conducted a study in Winnipeg's inner city to explore the intergroup relationships between the Indigenous Peoples and newcomers of the area. The results found that participants from both groups experienced isolation, miscommunication, and cultural prejudice towards one another relative to the broader society (Ghorayshi 2010). The study supports Bauder's (2011) and Chung's (2010) arguments—affirming the paradoxical relationship between Indigenous and newcomer groups. Ghorayshi (2010:93) and Chung (2010:29) note three factors that contribute to the paradoxical relationship as 'layers of separation':

1. Lack of knowledge about the 'other' group
2. Inter-group misconceptions
3. Infrequent inter-group interactions

One participant stated, "By and large, Aboriginal people do not know about newcomers...newcomers do not know about Aboriginal people and their history" (Ghorayshi 2010:94). Another wrote, "Overall Aboriginals are accepting newcomers, but they have suspicion, fear and stereotypes...there is a perception that they are coming here to benefit from what Canadian society has here" (Ghorayshi 2010:94). Lastly, "These different groups stick to their own communities. I do not see meaningful interaction between Aboriginals and newcomers" (Ghorayshi 2010:94). The degree of societal fracturing in Winnipeg is caused by the social exclusion, isolation, and segregation of Indigenous and newcomer groups by the broader society (Ghorayshi 2010).

The Ongoing Formation of the Settler State

This section will analyze two significant ways that complicit newcomer groups' creation benefit the multicultural project through the ongoing formation of the settler state. The conversation begins with an analysis of the Eurocentric multicultural discourse, demonstrating the pressure, appeal, and benefit of integration into contemporary Canadian society. The second argues that a lack of anti-racism education specific to the Canadian settler state inhibits a meaningful relationship between Indigenous Peoples and newcomers.

Kymlicka (2010) posits that the markers for successful integration into Canadian society for persons or cultural groups depend on their successful adoption of the host society's economic, political, social, and informal cues. Factors include a person's ability to integrate into the labour market, the electoral process, advantageous social networks, and access to the increasingly informal pathways to obtain critical information about culture and norms (Kymlicka 2010). He notes that the recent Canadian multicultural policy trends have heavily favoured the process of integration since the official introduction of multiculturalism as a government policy in 1971, which remains the benchmark for successful immigration into the

contemporary Canadian discourse (Kymlicka 2010). The majority host society and the newcomer populations evaluate successful immigration, leaving little room for Indigenous perspectives in the social or institutional spheres of political influence (MacDonald 2014). Chung (2010) adds that the integration process promises newcomers the option to join the ongoing colonial project. Newcomers gain the benefits of settling onto Indigenous lands by successfully integrating into the dominant Canadian society (Chung 2010).

Newcomer apathy is a learned behaviour resulting from the multicultural project as newcomers do not learn about anti-racism awareness or information about the realities of Indigenous, colonial histories upon arrival to Canada. A study by Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker, and Garcea in 2013 examined the Indigenous and newcomer programming of several intercultural organizations in the Winnipeg area. The authors discovered results similar to the 2010 study findings by Ghorayshi. One organization member wrote (Gyepi-Garbrah et al. 2013:1804):

> One thing that's very common is our new Canadians don't necessarily understand the context and history of oppression and colonialism that happened to our Aboriginal peoples and so trying to find spaces where we can explore that and create that opportunity for education is really important.

This statement reflects the larger Canadian narrative on Indigenous issues observed by Yu (2011). The majority population embodies personal and structural barriers to confronting the existing power dynamics that benefit the settler-colonial state (Yu 2011). Survival is the most critical factor of migration and pressures newcomers to integrate economically, socially, and politically. The pressure to integrate exemplifies the discrepancy between Indigenous Peoples and newcomers (Gyepi-Garbrah, Walker and Garcea 2013). The stereotypes, prejudice, and negative attitudes towards Indigenous Peoples transfer with little awareness of newcomer populations (Yu 2011).

Paths Forward

This section will collect themes from the critical literature on multiculturalism as a path forward for Indigenous and newcomer relationships. Traditional multiculturalism does not need to abandon the objective of a pluralistic society (Bauder 2011). However, it must be willing to accommodate and expand on concepts of reconciliation to promote a diversity inclusive of Indigenous perspectives (Mathur and DeGagné 2011). The shift must recognize indigeneity and redistribute power dynamics from the majority/minority

binary to a more complex and nuanced understanding (Newhouse 2004).

