1. Take the Investigating Links Quiz – how did you do? What is the pattern with all of the answers?

2. What do you know about Canada’s colonial past? What is The Commonwealth?

3. Take note of the definition and extent of colonialism.

4. Summarize the two sides of colonialism (was it good or was it bad?) in a T-chart, using the readings provided in class, the internet, or what you already know about colonialism.

5. Although there are no more colonies, what similar relationships exist today amongst countries?

6. Randomly draw for a country that was formerly a colony. Research its history during three eras: Pre-Colonial, Colonial, and Post-Colonial. Prepare a brief to show this history and to show how this country was affected both by the process of colonization and by the process of decolonization (independence). In your research, consider the following themes: government, economic development, social development, and cultural patterns.

- **United Kingdom**: Botswana, Egypt, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe

- **France**: Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Gabon, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, and Senegal

- **Portugal**: Angola and Mozambique

- **Italy**: Eritrea, Libya, and Somalia

- **Belgium**: Democratic Republic of the Congo

- **Germany**: Cameroon and Namibia
Questions

1. What is the most popular sport in India?
2. Where did the United Kingdom send many of its criminals in the 1800s?
3. Which is the city with the largest number of Portuguese-speaking people?
4. What is the most widely spoken language in the following countries? Angola, Haiti, Nigeria, Chile
5. What is the most popular sport throughout South and Central America?
6. What is the most common religion in the Congo?
7. To which country do most Algerians migrate?
8. Silver from which country financed Spanish wars in the 17th and 18th century?
9. Where did many of the towns and rivers of Ontario get their names?
10. What is the common language of some cities along the west coast of India?
11. Where does the term “Banana Republic” come from?
Colonialism Defined

Colonialism is the political theory governing colonial expansion and the maintenance of a colonial empire. It is generally associated with a belief that the mores of the colonizer are superior to those of the colonized.

The political theory of post-colonialism argues that many of the problems faced by former colonies are attributable to their colonial exploitation and devaluation. Others argue that while colonialism may be wrong, that need not imply that it has caused all economic problems of the third world. A range of former colonies – including Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, Mauritius, and Cyprus – are not poor.

Percentage of Territories Belonging to the European/US Colonial Powers (1900)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage Controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesia</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extent of Colonialism (1939)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Germany</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in Square Miles</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>212,600</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,500,100</td>
<td>42,000,000</td>
<td>8,300,000</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>67,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Colonies</td>
<td>13,100,000</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>940,000</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Colonies</td>
<td>470,000,000</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>66,000,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At one time or another, every country in North America, South America, Africa, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Oceania were colonized by Europeans, with the exceptions of Liberia, Ethiopia, Iran, Pakistan, and Thailand. Only Europe, the Soviet Union, and the Orient remained untouched by colonial hands.
### Colonialism Worksheet Questions

Region Selected: _______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Colonial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colonial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Post-Colonial

| Analysis of Nation and its Experience with Colonialism – here provide some major points of how colonialism impacted the development of the nation as well as some of the lasting effects that still exist as a result of its former status as a colony. |

I ask that each person in the group have this information copied and completed; I also ask that one person either type out, take a picture, or scan their sheet and send it to me so that I can upload each nation to the website and allow the rest of the class access to your data and information.
Scars of Colonialism

When one brings up the word ‘colonialism’, people might think of Christopher stepping foot onto the coasts of a Caribbean island or maybe the Pilgrims sitting down with Native Americans for Thanksgiving dinner, but most will fail to note the aftershock or scars of colonialism. There is not one continent that has not been touched by the hand of colonialism and imperialism and no time soon will it be forgotten. Most people will agree that colonialism wasn’t so much of a positive thing (a drastic change from public opinion a century ago), but those same people will tell you to ‘shut up’ and ‘get over it – it’s in the past’ when you rant on about its horrors. Colonialism did cause much death, slavery, and social injustices, throughout its reign but it is my opinion that the majority of its wrong doings are taking place today.

The most obvious effect of colonialism that has dragged out throughout the centuries is that on culture. From the beginning of a power’s induction to imperialism, it has progressed economically, politically, and culturally. The social and political institutions of these powers were and are all tweaked in accordance to their populations’ culture. As these powers’ colonies began to go through the decolonization process, they were programmed and built to fit the mold of their former colonizers. The highest forms of the culture of imperial powers – clothing, medicine, housing, religion, family and social institutions, and so on – all began the goal of the newly found republics. This fact is not so obvious to the naked eye, but one should ask themselves the following question to get the picture; how many former colonies have attempted to regress to their previous cultures?

Most of this was done by two institutions: the former colonial governments, wishing to assimilate their colonial subjects, and the missionaries. A. Adu Boahen, former Professor of History at the University of Ghana, described the effect of western missionaries on African colonies:

The standards of living of the converts had changed, for some were wearing European-style clothes, had gained access to modern medicine, were living in houses built in a modern style, were practicing monogamous marriage, and were feeling contemptuous of their own traditional institutions, their traditional polygamous system of marriage, and their traditional religion.[1]

These missionaries would (and sometimes still do) give education to their converts, which was often constructed from western-style curricula. This lead to a split in culture and a polarization of these colonies’ population into converts (often westernized) and nonconverts (often nonwesternized). In some areas, the vast majority of the population were converted (as seen in modern Latin America), and in others, colonial religions did not spread far (the Middle East), but in all colonies an upper-class receiving western education and a lower-class of peasants and proletarian culturally differed sharply. or hardly any of the. Such conditions offered a breeding place towards cultural clash, as seen by the North Vietnamese and the more colonially influenced culture of South. These converts would later end up supporting encroaching colonial imperialism. Such policies were carried out by the missionaries due to the fact that they did not identify themselves with local and indigenous racial ambitions and idiosyncrasies.[2] This resulted in the adoption of one culture by another; one man was attempting to walk in the shoes of another man thousands of miles away. Journalist Robert D. Kaplan recalls in his travel journal, An Empire Wilderness, a Native American friend telling him “Our inability to cope in the white man’s world may be due to our Indian culture”. [3]
The worst thing about one culture attempting to live that of another’s is the adoption of values specified for a completely different peoples. Moro Naba, an African king, told an imperial officer that “you claim that they will help me to organize my country. But I find my country good just as it is.”[4] What we see here is a difference in values; Moro Naba prefers more traditional African life styles to that of the French – a disagreement in values that has been forfeited to the latter’s by today’s African states. The imperial powers, along with the colonies’ elite and convert populations wished to civilize Africa through “introducing Christianity, education, capitalism, industrialization and the Protestant work ethic”.[5] All of these institutions required a change in cultural attitudes and values. Some of the cultural values necessary for these institutions have yet to fully assimilate (thus explaining these their failures in the region).

The commercializing of land also clashed with local cultures. The North American Indians for example could simply not understand how the earth could be privatized. For the commercialization of land to take place and to coexist with native cultures and peoples, a change in values and cultural characteristics had to take place. Even courts, which are the highest forms of institutionalized enforcers of values, were established by colonial administrations. We now see that if a colonial power did not aggressively push its cultures onto the colonized, that it forced the other colonies’ culture to reform in order to coexist with that of the imperial power.

Not only have cultures been adopted or reformed, but complete cultures have disappeared. During the protocolonial stages of Africa’s interaction with the European powers, for example, the long-distance trade that accelerated through the continent resulted in the spread of languages and cultures. This unification of commercial areas led to the conquering and replacement of various cultures by others. This can be seen in my article Globalization and Culture where I elaborate on how half of the world’s living languages are expected to disappear within the next century. In my writing I note how Arawak villages in Latin America are quickly disappearing as their youth run off to the large cities (results of colonialism) to take up jobs in the fast-paced world market (also the result of colonialism).[6] Various cultures have died during the era of colonialism, and cultures continue to die today due to the institutions constructed by that colonialism.

The former colonies have also inherited the social classes implemented by their former colonists. Someone noted to me how Latin American presidents are generally white-skinned, while the vast majority of the population that lies under them is made up of blacks, mulattos, mestizos, and Indians. This is due to the fact that the upper class that Latin America has today is the same upper class that it had during the Spanish occupation. The white-skinned rich Latin American landowners are the great great grandchildren of the white-skinned rich Latin American landowners that were sent by Spain expand the Spanish empire.

Gapping class differences can best be seen in rural Latin America, where rich landowner class and the lower peasant class lies the most polarized. In some areas, the great grandchildren of a farm’s peasants work for the great grandchildren of their ancestors’ landowner. These plantations are not a result of postcolonial Latin American capitalism gone wrong; “The traditional agrarian structures in Latin America,” states Professor Rodolfo Stavenhagen, “have evolved over a period of several hundred years. They have their roots in Spanish (and for Brazil, Portuguese) colonial policy,”[7] and some have barely changed structure after the Spanish withdrawal. Since the land still laid in the hands of the rich Spaniards after the banning of the slavery of Indians, Indians were required to render a large amount of labor in exchange for the right to cultivate a small plot of land for themselves if they wanted to eat.[8] Due to the isolation of these rural plantations, “it [is] possible to maintain a form of serfdom that was instituted by
the encomienda system and had already passed into illegality 250 years ago”.[9] Colonially-designed classes still exist, and the wide span in-between the upper and lower class creates an “absence of the possibilities of social ascension from the lower ranks”.[10]

In most of the former colonies, class did not even exist before they were invaded, purchased, colonized, or exchanged as commodities as war booty. In one form or another, ‘left behind’ class systems barely differ, or are even identical to that of the former colonizers’. These classes tend to be drawn according to race and have negatively effected the mentalities of the lower classes as seen in the following quotation:

Despite a pervasive myth of racial democracy in Belize, discrimination exists. Belize is not a harmonious, multiethnic island in a sea of violence. For example, sociologist Bruce Ergood notes that it “is not uncommon to hear a light Creole badmouth ‘blacks,’ even though both are considered Creole. This reflects a vestige of English colonial attitude summed up by the saying, ‘Best to be white, less good to be mulatto, worst to be black…”[11]

These social, economic, and cultural tensions that have survived the days of colonialism are the root causes to the vast majority, if not all, of the uprisings and social movements that are common throughout the former colonies. Colonial powers stepped in, molded mini-societies and classes in their own image, packed up their bags and left, then wipe their hands clean as the former colonized kill each other off.

