

just a chemical accident. Neurones, not just those in man, exhibit ‘tropism’; they appear to be purposeful and therefore violate the theory of evolution. The brain can turn immaterial ideas into physical objects which can give us control over our biological destiny. The biologist Leeuwenhoek (1632) imagined a microscope, built it, then looked down it at a world that no one knew existed. Two hundred years later the microscope gave us cures for bacterial disease. Then ‘the pill’, an idea which first took shape on a blackboard, took the ‘natural’ out of natural selection. By the year 2025 another idea, a manned spaceship with men and women on board, will land on Mars. Within the next century we may make radio contact with our nearest star. Far from the forest fire of consciousness flickering out, it is spreading.

While romantic love may be no more than a play on a biochemical stage, blinding its victims to another’s defects long enough to produce offspring, it has a purpose. It

creates new brains, fragments of the cosmos that can think, reason, number, ruminate on moral problems and write ‘Ode to a Nightingale’. What other structures out there might be able to reason? How come the mind has intent when the universe is supposed to be Dawkins-blind ?

Meanwhile chemistry may yet relieve the pain of love. Seeing the suffering and violence love causes it will be no more a loss than the Romans giving up the Games. They were fun, but now we have football. Perhaps we will invent the chemical equivalent of the beautiful game as a substitute for love. It will never beat ‘Ode to a Nightingale’.

(Ref *Cupid’s Chemisty*. Royal Society of Chemistry Feb 2006.)

Poem: A E Houseman, ‘Oh When I was in Love with You’, *A Shropshire Lad*, 1896.

[back to contents page](#)

# Surrendering the Heights of Abraham

Ricardo Duchesne

Last year, *Maclean’s* (July 9) had a front cover story ‘How Canadian Are You? — bumptiously announcing that Canadians have earned the right to brag as a people with a great culture. It offered an endearing ‘Canada Day Special’ quiz for readers to determine how Canadian they were. How much do you weigh? How many servings of veggies do you eat a day? How many times a week do you have sex? Should the NHL ban fighting? How many partial curl-ups do you do in one minute? If you scored between 20 and 25, you earned ‘bragging rights,’ you are ‘a quintessential Canadian’. But if you scored between 5 and 9, you are lacking in ‘Canadian pride,’ you are not in the right country.

This is what contemporary Canadian identity has become after five decades of mass immigration combined with endless pageants to multiculturalism. The idea that Canada has no other identity than ethnic diversity has been encrypted into our brains starting with Pierre Trudeau’s announcement in Parliament in 1971:

*We believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity. Every ethnic group has the right to preserve and develop its own culture and values*

*within the Canadian context. To say we have two official languages is not to say we have two official cultures, and no particular culture is more ‘official’ than another.*

According to Trudeau, every ethnic identity in the world is and can become equally Canadian. The British and the French are no more important to the making of Canada’s identity than the Chinese, Muslim, Mali, or Latino Canadian.

The ‘White Canada’ policy laid down in the Immigration Act of 1910, and extended in the Immigration Act of 1952, ended in the Immigration Regulations of 1967, when a non-racial set of admission criteria was adopted. According to those Regulations, the Act of 1952 was unpardonable. Today, no one cares to consider that the justification behind the ‘White Canada’ immigration policy was the preservation and cementation of the primary role of Canada’s founding peoples of European origin. The idea that other peoples (who had taken no part in the settlement efforts and in the centuries-long creation of the institutions and infrastructure of Canada) might simply arrive in mass numbers to claim Canada as equally their own was anathema to Canadians before

the establishment of multiculturalism.

Trudeau was plainly wrong that multiculturalism was a 'more accurate' description of Canada's historical culture than the idea of two founding peoples, the French and British. In 1971, the French and the British still constituted 74 percent of the population, and over 95 percent of the population was European. All the institutions, values, religions, and languages were overwhelmingly British and French. But historical accuracy was not the point: multiculturalism was a project for the future *against the past*. 'Racism and bigotry' were a 'large part' of Canada's 'official' history and tradition as a European nation. This once-official view would no longer be tolerated.