Firstly, multiculturalism and reconciliation have weak indicators of development. Just as political and geographical affiliation conflates the definitions of multiculturalism, the same is true for a definitive consensus on reconciliation (Hartmann and Gerteis 2005; McKone 2015). According to McKone, "The definitions of reconciliation are expansive and tend to cover many overlapping concepts, such as intergroup respect, trust, harmony, social cohesion, coexistence, justice, and peace" (2015:3). Canadians and their representative organizations typically understand concepts like reconciliation in a manner that is incomplete, partial, distorted, or with a lack of concrete analytical grounding. The loosely defined goals of reconciliation compromise the tangible and empirical effects of intercultural programming in Winnipeg due to their fluid nature and emphasis on reshaping individual identities through community engagement (McKone 2015). The study by Gyepi-Garbrah et al. (2013) recognizes the role of structural impediments to interculturalism. However, it fails to hold the implications of macro-level multicultural policy accountable in its analysis of the effectiveness of intercultural organizations in Winnipeg. Gyepi-Garbrah et al. write, "It would seem culturally advantageous for Aboriginal peoples through their community organisations to take a leadership role in building cross-cultural relations with present-day newcomers" (2013:1798-1799). And "Just as urban Aboriginal organisations have become the tools for manifesting self-determination among communities of interest in cities, it will arguably be Aboriginal and newcomer community organisations that facilitate the generation of intercultural trust through meeting and exchange" (2013:1798-1799). An interrogation of macro-level impediments at the provincial and federal levels of government is critical to strengthening the indicators of reconciliation from a structural standpoint. Change from community-level programs and top-down structural policies must honour, bolster, and trust Indigenous knowledge systems as the principal indicators of reconciliation. Community and government level accountability, coherence, and involvement would positively contribute to the study of reconciliation and intercultural relationships because it acknowledges the barriers to community participation within the current multicultural policy.

Secondly, improving the intercultural relationship between Indigenous Peoples and newcomers requires a movement away from the colonial binary (Mathur and DeGagné 2011). The current multicultural model concerning Indigenous Peoples and newcomers too frequently focuses on the sharing of food and dance as markers of reconciliation. Mathur and DeGagné (2011) argue that true multiculturalism should build authentic and respectful relationships between groups by restructuring society's

organizational dynamics. Gyepi-Garbrah et al. (2013:1801) agree:

> Interculturalism must embody engagement with the reality of persistent socioeconomic inequality that affects the material reality of many newcomers and Indigenous peoples, rather than simply become a local or senior government's opportunity to celebrate diversity as a place marker in the global economy.

Bauder (2011) argues for binationalism as a way to restructure the colonial binary. The power dynamic of contemporary multiculturalism implies that diversity exists relative to a dominant core. This relationship represents a majority-minority complex. Indigenous and newcomer populations are less likely to be relegated to victim roles when the centre shifts to accommodate two majorities (Mathur and DeGagné 2011). The majority-majority complex bolsters the political, social, and cultural bargaining power of Indigenous Peoples. However, the majority-minority and majority-majority structures encourage dichotomous conceptions of intergroup relations. Newhouse (2004) agrees that Indigenous values should be equal in importance to other value systems. He expands on the majority-majority structures of society by including an additional element of complexity. Newhouse (2004:143) writes:

> Complex understanding occurs when we begin to see a phenomenon from various perspectives and the relationships among these perspectives. Complex understanding does not seek to replace one view with another but to find a means of ensuring that all views are given consideration.

A complex understanding of multiculturalism allows ideas regarding participation, collaboration, absorption, tradition, identity, and visibility to be prominent that Bauder's binationalism does not adequately account for (Newhouse 2004).

Critical multiculturalism brings Indigenous perspectives to the centre by introducing concepts of indigeneity to newcomers. There is no significant academic or popular debate that questions whether immigration is a critical part of Canadian survival and imaginary (Bauder 2011). However, multiculturalism should seek to recognize its history, seek to educate, and alter contemporary immigration culture (Bauder 2011). The eurocentrism that has dominated cultural neutrality in Canada and the origins of the multiculturalism debate must be consciously and systematically reconceptualized (Newhouse 2004). Newhouse argues, "A modern society is defined by its post-colonial consciousness...it is a society that is starting to possess the ways and means to achieve its own [perceived] goals" (2004:141). Canada will fulfill its positive conception of multiculturalism when it achieves a post-colonial consciousness.

The critical multicultural analysis comprises the image of Canada as a multicultural reference point. The theory realizes that Canada's unwillingness to acknowledge the inherent rights of Indigenous Peoples weakens the meaningful conceptualizations of diversity. The integration of newcomers into the dominant Canadian society marginalizes efforts to decolonize across the nation. Therefore, the decolonization debate centres around questions of what being a settler means in a contemporary Canadian society. The literature establishes that it is theoretically irresponsible to conflate the settlers of the past with the present. However, newcomers' role in the ongoing formation of the settler state must be recognized to bring about change in contemporary colonial Canada. A summary of potential paths to reconciliation demonstrates the necessity of moving from a dichotomous view of majority-minority relations to one that privileges the complexity of Indigenous perspectives to create a post-colonial consciousness.

References

Alfred, Gerald Taiaiake. 2009. "Restitution is the Real Pathway to Justice for Indigenous Peoples". In Gregory Younging, Jonathan Dewar and Mike DeGagné (Eds.) *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal: Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Anderson, Benedict. 2014. "Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism." *London: Verso.* Retrieved June 10th, 2020. (https://hdl-handle-net.cyber.usask.ca/2027/heb.01609).