Colonies were not founded so that their indigenous populations could prosper from economic development – the economies of colonies were designed so that wealth would be exported to its colonial power.[12] The economies imposed onto the colonies continued to exist far after independence and decolonization was achieved and still continue in the same matter today. Much of wealth generated by postcolonies – weather in the form of raw minerals, capital, or crops – is exported to former colonial powers.

Many of these colonies became dependent on cash crops and other goods that were bought up by their colonizers’ countries. This caused serious problems, for their dependency on goods that are so frigidly linked to the world market now leaves them at the mercy of foreign economies. Exportation is prioritized so much by the postcolonies’ economic policies that little or no capital is left for the development of the country.[13]

The final and the worst of the postcolonial trauma is that of colonially-drawn borders. Most of the borders that exist today around and in the former colonies are artificial creations totally ignoring geographical, and most importantly ethnocultural realities. Many of these political borders were drawn up on maps in the chancelleries of the colonial powers.[14] This establishment of false borders in ignorance towards the predefined boundaries of nations, clans, kingdoms, and empires, has caused serious problems for postcolonies. How can a country wish to successfully nation-build when its state is made up of a host of different ethnocultural groups and nations, each with different histories, traditions, cultures, and languages?

Border and territorial conflicts between Pakistan and India, Iraq and Kuwait, and ethnic clashes in Nigeria, Uganda, and Zaire have all been due to colonially-imposed borders. Austria-Hungary’s imperial boundaries that overlapped the preexisting nation of Serbia is the main cause for World War I. We see here that these fake boundaries often include or cram together rival groups. American colonialism, for instance, unlike European imperialism did not conquer and divide, but conquer and expel thus cramming together different Indian cultures... This too
has caused tension between various Native American groups as seen in the quarrels between the Hopi and the Navajo reservations:

The struggle between the Hopi and the Navajo appears to outsiders age old, but it began only in the late nineteenth century as a reaction to modern development and the conversion of imperial territories to states, which necessitated the drawing of artificial borders and the adjudication of land rights for the exploitation of water and minerals.[15]

Colonialism might be long gone but its scars have yet to even begin to heal. Reparations in no way have been handed over to the postcolonies for the imperial actions committed against them. In fact, these postcolonies find themselves in debt to the former colonial powers. The blame for all of these woes have been retracted from the former imperial powers thus creating a whole generation or two within the postcolonies who blame the “inefficiencies” of their countries for their horrible conditions. They are mistaken, for it is not domestic inefficiencies but colonial scars that make the Third World the way it is today.

Luis Orlando Gallardo Rivera can be reached at reddpr@hotmail.com
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Colonialism has gotten a bad name in recent decades. Anticolonialism was one of the dominant political currents of the 20th century, as dozens of European colonies in Asia and Africa became free. Today we are still living with the aftermath of colonialism. Apologists for terrorism, including Osama bin Laden, argue that terrorist acts are an understandable attempt on the part of subjugated non-Western peoples to lash out against their longtime Western oppressors. Activists at last year’s World Conference on Racism, including the Rev. Jesse Jackson, have called on the West to pay reparations for slavery and colonialism to minorities and natives of the third world.

These justifications of violence, and calls for monetary compensation, rely on a large body of scholarship that has been produced in the Western academy. That scholarship, which goes by the name of anticolonial studies, postcolonial studies, or subaltern studies, is now an intellectual school in itself, and it exercises a powerful influence on the humanities and social sciences. Its leading Western scholars include Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, Walter Rodney, and Samir Amin. Their arguments are supported by the ideas of third-world intellectuals like Wole Soyinka, Chinweizu, Ashis Nandy, and, perhaps most influential of all, Frantz Fanon.

The assault against colonialism and its legacy has many dimensions, but at its core it is a theory of oppression that relies on three premises: First, colonialism and imperialism are distinctively Western evils that were inflicted on the non-Western world. Second, as a consequence of colonialism, the West became rich and the colonies became impoverished; in short, the West succeeded at the expense of the colonies. Third, the descendants of colonialism are worse off than they would be had colonialism never occurred.

In a widely used text, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, the Marxist scholar Walter Rodney accuses European colonialism of "draining African wealth and making it impossible to develop more rapidly the resources of the continent." The African writer Chinweizu strikes a similar note in his influential book The West and the Rest of Us. He offers the following explanation for African poverty: "White hordes have sallied forth from their Western homelands to assault, loot, occupy, rule, and exploit the world. Even now the fury of their expansionist assault on the rest of us has not abated." In his classic work The Wretched of the Earth, Fanon writes, "European opulence has been founded on slavery. The well-being and progress of Europe have been built up with the sweat and the dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians, and the yellow races."

Those notions are pervasive and emotionally appealing. By suggesting that the West became dominant because it is oppressive, they provide an explanation for Western global dominance without encouraging white racial arrogance. They relieve the third world of blame for its wretchedness. Moreover, they imply politically egalitarian policy solutions: The West is in possession of the "stolen goods" of other cultures, and it has a moral and legal obligation to make some form of repayment. I was raised to believe in such things, and among most third-world intellectuals they are articles of faith. The only problem is that they are not true.

There is nothing uniquely Western about colonialism. My native country of India, for example, was ruled by the British for more than two centuries, and many of my fellow Indians are still smarting about that. What they often forget, however, is that before the British came, the Indians had been invaded and conquered by the Persians, the Afghans, Alexander the Great, the Mongols, the Arabs, and the Turks. Depending on how you count, the British were preceded by
at least six colonial powers that invaded and occupied India since ancient times. Indeed, ancient India was itself settled by the Aryan people, who came from the north and subjugated the dark-skinned indigenous people.

Those who identify colonialism and empire only with the West either have no sense of history or have forgotten about the Egyptian empire, the Persian empire, the Macedonian empire, the Islamic empire, the Mongol empire, the Chinese empire, and the Aztec and Inca empires in the Americas. Shouldn't the Arabs be paying reparations for their destruction of the Byzantine and Persian empires? Come to think of it, shouldn't the Byzantine and Persian people be paying reparations to the descendants of the people they subjugated? And while we're at it, shouldn't the Muslims reimburse the Spaniards for their 700-year rule?

As the example of Islamic Spain suggests, the people of the West have participated in the game of conquest not only as the perpetrators, but also as the victims. Ancient Greece, for example, was conquered by Rome, and the Roman Empire itself was destroyed by invasions of Huns, Vandals, Lombards, and Visigoths from northern Europe. America, as we all know, was itself a colony of England before its war of independence; England, before that, had been subdued and ruled by Normans from France. Those of us living today are taking on a large project if we are going to settle on a rule of social justice based on figuring out whose ancestors did what to whom.

The West did not become rich and powerful through colonial oppression. It makes no sense to claim that the West grew rich and strong by conquering other countries and taking their stuff. How did the West manage to do that? In the late Middle Ages, say 1500, the West was by no means the world's most affluent or most powerful civilization. Indeed, those of China and of the Arab-Islamic world exceeded the West in wealth, in knowledge, in exploration, in learning, and in military power. So how did the West gain so rapidly in economic, political, and military power that, by the 19th century, it was able to conquer virtually all of the other civilizations? That question demands to be answered, and the oppression theorists have never provided an adequate explanation.

Moreover, the West could not have reached its current stage of wealth and influence by stealing from other cultures, for the simple reason that there wasn't very much to take. "Oh yes there was," the retort often comes. "The Europeans stole the raw material to build their civilization. They took rubber from Malaya, cocoa from West Africa, and tea from India." But as the economic historian P.T. Bauer points out, before British rule, there were no rubber trees in Malaya, no cocoa trees in West Africa, no tea in India. The British brought the rubber tree to Malaya from South America. They brought tea to India from China. And they taught the Africans to grow cocoa, a crop the native people had never heard of. None of this is to deny that when the colonialists could exploit native resources, they did. But that larceny cannot possibly account for the enormous gap in economic, political, and military power that opened up between the West and the rest of the world.

What, then, is the source of that power? The reason the West became so affluent and dominant in the modern era is that it invented three institutions: science, democracy, and capitalism. All those institutions are based on universal impulses and aspirations, but those aspirations were given a unique expression in Western civilization.

Consider science. It is based on a shared human trait: the desire to know. People in every culture have tried to learn about the world. Thus the Chinese recorded the eclipses, the Mayans developed a calendar, the Hindus discovered the number zero, and so on. But science -- which requires experiments, laboratories, induction, verification, and what one scholar has called "the
invention of invention," the scientific method -- that is a Western institution. Similarly, tribal participation is universal, but democracy -- which involves free elections, peaceful transitions of power, and separation of powers -- is a Western idea. Finally, the impulse to trade is universal, and there is nothing Western about the use of money, but capitalism -- which requires property rights, contracts, courts to enforce them, limited-liability corporations, stock exchanges, patents, insurance, double-entry bookkeeping -- this ensemble of practices was developed in the West.