The new 1967 immigration regulations emphasizing skill and education rather than ethnic origins were not brought on by popular demand or even parliamentary debate and initiative, but by senior Ministers and Cabinet officials who, in the words of one observer, 'did not trust the average Canadian to respond in a positive way on this issue'. Gallup polls in the 60s showed that only about one third of Canadians thought that Canada should invite new immigrants, and over 60 percent thought that the fairly low levels of Asian immigration (at the time) were already too high. In complete disregard to Canadian popular wishes, the borders of Canada were set wide open.

The number of immigrants coming each year into Canada since the early 1990s has been staggering, roughly between 225,000 and 260,000 immigrants per year, mostly from non-European nations. By 2011 the foreign-born population of Canada stood at 20.6 per cent. Settling mostly in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, immigrants have radically transformed the cultural composition and socio-ethnic dynamics of Canada's major cities. Today, the mainstream media and the academic world take great pleasure in labelling our immigration policy prior to 1967 as 'racist and exclusionary'. But this cultural Marxist assessment of Canadian perceptions should not be trusted. Canadians then were part of a Western world committed and strongly attached to the idea that every individual citizen of Canada should be treated equally under the law without discrimination based on race, national origin, or religion. They were not racist; they were merely ethnocentric, a people with a natural and normal preference for their own ethnic traditions. Ethnic groups throughout the world exhibit a preference for their own culture.

Recent scientific research shows that ethnocentrism is a healthy evaluation of one's ethnic identity and interests consistent with evolutionary theory and cultural sophistication. This is the argument ethnocentric individuals can opportunely take from

a scientific paper published in *Psychological and Cognitive Sciences* (January 2011), with the fitting title: 'Oxytocin promotes human ethnocentrism'. Written by a research team at the University of Amsterdam, directed by Dr Carsten de Dreu, this article shows that oxytocin is a human molecule associated with in-group favoritism and out-group derogation. Through a series of experiments in which participants were administered doses of oxytocin, the researchers learned that 'a key mechanism facilitating in-group cooperation is ethnocentrism, the tendency to view one's group as centrally important and as superior to other groups' at the expense of an out-group.

How, then, did European Canadians come to accept the idea that it is racist and xenophobic to exhibit preference for one's own ethnicity and heritage, while believing, at the same time, that every non-European ethnic group has a right to preserve its own culture inside Canada? It should be noted that the relentless promotion of diversity and mass immigration, despite some variations, has been a Western-wide phenomenon since the 1960s. The American President Lyndon B Johnson signed the Immigration Act of 1965 that led to a tremendous surge in immigration from Mexico and Asia in the decades that followed. Eight years later the 'White Australia Policy' came to an end, resulting in a massive influx of ethnocentric Asians.

Western European nations have also seen their cultures swamped by immigration and diversity. The British Nationality Act of 1948 affirmed the right of Commonwealth citizens (including those of newly independent Commonwealth countries like India) to settle in the United Kingdom. Commonwealth immigration rose from 3,000 per year in 1953 to 46,800 in 1956 and 136,400 in 1961. Despite some restrictions requiring migrants to have a 'substantial connection with the United Kingdom' by birth or ancestry, in the 1970s, averages of 72,000 immigrants were settling in the UK every year from the Commonwealth; and in the 1980s and early 1990s around 54,000 per year, rising to around 97,000 by 1999. About half the population increase in Britain between the 1991 and 2001 censuses was due to foreign-born immigration. By 2012, White British had dropped from 87.5 per cent of the population in 2001 to 80.5 per cent. White Britons in London, in 2012, accounted for less than half (almost 45 per cent) of its population, and more than one in three London residents is foreign-born. Diversity was strenuously enforced through incessant media campaigns including the transformation of the entire curriculum from *pre-Kinder* onwards away from any historic pride in the British heritage. Similar changes have been brought by liberal elites in France, Spain, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, and increasingly as well in

Norway, Switzerland, and Ireland.