Bauder, Herald. 2014. "Re-Imagining the Nation-State: Lessons from the Debates of Immigration in a Settler Society and an Ethnic Nation". *Comparative Migration Studies* 2 (1): 9-27. (10.5117/CMS2014.1.BAU2).

Bauder, Herald. 2011."Closing the Immigration-Aboriginal Parallax Gap*". Geoforum* 42 (5): 517-519. Retrieved Oct. 8th, 2018. (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.03.007).

Bohaker, Heidi and Franca Iacovetta. 2009. "Making Aboriginal People 'Immigrants Too*'.* A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples in Postwar Canada, 1940s-1960s." *Canadian Historical Review* 90 (3): 427-462. Retrieved Oct. 8th, 2018. (https://doi.org/10.3138/chr.90.3.427).

Chung, Melissa May Ling. 2010. "The Relationships Between Racialized Immigrants and Indigenous Peoples in Canada: A Literature Review." *Thesis for Ryerson University*: 1-68. Retrieved Oct 8th. 2018. (https://digital.library.ryerson.ca/islandora/object/RULA:1429).

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. 1982. "Part II of the *Constitution Act: Rights of Aboriginal Peoples in Canada*." Section 35 (2). Retrieved May 29th, 2020. (https://caid.ca/ConstAct010208.pdf).

Ervin, Alexander M. 2014. *Cultural Transformations and Globalization: Theory, Development, and Social Change*. Taylor and Francis Group. Retrieved June 9th, 2020. (https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/usask/detail.action?docID=3384666.).

Ghorayshi, P. 2010. "Diversity and interculturalism: Learning from Winnipeg's inner city." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 19 (1): 89-104. Retrieved Nov. Oct. 29th, 2018. (http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/817178838?accountid=14739).

Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Gyepi-Garbrah, John, Ryan Walker and Joseph Garcea. 2013. "Indigeneity, Immigrant Newcomers and Interculturalism in Winnipeg, Canada." *Urban Studies* 51 (9): 1795-1811. Retrieved Oct 8th, 2018. (https://doi-org.cyber.usask.ca/10.1177/0042098013502826).

Hartmann, Douglas and Joseph Gerteis. 2005. "Dealing with Diversity: Mapping Multiculturalism in Sociological Terms." *Sociological Theory* 23 (2): 218– 240. Retrieved Nov. 1st, 2018. (https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2005.00251.x).

Kymlicka, Will. 2010. *The Current State of Multiculturalism in Canada and Research Themes on Canadian Multiculturalism 2008-2010.* Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Kingston, Ont./Canada: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada. Retrieved Oct. 8th, 2018. (http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2011/cic/Ci96-112-2010-eng.pdf).

Macdonald, David B. 2014. "Reforming Multiculturalism in a Bi-National Society: Aboriginal Peoples and the Search for Truth and Reconciliation in Canada." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 39 (1): 65-86. Retrieved Nov. 1st, 2018. (https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/canajsocicahican.39.1.65).

Mathur, Shawn and Mike DeGagné. 2011. *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity.* Ottawa, Canada: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

McKone, Kelly. 2015. *Reconciliation in Practice.* The United States Institute of Peace. Washington, DC: Peaceworks. Retrieved Oct 7th, 2018. (https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/PW111-Reconciliation-in-Practice.pdf).

Newhouse, David. 2004. "Indigenous Knowledge in a Multicultural World." *Native Studies Review* 15 (2): 139-154. Retrieved Nov. 29th, 2018.

(http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=http://search.ebsc
ohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=13
838076&site=ehost-live)

Phung, M. 2011. "Are People of Colour Settlers Too?" Pp.
289-298 in *Cultivating Canada: Reconciliation
Through the Lens of Cultural Diversity*. Ottawa,
Canada: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Robbins, Michael C. 1973. "Modernization an Exploratory
Behavior: An Example from Buganda" in
Psychocultural Change in Modern Buganda.
Kampala, Uganda: Makerere Institute of Social
Research.

Sharma, N. 2011. "Canadian Multiculturalism and its
Nationalisms." Pp. 85-101 in *Home and Native
Land: Unsettling Multiculturalism in Canada*.
Toronto, Canada: Between the Lines.

Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler colonialism and the Elimination of
the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4):
387-409. Retrieved Nov. 29th, 2019.
(10.1080/14623520601056240)

Woods, Clyde M. 1975. *Culture Change.* Dubuque, IA: Wm.
C. Brown Co. Publishers.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2015. *The Settler Colonial Present.*
Palgrave Macmillan.

Younging, Gregory, Jonathan Dewar and Mike DeGagné.
2009. *Response, Responsibility, and Renewal:
Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Journey.* Ottawa,
Canada: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Yu, H. 2011. "Nurturing Dialogues between First Nations,
Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities in
Vancouver." Pp. 299-308 in *Cultivating Canada:
Reconciliation Through the Lens of Cultural
Diversity.* Ottawa, Canada: Aboriginal Healing
Foundation.