It is the dynamic interaction among these three Western institutions -- science, democracy, and capitalism -- that has produced the great wealth, strength, and success of Western civilization. An example of this interaction is technology, which arises out of the marriage between science and capitalism. Science provides the knowledge that leads to invention, and capitalism supplies the mechanism by which the invention is transmitted to the larger society, as well as the economic incentive for inventors to continue to make new things.

Now we can understand better why the West was able, between the 16th and 19th centuries, to subdue the rest of the world and bend it to its will. Indian elephants and Zulu spears were no match for British rifles and cannonballs. Colonialism and imperialism are not the cause of the West's success; they are the result of that success. The wealth and power of European nations made them arrogant and stimulated their appetite for global conquest. Colonial possessions added to the prestige, and to a much lesser degree the wealth, of Europe. But the primary cause of Western affluence and power is internal -- the institutions of science, democracy, and capitalism acting together. Consequently, it is simply wrong to maintain that the rest of the world is poor because the West is rich, or that the West grew rich off stolen goods from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The West created its own wealth, and still does.

The descendants of colonialism are better off than they would be if colonialism had never happened. I would like to illustrate this point through a personal example. While I was a young boy, growing up in India, I noticed that my grandfather, who had lived under British colonialism, was instinctively and habitually antiwhite. He wasn't just against the English; he was generally against white people. I realized that I did not share his antiwhite animus. That puzzled me: Why did he and I feel so differently?

Only years later, after a great deal of reflection and a fair amount of study, did the answer finally hit me. The reason for our difference of perception was that colonialism had been pretty bad for him, but pretty good for me. Another way to put it was that colonialism had injured those who lived under it, but paradoxically it proved beneficial to their descendants. Much as it chagrins me to admit it -- and much as it will outrage many third-world intellectuals for me to say it -- my life would have been much worse had the British never ruled India.

How is that possible? Virtually everything that I am, what I do, and my deepest beliefs, all are the product of a worldview that was brought to India by colonialism. I am a writer, and I write in English. My ability to do this, and to reach a broad market, is entirely thanks to the British. My understanding of technology, which allows me, like so many Indians, to function successfully in the modern world, was largely the product of a Western education that came to India as a result of the British. So also my beliefs in freedom of expression, in self-government, in equality of rights under the law, and in the universal principle of human dignity -- they are all the products of Western civilization.

I am not suggesting that it was the intention of the colonialists to give all those wonderful gifts to the Indians. Colonialism was not based on philanthropy; it was a form of conquest and rule. The British came to India to govern, and they were not primarily interested in the development of the natives, whom they viewed as picturesque savages. It is impossible to
measure, or overlook, the pain and humiliation that the British inflicted during their long period of occupation. Understandably, the Indians chafed under that yoke. Toward the end of the British reign in India, Mahatma Gandhi was asked, "What do you think of Western civilization?" He replied, "I think it would be a good idea."

Despite their suspect motives and bad behavior, however, the British needed a certain amount of infrastructure to effectively govern India. So they built roads, shipping docks, railway tracks, irrigation systems, and government buildings. Then they realized that they needed courts of law to adjudicate disputes that went beyond local systems of dispensing justice. And so the British legal system was introduced, with all its procedural novelties, like "innocent until proven guilty." The British also had to educate the Indians, in order to communicate with them and to train them to be civil servants in the empire. Thus Indian children were exposed to Shakespeare, Dickens, Hobbes, and Locke. In that way the Indians began to encounter words and ideas that were unmentioned in their ancestral culture: "liberty," "sovereignty," "rights," and so on.

That brings me to the greatest benefit that the British provided to the Indians: They taught them the language of freedom. Once again, it was not the objective of the colonial rulers to encourage rebellion. But by exposing Indians to the ideas of the West, they did. The Indian leaders were the product of Western civilization. Gandhi studied in England and South Africa; Nehru was a product of Harrow and Cambridge. That exposure was not entirely to the good; Nehru, for example, who became India's first prime minister after independence, was highly influenced by Fabian socialism through the teachings of Harold Laski. The result was that India had a mismanaged socialist economy for a generation. But my broader point is that the champions of Indian independence acquired the principles, the language, and even the strategies of liberation from the civilization of their oppressors. This was true not just of India but also of other Asian and African countries that broke free of the European yoke.

My conclusion is that against their intentions, the colonialists brought things to India that have immeasurably enriched the lives of the descendants of colonialism. It is doubtful that non-Western countries would have acquired those good things by themselves. It was the British who, applying a universal notion of human rights, in the early 19th century abolished the ancient Indian institution of suttee -- the custom of tossing widows on their husbands' funeral pyres. There is no reason to believe that the Indians, who had practiced suttee for centuries, would have reached such a conclusion on their own. Imagine an African or Indian king encountering the works of Locke or Madison and saying, "You know, I think those fellows have a good point. I should relinquish my power and let my people decide whether they want me or someone else to rule." Somehow, I don't see that as likely.

Colonialism was the transmission belt that brought to Asia, Africa, and South America the blessings of Western civilization. Many of those cultures continue to have serious problems of tyranny, tribal and religious conflict, poverty, and underdevelopment, but that is not due to an excess of Western influence; rather, it is due to the fact that those countries are insufficiently Westernized. Sub-Saharan Africa, which is probably in the worst position, has been described by U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan as "a cocktail of disasters." That is not because colonialism in Africa lasted so long, but because it lasted a mere half-century. It was too short a time to permit Western institutions to take firm root. Consequently, after their independence, most African nations have retreated into a kind of tribal barbarism that can be remedied only with more Western influence, not less. Africa needs more Western capital, more technology, more rule of law, and more individual freedom.
The academy needs to shed its irrational prejudice against colonialism. By providing a more balanced perspective, scholars can help to show the foolishness of policies like reparations as well as justifications of terrorism that are based on anticolonial myths. None of this is to say that colonialism by itself was a good thing, only that bad institutions sometimes produce good results. Colonialism, I freely acknowledge, was a harsh regime for those who lived under it. My grandfather would have a hard time giving even one cheer for colonialism. As for me, I cannot manage three, but I am quite willing to grant two. So here they are: two cheers for colonialism! Maybe you will now see why I am not going to be sending an invoice for reparations to Tony Blair.

_Dinesh D'Souza is a fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University and the author, most recently, of What's So Great About America?, published by Regnery._
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What is Nationalism?

- Canada and Quebec
- Indonesia and East Timor
- Turkey, Iraq, and Iran and Kurdistan
- Russia and Chechnya
- Spain and Basque
- United Kingdom and Northern Ireland
- Israel and Palestine

In all of these fractured national geographies, neo-national identities are in the midst of political contest with their predecessors. Each predecessor views the new or new-old claimant as a threat to its own integrity, or even to its continued existence as a state.

Neo-nationalism has come to mean violence, whereas it should mean mutual recognition and new opportunity. “Velvet divorces”, as between Slovakia and the Czech Republic, or successful new federal solutions are rare.

Other notable locations with neo-nationalist movements include Scotland, Japan, Denmark, Poland, and Yugoslavia, although the United Nations estimates that only 25 of its 191 members are free from secessionist disputes.
Border Terminology

**Physical borders** are actual walls, gates, or other tangible barriers dividing political divisions. On the other hand, **theoretical borders** are those that exist on paper alone and often just follow lines of latitude or longitude and are not marked on the ground.

A similar concept is real v. perceived borders. **Real borders** are those that do exist - whether physical or theoretical. **Perceived borders** are those which one or more people feel exist but are not actually there. The latter may affect people just as a real border would but nonetheless are not there.

The next type of borders have had significant affect in Canada. **Temporal borders** refers to the timing of the creation of the border. **Antecedent borders** are those placed down where no development has previously occurred. **Superimposed borders** are those placed down irrespective of any existing settlement.

The last set of terms when referring to borders are lines and regions. **Border lines** are those of small, finite widths that are knowingly crossed. **Border regions** are areas of indefinite width surrounding a border line. The width may vary significantly depending on many variables including population, geography, and political stability.

**Political exclaves** are small areas of land belonging to one jurisdiction yet completely surrounded by another.
Political Exclaves

SOUTH AFRICA

VATICAN CITY, SAN MARINO in ITALY
KASHMIR between INDIA, PAKISTAN, and CHINA

GREECE and TURKEY in CYPRUS
Introduction
Canada and the United States share the longest undefended border in the world. This is a fascinating issue in both interest level and importance in this post-September 11 society. In researching the topic, dozens of stories of the superimposition of the border have been uncovered and many problems that thousands of people have to deal with living near and/or crossing the border every day. Even before the security concerns raised by the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, a North American Perimetre had been proposed to secure both Canada and the United States from foreign intruders while simultaneously permitting freer movement of people and goods between the two countries. A North American Perimetre, opposed to the current national boundaries, would be mutually beneficial to Canada and the United States.

Problems with the Superimposition of the Canada-U.S. Border

The majority of communities affected by the superimposition of the Canada-U.S. border are those between Quebec and Vermont, close to the 45th parallel which makes up the border between Cornwall, Ontario and the mountains of New Hampshire.

The villages of Beebe Plain, Sutton - Richford, and Morse’s Line all have portions of their community in both Quebec and Vermont. From some of those communities rises the following stories:

- The Nelson Company Store is divided by the Canada-U.S. border. On the inside, the shelves are divided as well. Import laws require that Canadian goods are stacked and sold only within the Canadian portion of the store and American goods are stacked and sold only within the American portion of the store. At the checkout (right on the line), the cashier runs the items through separately (different sales taxes) and has a telephone on each side of the counter to avoid long distance charges to the store’s neighbours.