Some will argue that these changes were ‘sensible’ components of worldwide trends toward globalization. The fact is that Asia’s now advanced economies have seen international trade and investment represent ever growing portions in their economies, but Asia has not seen migrants grow as a share of its population. In fact, immigrants have accounted for a mere 1.4-1.6 per cent of Asia’s population over the past twenty years – despite fertility rates well below replacement levels in Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and other Asian countries.

If I had to choose one reason why Western countries decided to negate their European heritage, I would say it was the twin ideologies of universalism and egalitarianism. By universal egalitarianism, I mean the idea that humans are essentially the same everywhere, and that our ethnicities and cultural ancestries are either superficial or easy to transform through proper instruction in the acquisition of modern ‘universal values’ such as civic equality, tolerance, affluence, and democratic participation. Liberal elites in the post-WWII era believed they represented the highest ideals of humanity; it was their moral obligation to showcase these values to the world. Humanity could be united under these values with different ethnic groups co-existing and interbreeding in the same lands in an atmosphere of liberal affluence and intercultural dialogue.

These ideas preceded the 60s with roots going back to the Enlightenment and perhaps even to early Christianity. The senior government officials who introduced non-racial immigration rules in Canada in the 60s were influenced by the ideas which led to the creation of the United Nations and a multiracial Commonwealth. The UN Declaration of Universal Human Rights in 1948, the UNESCO statements on race (1950, 1951, 1964, 1967), with their language about a common humanity, which arose directly from the experience of Nazism, made some politicians uncomfortable with a Canada acting on the world stage as a democratic and liberal nation while excluding non-Whites from its borders. The Immigration Act of 1952 seemed old, exclusionary, and illiberal.

This love for a non-ethnocentric humanity, projected onto a benign future that was not real, entailed a growing dislike and intolerance for the actual Canadian population of European ethnic origin. In 1971, this European population constituted about 96 percent of Canada’s demography. This existing European population still sympathized with the observation by Prime Minister Mackenzie King in 1947:

*The people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration in the*

*character of our population. Large-scale immigration from the Orient would change the fundamental composition of the Canadian population.*

But liberal elites, as the radical 60s spread, were determined to re-engineer the souls of average Canadians. There was no national debate on multiculturalism and mass immigration. Canadian immigration policy proceeded for the most part by way of non-transparent regulations, executive directives, and administrative discretion, not by legislative action.

Immediately after Trudeau’s 1971 announcement, numerous programs were implemented: multicultural grants, support for Canadian ethnic studies ‘to set the record straight’ by reflecting Canada’s diverse cultural traditions. All ethnic groups were to be seen as equal in the making of Canada. Never mind the actual historical and political fact of the two founding peoples of Canadian Confederation! With grants freely available, there was, in the words of one observer, an ‘explosion of academic research into ethnicity.’ A new discipline, ‘Canadian Ethnic Studies,’ was born, soon to proliferate throughout the halls of academe. This was just the beginning of a ‘bonanza of remarkable proportions’ in the promotion of multiculturalism through every level of society. In June 1984, the Conservative Leader Brian Mulroney told a cheering crowd that his party now stood for multiculturalism and would not allow itself to be called ‘the Party of White Anglo-Saxon Protestants’. Multicultural diversity, he said, was an absolutely obligatory part of Canada’s national identity and to reject it was to reject Canada. He then outlined future changes his party intended to implement in the hiring policies of the federal government, services in non-official languages, more funds for the preservation and advancement of non-European cultures and greater efforts to ‘stamp out racism wherever it rears its ugly head’.

