

Sergei Souglobin
*Institute of Sociology,
Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*

Primljeno: 15.02.1991.

ETHNIC POLITICS IN A MULTI-ETHNIC STATE: CANADIAN IMMIGRANT COMMUNITIES AND POLITICAL PROCESS

SUMMARY

The paper examines the contents and peculiarities in the Canadian case of the interrelationship between ethnicity and politics in a contemporary multi-ethnic federative state. The author argues that, analytically, ethnic politics may be viewed as being both group-based and state-based. This distinction made, the emphasis on group politics, i.e. »ethnopolitics from within« rather than »ethnopolitics from above« thus encourages one to analyse each component in what might be termed, tentatively the political functioning of ethnic communities. In this paper focus is placed on the political representation and organization of Canadian ethnic structures specifically chosen to address the main point in the discussion, that is defining the contextual scope of potential models of distinctively ethnic political behaviour. As diverse empirical data indicates, ethnic patterns in political participation are increasingly indistinguishable and vague and, certainly, no longer clearly defined. This is an indisputable reflection of a more rapid and efficient ethnic mobility and integration, peculiar to Canada today. In terms of political organization, the general drive towards integration rather than particularism, let alone non-integration, has also been responsible for the lack of structural scope available for ethnic institutions, aside from traditionally sporadic and highly selective interest-group politics from ethnic organizations as such. In the end, this rather low profile of »ethnopolitics from within« appears to be well balanced by the highly promoted but depolitized ethnic pluralism in the Canadian »ethnopolitics from above«.

Recent developments in many parts of the contemporary world have testified prominently, among other things, to the fact that the growing interrelationship between ethnicity and politics is beyond doubt. Indeed, ethnicity has come to serve as a real factor in the formation of certain political interests and corresponding actions. As the events in some East European states clearly show, the rising significance of this factor tends to have a tantalizing effect on the general political scene within those countries and, certainly, contributes greatly to a much more colorful yet contradictory picture of politics there as a whole. In contrast, after the earlier hectic days of the so called »ethnic revival« of the 1960's - 70's (23), the West has in fact been going through a period of relative decline for ethnic movements in several western polyethnic states. This obvious change makes it even more important to look back on some western models of ethnopolitics for the sake of a better explanation and understanding of our own ones. In this respect, the case of Canada - a country with so similar a state model, being a federation, of course,

and multi-ethnic at the same time, and having so different a level of conflict in ethno-national development – is highly indicative.

A Framework for Analysis

The function of ethnicity in politics seems to be two-fold. It can be present both as an object and subject of politics, hence providing us with two corresponding perspectives for the interrelationship involved. Firstly, political activity may be expressed along certain ethnic lines and, secondly, political activity, may be concentrated upon and/or around issues which have something special to do with ethnicity as such. Conversely, whereas the former perspective leads to what might be termed the participation of ethnic communities in the political process as subjects of the game with non-ethnic political institutions chosen as a target (object), the latter, on the contrary, has non-ethnic political institutions (official state, party structures and alike) playing their traditional role as subjects with objects largely found among ethnic communities. Certainly, a distinction like this is always a bit too theoretical. When it comes to practice these two perspectives are more often than not so heavily interwoven and superimposed over each other that it is by far not an easy exercise to distinguish between the two. Yet, bearing in mind the analytical benefits, this distinction can serve our major aim of penetrating deeper into the phenomenon of ethnic politics. The proposed distinction has been made largely on the basis of what appears only too evident. After all, ethnic politics are merely an amalgamation of ethnicity and politics *per se*, each of which can still be a reason/motive or consequence or/and both. For instance, the political behaviour of (1) ethnic communities (ethnic institutions) and (2) non-ethnic (governmental, national parties) institutions can be determined, in varying degrees, via both ethnicity and political/ideological perspectives, and, vice versa – the effects of political behaviour on the part of some ethnic communities (institutions) can still be traced somewhat in the policies shaped and carried out by non-ethnic political institutions (governmental first of all), with certain effects of the latter also discernible in the behaviour of ethnic communities.

Thus, analytically, there are two (in no way not easily separable) aspects for discussing Canadian ethnopolitics at that level of generalization;

- 1) the political functioning of Canadian ethnic communities, which should include issues relating to their political participation, structural/organisational outlook and behaviour in the process. We shall term this perspective »ethnopolitics from within«;
- 2) the regulation of this functioning along with all ethnic or ethnicity-related issues set up by national official policies and the political community at large – via national (non-ethnic) political institutions (primarily, of course, state ones) – to play a major role in formulating the agenda and rules of general conduct. This perspective may be termed »ethnopolitics from above«.

In this paper, it is the former perspective that is to be dealt with specifically. The main reason for that is that there has been no lack of analysis into what might be termed Canadian official ethnic or immigration policies, at least in regard to bilingualism and multiculturalism (3), while there is still much room to try and formulate an approach to studies in ethnopolitics »from within«. This may well provide scholars with much richer insights if anything close to the complex and conflicting picture of today's ethnopolitics is to be reached.

The Canadian General Ethnic Context

According to the Census statistics, the Canadian population is presently composed of more than six dozen various ethnic groups, identified so by the respective origins or ancestry of those polled¹. Although none of these ethnic groups can at present claim an absolute majority over the rest of the population, two charter groups, English Canadians and French Canadians, having lost substantially some of their historic numerical strength over the last post-war decades, are still, if taken together of course, in a relative majority (about 40 % and 27 % respectively) over the all the so called »other« ethnic groups (33 %). Moreover, whereas the total share of the »other« groups is not unimpressive and, due to the continuing flow of immigration, especially from the Third World, constantly on the rise, the largest among the non-English and non-French groups (i.e. the Germans) has never accounted for more than a 3 % share in the overall Canadian populace (the second largest, the Italians – about 1,5 %, with Scandinavians, Dutch, Ukrainians following them with less than 1 %). Thus, taking a closer look, the Canadian mosaic is indeed very evident, but this is above all true for the groups of the Third component.