- A family farm whose vegetable garden lies in the United States, their kitchen in Canada. While surely customs officers are not lurking in the shadows of their back porch, it is technically illegal for this family to bring the vegetables from their garden into their house.

- A local pool hall has a line painted down the floor to ensure that people do not illegally take the American beer is not taken to the pool tables, which are across the border in Canada.
• A farmers’ cattle wanders across the line - the tails of the American cattle painted with phenolphthalein which turns bright red when washed with “washing soda” to determine which side of the line they should be on.

• Rock Island, Quebec and Derby Line, Vermont have the somewhat infamous “Canusa Street” on which the yellow painted lines down the centre of the street not only serve to keep cars on the right side of the road but also double as an international boundary. I have had the strange experience of driving down this street. When I made a right hand turn at an intersection, I “remained” in Canada by heading north, passing a Canadian customs office on the corner. If I were to turn left at this intersection, I would have to stop and check in the U.S. customs office on the opposite corner.

• The joint communities of Stanhope, Quebec and Norton, Vermont share the Haskell Library and Opera House, which appeared in a series of Red Rose Tea commercials a few years ago. Another building with a painted line down the centre of the room, making an otherwise inconspicuous local theatre a famous landmark.

While infinitely amusing, these stories are numerous and create some of the most ridiculous inconveniences for those around them.

Political Exclaves

Another type of problem created by the laying down of the Canada - U.S. border is that of political exclaves. American territory accessible only via Canada include the communities of Point Roberts, Washington, the Northwest Angle, Minnesota, the St. Regis Indian Reservation, New York, the island in the middle of Lake Memphremagog, near Beebe Plain, Vermont, and Clayton Lake, Maine. Canadian territory only accessible via the United States include the village of Estcourt and the Akwesasne Indian Reserve, both belonging to Quebec.

Border Costs

The governments of Canada, the United States, the 13 states, 7 provinces, 1 territory, and hundreds of municipalities spend millions of dollars each year on border patrol, customs agents, maintaining the physical border, and funding many organizations (IBC, IJC, RCMP, USBS, CBS, NPS, PCH, others).
The most frustrating aspect of governments along the line is the incredible duplication of services where a small community would have to maintain two separate fire departments, just to name one example, as the manner of house insurance plans require that the no one other than the proper local municipality must respond to emergencies within its service area. Other agencies would have to deal with conflicting planning, environmental, and other differing governmental policies.

**Border Logistics**

On the personal level, regular citizens have to deal with the hassles of crossing borders to get to work, checking in with customs officers to visit next door neighbours, sorting out differing laws in different jurisdictions, and doubling administrative work with split ownerships of buildings and properties. On this last issue, the International Boundary Commission maintains floor plans of thousands of buildings which sit on the line so that they may provide advice as to the country of any incident or request that may arise. Tourists camping in remote locations might unknowingly cross international borders, tripping laser censors at unmanned crossings and sending border patrols scrambling to ensure that each country’s respective sovereignty is assured.

**A History of Marking the Border**

Officials from both countries began trying to stake the boundary as far back as 1783. The original description led through the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes and was then clarified in 1842.

- As part of the 45th parallel boundary between Quebec and New York, the Americans wanted an old War of 1812 facility, Fort Montgomery, New York to remain part of the United States. The officials bent the boundary north of the 45th to include the fort. To compensate for the “cheated” territory into Canada, the boundary was then bent an equal distance south nearby.

- The Treaty of Oregon was signed in 1849 which extended the 49th parallel as the Canada - U.S. border to the Pacific Ocean. The border was marked on the ground westward to the Red River Settlement in 1872 and then to the mountains in 1874.
• The Alaska panhandle boundary was established by a panel of 3 Americans, 2 Canadians, and 1 Brit in 1903.

• A permanent International Boundary Commission established in 1925 to clear the border, maintain the monuments, and provide information about any exact location in question. Even so, Canada and the United States still dispute the location of the Canada-U.S. boundary off the south coast of Alaska and the boundary off the coast of Nova Scotia and Maine. In the summer of 2005, Canada reignited a boundary dispute between itself and Denmark over Hans Island, which lies between Ellesmere Island and Greenland. The United States is also questioning Canadian sovereignty in six other areas of the Arctic.

Opportunities of a North American Perimetre

Not only would a North American Perimetre ease or eliminate the problems that have just been discussed, it would also create opportunities that would easily be capitalized upon.

Security
During the winter of 2002, United States Military has established a “North American Command”. While the details of this reorganization are still to be sorted out, it is a move that essentially expands the existing North American Air Defence organization (NORAD). Canada responded by creating our own “Canada Command” in 2005.

Obviously, North America is subject to physical attacks. A common, secure perimetre would greatly increase the security for both countries from external threats.

Ease of Movement
Excellent political relations and free trade agreements already cover tremendous movement of people and goods but they must cross borders. Once in either country, a North American Perimetre would allow completely free movement of people and goods across international lines, without hassles.

Cooperation
Canada and the United States are each others’ biggest trading partners; we also share intelligence for security, technology, and other information types already. The symbolic cooperation of a common perimetre, not requiring physical borders between us, would speak volumes of the reality of our situation already. Among other issues, environmental concerns know no boundaries.... while complex international treaties are in place to deal with such issues, further cooperation on these matters without hindrances of jurisdictional matters regarding the border would be mutually beneficial.
Take a look at the European Union. No member has relinquished sovereignty of any kind yet the ease of movement and cooperation taking place in Europe today is magnificent. This type of arrangement, while it need not be copied directly, is an excellent example of the kinds of arrangements that could and should be made here in North America.

**Sovereignty**

Many Canadians are reluctant to support any perceived “Americanization” of Canada. It should be known that economic union options, while entirely unrelated to border issues that are being discussed here, would not be aided or hindered by creating a joint North American Perimetre and eliminating physical national boundaries.

Political union has always been an option for Canada - and remains one - which Canada can take advantage of whenever it wishes.... Article XI of the United States’ Articles of Confederation:

“Canada acceding to this confederation, and adjoining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of this Union; but no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States.”

By solidifying border issues and allowing free movement of people and goods across national lines would not make us any closer to becoming part of the United States than we are already able to be if we wish to.... Eliminating the Canada - U.S. border in favour of a joint North American Perimetre would not affect either country’s sovereignty status in regards to economic or political unions.

**Conclusion**

There are many Canadians whom are more than skeptical about letting go control of the Canada - U.S. border for symbolic reasons alone. As outlined today, the problems of such a unnecessary barrier between countries that are so alike in so many ways, a North American Perimetre, would be mutually beneficial to the people and governments of both Canada and the United States.
Western Alienation

A Century of Western Discontent

Sir John A. Macdonald’s National Policy had a three-fold agenda: to complete a transcontinental railway, to settle the prairies, and to create a manufacturing base in Eastern Canada. This policy was Macdonald’s solution to the problem of uniting Canada geographically and economically. Once this was achieved, it was thought, political unity would follow.

However, the National Policy became the source of considerable Western discontent. To Western Canada, the legacy left by the policy consisted of discriminatory freight rates and a resource-based economy that was subject to the boom and bust cycles of the manufacturing and financial sectors of Central Canada.

The last half of the 20th century has seen great change and growth in Western Canada, particularly in Alberta and British Columbia. The 1947 discovery of oil in Leduc, Alberta, transformed that province’s economy, but also led to increasing conflict with Ottawa. During the 1970s, Alberta Premier Peter Lougheed fought for his province’s right to use the proceeds from its oil resources to fund economic diversity, whereas Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau’s National Energy Policy, implemented in 1980, intended to use Alberta’s oil to subsidize gas prices throughout the nation.

Some observers point to parallels between the “Western alienation” of the 1970s and the rise of the Parti Québécois and threat of separation from Canada during the same decade. But a fundamental difference was that while Quebec was trying to “get out,” the West was trying to “get in.” The Prairie premiers played a significant role in the constitutional talks of the 1970s and 1980s. The entrenchment of equalization payments to reduce regional economic disparities, as well as a clearer definition of provincial ownership of resources and the extension of provincial taxation powers, were all significant points in the Constitution Act of 1982 and a result of the Western agenda. And finally, although the amending formula that requires the agreement of seven of 10 provinces with at least 50 per cent of the population continues to haunt the constitutional talks to this day, it has alleviated the Western concern about an Ontario or Quebec veto.

Continuing Conflict

During the summer and fall of 1997, British Columbia made news headlines over its natural resources. First, the actions of Premier Glen Clark during the British Columbia-U.S. “salmon war” brought the unresolved issue of the Pacific Salmon Treaty to a head. This treaty, signed in 1985 with the United States, expired in 1992 and has not been renewed. But British Columbia claims the treaty was ineffective and subject to misinterpretation that consequently allowed the U.S. fishers to overfish. In an attempt to focus federal attention on this issue, B.C. fishers held a U.S. ferry hostage in the harbour of Prince Rupert for three days. Clark’s strong stand on the
issue is similar to that of former federal Fisheries minister Brian Tobin over the issue of Spanish overfishing off the east coast of Canada in 1995. But whereas Tobin had been acting on behalf of the federal government, Clark was protesting Ottawa’s inability to protect B.C. interests against the United States.

But it was Senator Pat Carney, who, by suggesting that British Columbia might consider using the threat of separation during further constitutional talks, demonstrated Western alienation once again. Her comments made the national news, and polls immediately were struck to see what the rest of British Columbians thought about separatism.