This stamping out was directed singularly against the British people and their legacy in Canada. The French in Quebec had successfully managed to portray themselves, from the 60s onwards, as an oppressed minority within Canada with its own legitimate identity seeking a new constitutional deal framed against Anglo Canada. It was the British, and then the Europeans who had assimilated to English Canada, who were being asked to relinquish any sense of culture deeply grounded in ethnic bonds, ancestry, and homeland. The ethnicity of Quebecers, and of Native peoples, could be viewed in primordialist terms as deeply rooted in their lands, communities, histories, and customary identities. But normal British and English Europeans were prohibited from binding themselves to a geographical and cultural ‘homeland’. Their ethnicity was to be de-linked from a homeland called ‘Canada’.

There was no such thing as a Canadian identity that could be linked primordially to the British or the English-Europeans. The European-Canadian identity was to be witnessed only in multicultural tolerance, pluralist values, democracy, and diversity. But since these values were ‘universal’ — for ‘humanity’ — they would not be seen as uniquely British or European. On the contrary, these values would be used against any British sense of identity for the sake of protecting and promoting the ethnic pride of non-Europeans. Asians, Blacks, and Latinos had the right to preserve their own ethnic roots and culture in a multicultural Canada. They would have hyphenated identities such as ‘I am really Chinese, but I live in mosaic Canada,’ or ‘I have ethnic Chinese roots, but I identify with Canadian diversity and democracy.’

Since the British were allegedly the agents of racist and exclusionary immigration practices, whereas the immigrants (including the millions who were not yet in Canada) were the victims of such practices, multiculturalism thus worked necessarily as a force against British identity and as a force for non-European identities. To this day, every day, media pundits and self-righteous academics insist that racism is experienced by immigrants of visible status and that a ‘major goal of multiculturalism must be to eliminate racism.’ Forget that visible immigrants come from illiberal, racially ranked and backward cultures, and that individual rights and non-racial discrimination policies were unique legacies of the British, and that visible immigrants in Canada are far more uncomfortable with other visible groups than are European Canadians. The point is that racism per se has been inexorably tied to the ethnocentrism of British/European Canada, and so the elimination of racism requires the eradication of British and European identity. Some iconic symbols and practices such as the maple leaf, hockey players, and calendar photographs of Lake Louise may be

allowed. The *Macleans* Canadian ‘with bragging rights’ should ask for no more.

We should critically examine the unfounded notion that European ethnocentrism, and only European ethnocentrism, amounts to ‘ethnic cleansing’, ‘fanaticism,’ and ‘violence’ against outsiders. Japan, Korea, and many other countries, have a very high degree of ethnic homogeneity, as do some Nordic European countries (Finland, Norway, and also Switzerland), but none of them are engaged in wars of exclusion and violence against other ethnic groups. Ending mass immigration and multiculturalism in the West is not an act of exclusion and racism. It is the other way around: these policies have amounted to acts of exclusion and dispossession against the historic British and European peoples of Canada. Ethnocentrism means loyalty and commitment for one’s group; it does not entail hatred and rancour against other groups.

The multiculturalists are the ones who have infused politics with an intolerant ideology in which anyone proud of his European heritage and refusing to join the multiculti choruses is despised as a xenophobic outsider. The irony of creating a ‘universal humanity’ is that it has required the dehumanization of the British people, or any particular European group, wishing to retain its identity. Multiculturalists advocate in-group favouritism for immigrants and cultural Marxists, on the one hand, and, on the other, out-group hate for those Canadians who love their European heritage. Their position runs counter to the actual ethnic diversity of the peoples of the earth. Why would the Japanese, Koreans, and Pakistanis want their countries to look like ‘diverse’ Toronto? Let us defend European ethnocentrism in the name of human nature and the true diversity of the peoples of the planet.

*Ricardo Duchesne is a professor in the department of social science at the University of New Brunswick Saint John.*

[back to contents page](#)



*"If the government continues with its hate campaign against older people it may be safer to wear burkas when we go out."*