British Columbia is Canada’s third-largest and fastest-growing province. The impact of the Pacific Rim on its economy shows no signs of diminishing. But it has been a long wait for Canada’s westernmost province. When Central Canada was experiencing an economic boom during the late 1980s, B.C. was still trying to find its way out of the 1981-82 economic downturn.

**Where to Now?**

Salmon are more symbolic than significant to B.C.’s economy, unlike Alberta oil during the 1970s. Yet, the B.C. salmon industry has greater monetary value to Canada than all of our trade with Cuba. And many Canadians feel the Canadian government did not adequately oppose the United States’ attempts to inhibit Canadian-Cuban trade. With an economy still dependent primarily on resources—forestry being its number-one industry—British Columbia is seeking to take more control over its own regional interests and away from Ottawa. And since B.C. contributes more in taxes than it receives in transfer payments, the provincial government feels it is in a position to make political demands of the federal government for those tax dollars.

The unity question that Sir John A. Macdonald thought he had solved with his National Policy still is a sore point in the federation of Canada. For many Westerners, the fact that a western-based protest party—the Reform Party—was once the Official Opposition gives them hope that their interests will finally be heard in the House of Commons. But, as far as the Constitution of this country is concerned, it may still be a long time before true political unity is achieved.
Canadian Unity: The Calgary Initiative

1. To write the final draft of the Calgary Declaration, the premiers dismissed their advisors and civil servants from the meeting and wrote it themselves. Why do you think they did this? Discuss the difficulties of finding consensus among 11 people. What do you think is the best way to reach consensus in a group setting?

2. Rewrite the seven principles of the Calgary Declaration in your own words. Share them with a partner. Discuss whether or not you find this helpful.

3. There are a number of websites that have been set up to distribute information about Canadian unity. Examine one of these and evaluate its effectiveness in explaining the current political issues:

4. Read the Calgary Declaration and complete the following tasks:
   a. Read the introduction and make a list of the key words and phrases that, in your opinion, communicate the essential message of the declaration.
   b. Now examine the section “Framework for Discussion on Canadian Unity.”
      i. Summarize each principle of the framework in point form. What do you notice as you do this exercise?
      ii. The framework’s principles relate either to the nature of Canada’s federation and/or to the nature of its citizenry. Beside your summary of each principle, put an “F” for federation or a “C” for citizenship.
      iii. In your own words, compose brief descriptions of what individual rights and collective rights you think Canadians currently enjoy. Then, beside each of the seven principles outlined in the “Framework” section of this document, write down individual or collective. What conclusions can you make?
      iv. Share your findings with at least two other groups and then discuss as a class which right should take precedence in a society: the individual or the collective. Be prepared to explain your reasoning.
   c. Finally, examine the section “Guidelines for the Process of Public Consultation.” Explain in your own words the overall intent of this section. Suggest reasons why each point was included in the Guidelines.

5. The public consultation process was a large part of the Calgary Declaration. Here is one of the questionnaires that was distributed to citizens to gauge their reactions. Answer the questions for yourself!
   a. Overall do you support the framework?
   b. What are the elements in the framework that you particularly like?
   c. Are there any elements in the framework that concern you? Why?
   d. Are there any other elements that you feel should be addressed?
   e. Do you think the interests of Ontarians are reflected in this framework?
   f. An important consideration in thinking about our future as a country is what it means to each of us to be a Canadian. What does it mean to you to be Canadian?

6. Read the “Western Alienation” article and identify what you feel are the significant issues in the theme of western alienation and how they relate to the Calgary Declaration. How are these issues similar to or different from concerns that have been expressed by sovereignists in Quebec?
“The Canadian Constitution can no longer be amended by the federal government alone. So we need the participation of the provinces, and they know it.” With this statement, made 10 days before the premiers’ meeting in Calgary, Alberta, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien gave his endorsement to the premiers’ discussion on Canadian unity. And so, nine of Canada’s premiers (Quebec’s Lucien Bouchard declined to attend) and its two territorial leaders engaged in 10 hours of debate September 14-15, 1997. What they ended up with was a short, precise document outlining a new framework for unity and a process for attaining public support and approval for this document.

Prior to the debate, the leaders were divided essentially into two differing opinion groups. For example, the Atlantic premiers and Saskatchewan’s Roy Romanow wanted to show Quebec that the rest of Canada was prepared to engage in constitutional change. British Columbia’s Glen Clark, Alberta’s Ralph Klein, and Ontario’s Mike Harris did not want to go beyond deciding how the consultation process would work. However, the first group pushed for a specific proposal, and it was this group that won. After agreement was reached, each promised to take it to their electorate for approval.

Initial reaction to the Calgary Declaration appeared to be positive, and Chrétien’s own advisers admitted to the media that the provinces would have a better chance of succeeding in finding unity agreement than would any initiative coming from Ottawa. However, some critics have argued that the entire process was nothing more than a public relations initiative. Whether or not the Declaration is approved by the Canadian people, it will have no legal bearing on constitutional amendments. And although it appeared to have resolved the concerns of the Western provinces and those of the federal Leader of the Opposition, Preston Manning—in terms of the “distinct society” clause that brought down the previous accords—Quebec Premier Lucien Bouchard scoffed at the efforts of the leaders.

The process for approving this Declaration was different once again from the Meech Lake and Charlottetown accords. The 1987 Meech Lake needed ratification by each provincial legislature, and failed when the Newfoundland and Manitoba legislatures did not achieve ratification before the three-year deadline was up. The 1992 Charlottetown accord was put to the people of Canada in separate referendum votes held in Quebec and the rest of Canada in 1995. That accord failed when the results were a resounding “no.”

Each of the leaders appeared to have his own agenda. Some observers say that New Brunswick’s Frank McKenna—who recently retired from politics—and Saskatchewan’s Roy Romanow were followed by ghosts of previous constitutional talks. Both played important roles in previous talks, McKenna during Meech Lake and Romanow during the original repatriation of the Constitution in 1981. B.C.’s Glen Clark had to face an electorate that voted down the Charlottetown accord with a 68 per cent “no” vote.

Whatever the outcome of this latest round of constitutional talks, it is becoming more and more apparent that the debate of the last 10 years has evolved into much more than bringing Quebec back as an active member of the Canadian constitutional family. Indeed, the very framework for Canada’s federalism is now under scrutiny, and with the diversity of viewpoints from each of the players, it remains to be seen if another constitutional ghost will haunt the Canadian political scene.
The Calgary Declaration

Nine premiers and two territorial leaders have unanimously agreed on a framework for open and grassroots public consultations with Canadians on strengthening the Canadian federation.

Premiers and territorial leaders considered both the subject matter and the process of public consultation on national unity. The attached framework of subjects for consultation is not intended to be exhaustive. Each province and territory will determine the scope of consultation and the most appropriate mechanisms.

Premiers and territorial leaders also reached an agreement on guidelines and on a time framework. All premiers and leaders undertook to initiate consultations this fall. They will report progress prior to their January Team Canada trade mission.

Premiers and territorial leaders also reiterated that the federation also needs practical non-constitutional approaches to reform, strengthen, and improve its effectiveness. In August, premiers and territorial leaders released a statement on Social Policy Renewal that sets out approaches to work co-operatively with the federal government in the areas of health care and social programs. Today, premiers, territorial leaders and the Prime Minister agreed to meet this fall to discuss social policy renewal and to work co-operatively in the areas of health care and youth unemployment.

Premiers and territorial leaders remain committed to meeting with Aboriginal leaders to follow up on the recent Annual Premiers’ Conference held in St. Andrews. This meeting has been tentatively scheduled for Winnipeg, Manitoba, on November 18, 1997.

Framework for Discussion on Canadian Unity

1. All Canadians are equal and have equal rights protected by law.

2. All provinces, while diverse in their characteristics, have equality of status.

3. Canada is graced by a diversity, tolerance, compassion, and an equality of opportunity that is without rival in the world.

4. Canada’s gift of diversity includes Aboriginal peoples and cultures, the vitality of the English and French languages, and a multicultural citizenry drawn from all parts of the world.

5. In Canada’s federal system, where respect for diversity and equality underlies unity, the unique character of Quebec society, including its French-speaking majority, its culture, and its tradition of civil law, is fundamental to the well-being of Canada. Consequently, the legislature and Government of Quebec have a role to protect and develop the unique character of Quebec society within Canada.
6. If any future constitutional amendment confers powers on one province, these powers must be available to all provinces.

7. Canada is a federal system where federal, provincial, and territorial governments work in partnership while respecting each other’s jurisdictions. Canadians want their governments to work co-operatively and with flexibility to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the federation. Canadians want their governments to work together particularly in the delivery of their social programs. Provinces and territories renew their commitment to work in partnership with the Government of Canada to best serve the needs of Canadians.

Guidelines for the Process of Public Consultation

1. It will be open to general citizenry.

2. Efforts should be made to find creative ways for engaging Canadians in each provincial consultation process.

3. Governments should act as a catalyst for the process of consultation.

4. It is acknowledged that provinces and territories may wish to have processes of consultation in stages but the advantage of a co-ordinated time frame is recognized.

5. Each province and territory is free to decide on the range or scope of consultation as well as the most appropriate mechanism for consultation.
Sovereignty Issues in Quebec

Quebec Sovereignty According to Canadian Constitutional Law

Canadian constitutional law does not explicitly allow for the possibility that a province might secede. Yet some people claim that sovereignty can be attained via constitutional amendment and the subsequent consent to such an amendment by the Canadian provinces (seven out of ten or perhaps all of them) as well as the federal government. In the event of a vote in favour of sovereignty, some would still insist that the Canadian constitution is binding, even if this constitutional order was implemented against the democratic will of the Quebec people. They claim that Quebec's political sovereignty is illegal, that it cannot be declared unilaterally and that, should Quebec unilaterally declare independence, its territorial integrity would not necessarily be preserved.

What can be said in response to these arguments? One could indeed use the Canadian Constitution to counter some of Quebec's moral and political arguments. Yet, by choosing to repatriate the Constitution without the consent of Quebec and its National Assembly, Canada has in a sense helped to resolve this dilemma. Even if it were in principle possible to use the political weight of the Constitution to oppose the political weight of Quebec's moral arguments, the balance leans in the latter's favour. The reason is that the Constitution is, in fact, illegitimate because it was imposed without the consent of the people of Quebec or Quebec's National Assembly. Therefore, the events of 1982 justify a unilateral declaration of independence, if it should become necessary. To claim that Quebec cannot attain sovereignty without Canada's consent means to forget that Canada imposed its new constitutional order without Quebec's consent. However, since it did do so, Canada must now be prepared to accept the consequences and accept the expression of the will of the Quebec people.

Quebec and Canada would nonetheless be wise to reach an agreement in the period immediately following a vote in favour of sovereignty. Canadians could, after such a vote, quickly come to an agreement concerning amendments to their own constitution which would take Quebec's sovereignty into account. A unilateral decision by Quebec must be considered a last resort, but a refusal to acknowledge Quebec sovereignty would be one way for Canada to force Quebec to make a unilateral declaration of independence. If the Canadian provinces and the federal government use their Constitution to block this process, they will be the ones opting for force over law and imposing "constitutional legality" over democratic legitimacy.

Peoples create constitutions, constitutions do not create peoples. And when a constitution is imposed on a people against its will, they have every right to acquire a new one. If there are sufficient moral justifications, such a people could even resort to political sovereignty as part of this process. All in all, Quebec sovereignty only appears illegal in relation to a constitution which has been illegitimately imposed on Quebec. This is the reason why the Canadian Constitution cannot be used to counter Quebec's proposed actions.
Quebec Sovereignty and International Law

The Canadian Constitution cannot legitimately exert influence over Quebec's sovereignist aspirations, but can such aspirations be governed and directed by international law? The right to self-determination written into the United Nations Charter, stated in the U.N. 1970 Declaration of Friendly Relations (A.G. Resolution 2625), essentially concerns colonized peoples, and some understand this to mean that the right to sovereignty is limited to them. Yet in practice, international law recognizes a society's right to accede to sovereignty, if the process is democratic and if it is able to properly govern its territory and population. Therefore, the process of attaining sovereignty is first and foremost a political issue, not a legal one. International law neither authorizes nor prohibits sovereignty; it simply recognizes it. On this basis, we claim that Quebec sovereignty is in keeping with international law, in the same way as the sovereignty of many states since the end of the Second World War, and especially during this decade (during which 21 new states have been recognized).

Certain members of the current Canadian government maintain that Quebec cannot use international law as a basis for unilaterally declaring its sovereignty, concluding that such a declaration would be illegal under international law. This is how they hope to make people believe that this process is morally reprehensible. Yet most international legal experts who have offered opinions on this subject disagree. International law does more than simply avoid ruling on this question. It recognizes sovereignty. These jurists implicitly recognize that the pursuit of sovereignty surpasses the bounds of the strictly legal, and is often both politically legitimate and morally justified.

As we have indicated, Quebec will do everything in its power to avoid a unilateral declaration of sovereignty. Nonetheless, if faced with Canada's refusal to recognize its democratic decision, Quebec could feel itself obligated to make such a declaration. Would Quebec be able to justify its actions?
Separatist Movements

• Algeria — Kabylia Berbers claim autonomy from the government of Algeria
• Angola — Cabinda
• Belgium — Flemish and Walloon separatists
• Bosnia and Herzegovina — Bosnian Serbs of Republika Srpska and Bosnian Croatian nationalists
• Brazil - Separatists want to separate the south from the rest of the country
• Burma — Karens (Karen National Union, east Burma) and Kachin.
• Canada — Province of Quebec (FLQ, Parti Québécois, Bloc Québécois), Western Canada (Separation Party of Alberta, Western Independence Party)
• China — Taiwan, Inner Mongolia, Tibet, Xinjiang (East Turkestan Islamic Movement)
• Democratic Republic of the Congo - Katanga area
• France — Corsica, Brittany, and Savoy
• Germany — Bavaria, Alemannic Separatism
• India — Kashmir, Sikhs, Bodoland, Assam (or "Asom") and Nagaland
• Indonesia — Aceh, Riau, West Papua, Moluccas
• Iraq — Kurds and Shiites
• Iran — Kurds, Arabs and Azeris
• Israel — Palestinians
• Italy — Padania, (Lega Nord), South Tyrol, Sicily
• Morocco — Polisario funded and hosted by neighbouring Algeria, challenges the sovereignty of Morocco over Western Sahara
• Nigeria— Biafra
• Pakistan — Kashmir
• Philippines — Muslim separatists in the south, (Moro)
• Russia — Chechnya
• Serbia and Montenegro — Kosovo (KLA - Kosovar Liberation Army guerrila organisation, also referred to as the Kosovo Protection Corps), Serbia and Montenegro
• Senegal — Casamance
• Somalia — Somaliland
• South Africa — Zulu areas
• Spain — Basque (ETA) region, Catalonia, and Galicia
• Sri Lanka — Tamils (Tamil Tigers)
• Sudan — Tribal animist and Christian south
• St. Kitts and Nevis — Nevis
• Sweden — Terra Scania
• Syria — Kurds
• Thailand — Malay separatists in southern provinces
• Turkey — Kurds
• United Kingdom — Northern Ireland (IRA, Sinn Féin, Social Democratic and Labour Party), Scotland (Scottish National Party, Scottish Socialist Party), Wales, and Cornwall
• United States — Alaska, Cascadia, California, Hawaii and Puerto Rico
The British Empire
1. Work in small groups and create three lists of all the pieces of information, large or small, that you know about Scotland, Wales, and England. Share your findings with other groups and then create a class list. Now examine the compiled list and try to determine the sources of your knowledge.

2. Examine the compiled list once again and group similar items together. Invent categories that describe the groups of items. For example, some items might be categorized as historical while others might be categorized as art.

3. What elements of these lists, in your opinion, describe the culture of the three countries? Suggest why you think the items are cultural.

4. With reference to the three lists, suggest the following:

   (a) How you think Scotland, Wales, and England are similar and how do you think they are different?

   (b) From your pre-existing knowledge, which seems to be the most different from England, Scotland or Wales? Can you explain why?

5. Suggest what might occur when two cultures appear to have more differences than similarities.

6. For hundreds of years, the leaders of Scotland and Wales went into battle with swords, truncheons, longbows, and muskets and fought for independence from England. Today, the quest for a degree of independence from England, involves negotiation, focus groups, government white papers, public opinion polls, and referendums. Discuss the following:

7. What is devolution and how does it apply to this news story? What were the factors that brought about devolution in Scotland and Wales? Suggest the difference between devolution, evolution, and revolution. What is common to all three words and how do they differ?

8. Why has there been disagreement about devolution in Great Britain? Why would there be disagreement in Scotland and Wales particularly?

9. The issues of national unity and minority cultures with distinct identities working for political independence are all too familiar to Canadians. In a brief essay, compare Canada and the Scottish and Welsh experience and determine to what extent they are a similar expression of the same phenomenon. Are there any lessons the Scottish or Welsh can learn from the Quebec independence movement? Are there any lessons Quebec can learn from the Scottish and Welsh? How are the language debates in each culture similar?
Scotland and Wales: Houses of their Own

On September 11, 1997, Scotland won the right to establish a legislature of its own and, in effect, bring about a devolution of powers from London to Edinburgh. Seventy-four per cent of the people supported the establishment of a new Scottish parliament, a 129-seat body with wide—but not exclusive—powers to govern Scotland’s five million people. A week later in Wales, 50.3 per cent gave their approval to a referendum supporting the establishment of a Welsh legislature. The 60-member Welsh assembly is due to convene at the turn of the century in Cardiff. For the first time in almost 300 years, Great Britain will cease to be a unitary state and will take on the structure of a federal system of government, not unlike Canada’s.

Many people see these referendums as the natural culmination of a long struggle for autonomy in the face of what many Scots perceive as indifference or even scorn on the part of England, the dominant culture. This nationalist cause is deeply rooted in the histories of both countries. Seven-hundred years before this referendum, in 1297, William Wallace of Scotland defeated the English at the Battle of Stirling Bridge. This historic and symbolic event was recently brought to the forefront of popular culture with the release of the movie Braveheart. For many Scottish people, the decisive result of the referendum in favour of devolution is an expression of nationalist sentiment and the modern-day equivalent of a nationalist victory on the battlefield.

A different historical metaphor explains in part the relationship of Wales to England. In 1969, following custom, Queen Elizabeth II presented her son, Prince Charles, as the new Prince of Wales, in a ceremony that traditionally takes place within the ramparts of Carnarvon Castle in Wales. As the Queen’s representative and speaking from Wales, Charles pledged “I, Charles, Prince of Wales, do become your liege man of life and limb and of earthly worship. In faith and truth, I will bear unto thee, to live and die against all manner of foes.” This ritual dates to the conquest of Wales by the English in 1536 when the Act of Union declared Wales “forever and henceforth incorporated and annexed” by England. The narrow margin of victory in the Welsh referendum was an indicator of a significant division among the Welsh on the nationalist issue. Although Wales appears to be strongly united, a split between the north and south and urban and rural areas on the question of unity is evident. William Hague, the leader of the British Conservative Party—and Secretary for Wales in the cabinet of the previous prime minister, John Major—said, “We’ve seen the country split down the middle.”

The reactions to devolution reflect a significant division in British politics in general. Edinburgh’s newspapers proclaimed “A Nation Again” and “A New Dawn,” while William Hague lamented the “. . . sad night for the future of Scotland and the United Kingdom.” In promoting devolution, Prime Minister Tony Blair is hoping to defuse calls for Scottish independence. When the devolution plan was first unveiled, it was described as a scheme to recognize Scotland’s “distinct identity” while keeping the Scottish within the United Kingdom. Scottish legislators will only have legislative control of local concerns, such as health, education, and municipal government; however, there are those who feel that Blair’s program will fan the flames of regional nationalism and lead to the eventual breakup of the United Kingdom. Many political observers in Canada are now drawing comparisons between Scotland and Quebec. For students of history, it is perhaps another proof that political movements rarely exist in isolation: that for most, there are precedents elsewhere in the world.
Cymru Nationalism

Cymru is the Welsh name for Wales. As you read the following passage about Welsh history, consider what it tells us about Welsh culture and identity. Identify specific elements, words, or expressions that suggest Welsh nationalism.

Around 2000 BC a migration of people from the area of the Rhine River in Germany to Wales occurred. They brought with them their battle axes, bronze knives, and other weapons. They also brought a distinct language. The Greeks called these people, with their organized culture and developed social structure, Keltoi. The Romans called them Celtai. Today we refer to them as Celts.

In a poem dated 633, the word Cymry appears, referring to the country; it was an early example of self-awareness among the Welsh, and it was not long before they themselves came to be known as the Cymry. Today the Welsh people themselves still prefer to call themselves Cymry, their country Cymru, and their language Cymraeg. The Welsh language is a Celtic language related to Gaelic, which is still spoken in Scotland.

In the middle of the eighth century a long ditch was constructed beside a high earthen rampart running from north to south and dividing the Celts of the west from the Saxons to the east. Today it marks the symbolic boundary between those who consider themselves Welsh from those who consider themselves English. The boundary is known as “Offa’s Dyke” in memory of Offa, the king who ordered it built. According to Welsh historian John Davies, “Offa’s Dyke was perhaps the most striking man-made boundary in the whole of Western Europe.” For hundreds of years, to cross the ramparts from east to west meant bloody defiance, and signalled an attack on Wales itself.

King Hywel Dda reigned in Wales from 904 to 950. He is remembered for his codification of Welsh law. Professor John Davies calls the Law of Hywel “among the most splendid creations of the culture of the Welsh,” for it contained proof, not only of the Welsh identity, but also of their unity. The law was enlightened for the time, but what is most significant is the fact that the majority of the surviving documents are in Welsh, with only a few in Latin—another sign of the legitimacy of the language of the Welsh. The Law of Hywel survived until it was replaced by the provisions of the Act of Union of 1536, at which time English law replaced it.

After the Battle of Hastings in 1066, when William of Normandy took possession of the English throne, the Norman invaders set about establishing a strong centralized kingdom in England. It is around this time that the great Norman castles were built that still dot the landscape of Wales today.

In 1216, Llewellyn Fawr took advantage of feuds between England’s King John and his barons, and established control over most of Wales, which had previously been claimed by a number of feuding princelings. Llewellyn Fawr became known as the first Prince of Wales. In 1282, Llewellyn Fawr’s grandson Llewellyn Gruffydd was assassinated. Today, his memorial stone
reads “ein llyw olaf” (“our last prince”), reflecting the ascendency and dominance of the English after his death.

Of crucial importance to keeping alive the great pride of the Welsh in their ancient traditions is the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth. It is to Geoffrey of Monmouth that we owe the basis of the Arthurian tradition, that of a noble, wise, and benevolent king presiding over a chivalric court. His compilation, *Historia Regum Britanniae* (History of the Kings of Britain), completed in 1136, claimed to be a history up to the time of the Saxon invasions. Its impact upon the Welsh was to remind them of past glories and to inspire them with hope for the renewal of their heritage.

In an act of defiance against the English King Henry IV, Owain Glyndwr, Lord of Glyndyfrdwy was crowned Prince of Wales in 1400 by a small group of supporters. Owain’s supporters were easily put down by the English and scattered across Wales. In a punitive act, Henry IV brought in a series of repressive measures that restricted Welsh civil rights. Instead of subduing the Welsh further, these measures gave Owain and his independence movement renewed support. A popular description from the time captures the nationalist fervour of the Welsh: “The English fight for power; the Welsh for liberty; the one to procure gain, the other to avoid loss. The English hirelings for money; the Welsh patriots for their country.” Owain’s open rebellion went well against Henry IV, and he was given support from Ireland and Scotland. He even received support from many English nobles who believed Henry’s crown had been falsely obtained. It seemed as if independent Wales was about to become a reality. However, a series of coincidences, untimely deaths of supporters, and the eventual betrayal of Owain brought about the end of Owain’s vision of an independent Wales. The failure of Owain’s dream was a crushing disappointment for the people of Wales. The rebellion had been no mere peasant uprising but a general uniting of feeling and action. It served to raise the consciousness of the average Welsh person and instill a nationalist sentiment against English control.

There is an expression from the 19th century that describes a Welshman who pretends to have forgotten his Welsh or who affects the loss of his national identity in order to succeed in English society. Such a man was known as *Dic Sion Dafydd*. In the 15th century, many Welshmen petitioned the English Parliament to be “made English” so that they could enjoy privileges given only to Englishmen. One of the rights they were denied as Welshmen was the right to buy and hold land according to English law. Such petitions were distasteful to the patriotic Welsh, but for the ambitious and the socially mobile they were a necessary step for any chance of advancement. The Act of Union in 1536 gave the Welsh people full equality before the law with their English counterparts. Although the Act was one of the most important documents in the history of Wales, it was passed without consultation with the Welsh people. Because it was the intent of the Act to abolish any distinction between English and Welsh law, English law became the only law recognized in the courts of Wales. The Act also made English the official language of the courts and of offices of the king, thus restricting the Welsh ruling class to only those who could demonstrate fluency in English. Out of this attempt to dissolve a nation and diminish a culture came something that was entirely unexpected. Although Wales had to adapt itself to momentous change in order to survive, it did not die. There was no longer any advantage in boasting of the condition of being English, and from this time on everyone who was living in Wales considered themselves Welsh.
The Industrial Revolution in Wales

In the late 18th and early 19th century, south Wales experienced heavy industrialization, which had a profound effect on the Welsh language and culture. Many Welsh migrated to the south in search of work and brought their language with them. Massive emigration out of Wales in search of work was averted, and Welsh as a language thrived in large industrial communities. But the industrialization of the south had a lasting impact on the countryside and agrarian culture of Wales. In 1847, before the industrialization, one writer described life in a pleasant valley. “The people of this solitudinous and happy valley are a pastoral race, almost wholly dependent on their flocks and herds for support. . . . The air is aromatic with wild flowers and mountain plants, a sabbath stillness reigns.”

Three years later, in 1850, the celebrated English author Thomas Carlyle described the same scene in a letter to his wife: “Ah me! Tis like a vision of Hell, and will never leave me, that of these poor creatures broiling or in sweat and dirt, amid their furnaces, pits, and rolling mills. . . . The Town might be, and will be, one of the prettiest places in the world. It is one of the sootiest, squalidest and ugliest; all cinders and dust mounds and soot. . . . Nobody thinks of gardening in such a locality, all devoted to metallic gambling.” Out of the industrial revolution a stereotypical caricature of an English-speaking Welshman emerged as a cloth-capped, heavy drinking, strike-prone, rugby fanatic. This caricature was imposed from outside the Welsh culture.

Eventually the Welsh communities in the heavy industrialized areas were unable to absorb the vast influx of non-Welsh speakers, mainly from Ireland and England. The Welsh industrialist David Davies expressed his concerns in a speech that typified the sentiments of many ambitious Welsh. He said: “I am a great admirer of the Welsh language, and I have no sympathy with those who revile it. Still, I have seen enough of the world to know that the best medium to make money is by the English language. I want to advise every one of my countrymen to master it perfectly; if you are content with brown bread, you can of course remain where you are. If you wish to enjoy the luxuries of life, with white bread to boot, the only way to do so is by learning English well. I know what it is to eat both.” Many Welsh heeded Davies’ advice, and the repercussions are felt strongly today—only one in five of the inhabitants of Wales use Welsh as a language of everyday affairs.

Discussion

1. Compare the culture of Wales before and after industrialization. Speculate as to the ways technology can influence and shape culture.

2. How has industrialization and technology shaped Canadian culture in the last century? Identify industrial and technological influences that are foreign and assess their impact on Canadian culture and our Canadian identity.

3. Many economists note that the Canadian economy is changing from an industrial-based economy to a service-based economy. Brainstorm what the impact may be for Canadian culture and share your ideas with your classmates.

4. What parallels might one draw between the history of Wales and that of Quebec and the rest of French Canada?
One of the most popular Scottish heroes and patriots is Sir William Wallace of Elerslie, who was depicted recently in the Hollywood film *Braveheart*. Wallace desired freedom for Scotland, and he united the clans and gained the loyalty of the people. He struck fear into the hearts of Scotland’s enemies and defied the cruel hand of a warring and invading king. Today Wallace has been romanticized and portrayed with all the attributes of a chivalrous and courageous knight and as a leader of a divided and fractious land. For many, Wallace has become the personification of Scottish nationalism. As you read the following account of William Wallace’s life, consider the following questions:

1. What, in your opinion, are the qualities of national heroes?
2. In what ways is Wallace a hero? A Scottish hero?
3. What are some of the problems of hero creation and hero worship?

William Wallace was born in 1272. Wallace carried a two-handed broad sword, approximately 168 cm in length, with the blade itself being about 132 cm long. Historians and military experts agree that for a man to carry such a sword, let alone wield it, he would have to have been of considerable physical stature. They estimate that Wallace must have been almost two metres tall. Today the sword is displayed in the New National Wallace Monument.

William Wallace witnessed Scotland’s defeat at the hands of the English in 1292 and, like all Scots of the time, endured the humiliation of English occupation in Scotland. When William was a young man, he had an encounter with the English that changed the course of his life. Dundee Castle was under the control of the English and overseen by an English constable named Selby. Selby had a son who was just slightly older than William, and this son had the misfortune and bad judgment to pick a fight with young William Wallace. Young Selby, accompanied by a number of his English friends, made some remarks to Wallace about his Scottish attire. Selby and his friends apparently berated Wallace and demanded that he hand over some of his valuable possessions. William’s response was swift and dramatic; grabbing the Englishman by the collar, he drew his blade and thrust it through his assailant’s heart. At this point William became an outlaw hunted down by the English. He thus became a symbol of defiance against English tyranny and control and began to lead Scottish forces on raids against English outposts and garrisons. The movie *Braveheart*, which you may have seen, portrays Wallace and his men as a rampaging band constantly attacking and ambushing anything with an English insignia and with quite a brutal and unforgiving anger. To what extent this portrayal of Wallace is accurate is not well documented. Historically, it is accepted that Wallace was a product of the chivalrous age in which he lived, an age that valued courage, strength, and prowess on the battlefield, but also an age of lawlessness and revenge. Wallace and his men did indeed attack at will and without provocation from many different places within lower Scotland. This is what gained him the reputation as a great warrior with his own people and a feared enemy with the English garrisons. No one ever knew where he would strike next or when. The Grolier Encyclopedia documents
this historical figure in this way: “. . . Wallace led a group of men who killed the English sheriff of Lanark. In the same year [1297] he defeated John de Warenne, Earl of Surrey, the English governor of Scotland, near Stirling. Wallace went on to drive the English out of Scotland and invade southern England. He became guardian of the realm in the name of the imprisoned John Balliol. Many Scottish nobles did not support Wallace, however, and in 1298, Longshanks defeated him at Falkirk. Wallace went to France in an unsuccessful bid for assistance. After his return he was arrested, brought to London, and executed for treason.” Given the historical facts, one can understand why Wallace became a martyr to a cause and a national hero in the popular imagination.

Discussion

1. What is the lesson to be learned from the story of William Wallace? What is the role of individuals in the development of nationalism? Can you give some Canadian examples?

2. The day after the referendum a statue of William Wallace was unveiled in a town close to Edinburgh. The New York Times reported that the film Braveheart helped fan Scottish nationalism and a renewed fascination with Scotland’s culture and heritage. The statue is in the likeness of Mel Gibson. Do you think this is an accurate assessment of the film Braveheart? Have your own feelings of nationalism ever been affected by popular culture?
As you read the following passage, think carefully about the implications of the words and phrases in *italics*.

Culture may well be the key issue in this news story. But what is culture? Culture involves almost every aspect of our lives. It is so close to us that we frequently do not recognize it for what it is until someone points it out to us. Sometimes people are placed in a different cultural environment when they travel to another country and they experience different foods, customs, laws, and ways of life. Sometimes different cultural environments can be experienced within one’s own country or even within the same city. For instance, many large urban areas are multicultural in composition and are home to people from Italian, Greek, Chinese, Portuguese, Indian, and many other cultures. Quite often these cultures are found in certain areas of the city where they have fostered strong communities devoted to the preservation of their specific culture.

Culture is sometimes misconstrued as something that you “get” if you go to the ballet or listen to classical music. However, if you go to the mall or go to a fast-food restaurant you are also “getting culture.” In these situations a person is experiencing day-to-day aspects of his or her culture. Every person possesses culture because he or she is a member of a society. Social scientists often define culture as society’s way of life, and the manner in which its members conduct their day-to-day lives. Culture includes the knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, and behaviours of a society.

Everything that occurs within a culture has meaning because cultural elements represent the view and outlook of that cultural group. By looking closely at a variety of cultural practices and attempting to interpret the view of these practices, we can try to figure out how a cultural group thinks and what the members think is important. To analyze a society, social scientists examine certain components of culture. A few indicators of culture that exist in society are symbols, norms and rules of behaviour, values, and objects.

**Symbols**

Symbols can be anything that, over time, a group of people has come to recognize as having a specific meaning. Language, for example, is full of shared symbols. Informal figures of speech can define cultural groups. There may also be more fundamental language differences: dialects, accents, or different languages altogether. These can define a group of people and serve as symbols of identity. Symbols also take the form of flags, national anthems, emblems, mottoes, heroes and heroines. Even literature, the arts, and important historical events have symbolic importance in a culture.
Norms and Rules of Behaviour

People who share a culture also share rules of behaviour. Rules regulating behaviour in certain situations are called norms. The table manners of a particular culture would be an example of a norm. Some of society’s norms are flexible and vary from situation to situation. For instance, different norms of table manners exist for different dining experiences. At other times norms are more rigid and less open to interpretation. Norms that are considered very important to society are called mores. Mores are essentially basic “moral” views of a group and are generally accepted by the majority of a group without question. Societies tend to show how important mores are to their particular culture by writing laws to protect them. This partly explains why laws vary between different cultures.

Values

Values are an important component of culture because they help people explain and interpret their actions in the world. Values can vary within a culture and are shaped and formed by a variety of socializing agents in our societies such as parents, schools, television, peer groups, and religion. Cultures are not monolithic entities; some are more uniform than others, but there are always individual differences because of the different socializing agents. This partly explains the wide differences in values we find when comparing different cultures.

Objects

Physical objects are given meaning in cultures. The material products produced by cultures tell us a lot about what that culture deems to be important. Material objects may also tell us a lot about human interaction and behaviour. For instance, the television is a material object that, through its programming, tells us many things about our culture. The way we use television also reveals our cultural habits. Similarly, cultural anthropologists who study both present-day and past cultures can tell a lot about ancient cultures by studying their tools and weapons. Cultural anthropologists can tell us a lot about our own culture by examining simple, everyday items. For instance, suppose you emptied your pockets. What objects would you find? How are they used? What meanings does our culture assign to them?

Social Organization

The fundamental basis of culture is social organization and the social cohesion that forms an identifiable group. A culture’s social identity involves the cultural practices that serve to distinguish a social group from other social groups. It has been said that all cultural practices that serve to bestow identity on a social group involve an idea of “other.” “Other” is used in the sense that cultural groups often define themselves in terms such as “We are not like them.” As a subset of social identity, social memory serves as a means of defining a cultural group. Social memory not only defines cultural groups positively —“We are who we are because of our history.”—but it also defines patterns of behaviour, ritual, and other social practices. The primary function of social memory is to explain the origin and meaning of cultural practices. Social memory takes many forms: religion, mythology, and history.
Nationalism

Over a long period of time, the identities of some cultures become strong enough that they resemble national entities and even become nations unto themselves. There are many historical examples that demonstrate this phenomenon. In the 1860s the German-speaking country Prussia conducted a series of wars against Denmark, Italy, and France to unite many German provinces and subsequently to form a nation in 1871. This shared sense of culture by Prussia and other German-speaking provinces fostered an intense feeling of patriotism and national consciousness to promote the German culture and interests above all others. This sentiment and social force is referred to as nationalism. In this example, nationalism emerged as a force to unite a loose confederation of provinces into a single strong united German nation. However, nationalism does not always work to foster a sense of unity. Quite often nationalism works in the opposite way and can weaken a country’s unity or, when pushed to an extreme, can lead to war—as was the case in the two world wars. Conflict of another kind occurs frequently when a culture attempts to gain the status of a nation for itself when, politically, it is part of a more dominant culture and nation. Quebec’s separatist movement is a good example of this type of nationalism. Quebec nationalism is rooted in pride in and identification with francophone culture—of which language is the principal ingredient—and the protection of that culture in a strong, independent Quebec. These examples illustrate the inherent special status that, because of nationalistic beliefs and feelings, a culture may ascribe to itself. Such cultural affirmations have frequently been the cause of conflict between cultures.

Follow-up Discussion

1. Do we have a Canadian culture or is Canadian culture by definition the composition of many different cultures together? How do we as Canadians define Canadian culture? Brainstorm a list of symbols, norms and rules of behaviour, values, and objects of Canadian culture. Is it possible to define Canadian culture without referring to the idea of “other”?

2. Examine your description of Canadian culture from the above question. What are the characteristics of our culture that contribute to a strong sense of nationalism? What are the characteristics of our culture that weaken our sense of nationalism? Is a strong sense of nationalism always a good thing for a country?

3. What does this notion of culture have to do with the recent events in Scotland and Wales? In terms of culture, what might be the cultural impact of devolution on these two countries?

4. Is the devolution that Scotland and Wales are undergoing about nationalism, culture, or democratic reform? How might the three be interrelated?