This feature relating to ethnic composition is very likely to be the first one to play a role in ethnopolitics and, certainly, the main one to be taken into account when debating Canadian ethnopolitics. The dominance of English and French Canadians, statistical at this point of our discussion, along with various social implications related to this fact, may in fact be responsible for a hypothetical low-profile or expectantly unspecified show of the »other« groups on the Canadian national political scene. At any rate, this is an interesting and necessary point with which to test and start our discussion.

Another ethnostatistical dimension that is likely to influence specific Canadian codes of ethnopolitical behaviour for a variety of groups is their geographical dispersion across the country. In fact, it is only French Canadians who make up an ethnically homogeneous, compact or concentrated community with 79 % Canadians of French origin residing in the province of Québec, where they account for more than 80 % of the local population. All the other ethnic groups are quite scattered, although in various ways, but – except for English or British origin Canadians – modest proportions are found invariably in every Canadian province. Despite many areas with rural or urban ethnic concentrations at the local level from province to province, Canada has never had large regional ethnic territories populated by minorities, i.e. non-Charter groups component. Political implications in mind, this highly dispersed nature of Canadian ethnic group settlement may well have an impact on the problems, let us say, of ethnic consolidation amidst clearly determined territorial disintegration. On the other hand, regional/provincial based politics are very likely to condition community political behaviour in each separate province on a distinct regional rather than national pattern.

Finally, in regard to ethnic politics in such an immigrant shaped society as the Canadian one, there is always an overriding need to measure such politics against the balance of the immigrant force in the ranks of the participants (communities and their institutions). This has special historic significance in the case of the »other« communities.

¹ The main criteria traditionally employed in the Canadian census to identify »ethnic groups« is an ethnic origin. Starting from 1981, though, this has been supplemented by »multiple origins«.

Canadian census statistics indicate that the overall number of foreign born Canadians has for the last three to four decades been relatively stable for the country as a whole – about 15 % (certainly a product of carefully planned and closely watched immigration policies by the federal government). However, within the »major« groups, the immigrant share (a little more sizable and shifting of course), has in fact greatly varied from group to group, ranging from 12 % to 35 % on the average for each decade². Cast against this paper's theme, these patterns must almost inevitably be viewed with regard to the effect which the immigration factor could have in the process of political adaptation and the overall political behaviour of all the Canadian ethnic communities which are predominantly immigrant by their nature and formation. This last point will be followed throughout our discussion, with emphasis made on issues in political participation for Canadian ethnic groups to allow for checking the latter, along with the other hypotheses.

Ethnic Communities and Political Participation

Obviously, what can be termed the political functioning of Canadian ethnic communities is first of all and most importantly affected by specific conditions in the socio-political life of the country. In this regard, traditions and patterns of the political system peculiar to Canada – its national institutions and structures, dominant ideological values and attitudes as well as general socio-political climate prevalent in the country – constitute the only context within which any political functioning of all the Canadian ethnic communities can take place. On the other hand, even bearing in mind all the national trends in the political behaviour of the Canadian public, it still remains to be seen whether there are definite ethnic patterns in this respect, and if there are, what these are and how special are they. Hypothetically, the specific question eventually boils down to the following: do members of various ethnic / immigrant communities, those in the minority in the first place, show any signs of political alienation by their lower levels of political participation? In broader terms, the question reads – are there more or less substantial deviations in the level of political activism or involvement on the part of certain Canadian ethnic communities, English Canadians and French Canadians included?

The classical, but now largely outdated interpretation given by John Porter on the »vertical« socio-economic appearance of the Canadian ethnic mosaic (18) seems today less and less helpful in explaining contemporary trends in ethnopolitical mobility. As ever, the rising socio-economic status of a good many »other« groups in Canada is basically beyond doubt (16). Yet it still takes some extra knowledge to see how this mobility and higher status can affect political participation. The major trend, however, is sufficiently apparent: ethnic group integration into the Canadian political mainstream has been gaining an increasingly clear-cut and irreversible momentum.

First of all, it is worthwhile to remember that whatever the *de facto* group status might be, in formal political terms all Canadian ethnic communities are expected, legally, to enjoy equal political freedoms. The last ethnically discriminative laws that had for some time curtailed political rights of certain groups (those of Orientals and Natives) were

² All the data concerning the above statistics in the population structure has been derived from Statistics Canada. Census of Canada. Population by Ethnic Group, 1971, 1981.

scraped as far back as in the 1950's (15: 153). Moreover, the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, an integrative part of the Canadian Constitution, specifically refers to the absolute political equality of all Canadians regardless of their ethnic or racial origin (clause 15) (6: 15-16). A similar notion is expressed in the guidelines of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988.

Secondly, ethnic representation in Canadian political institutions (those at the very top included), has been rather wide structurally, though far from proportionate as a whole. Several studies show that, for instance, at the federal government and parliament level, the ethnic balance of persons nominated and elected has over the years come closer to reflect the country's ethnic composition, with a roughly aggregated breakdown of 50-70% for those of British origin, 30-45 % for the French, and about 5-10 % for those in the »other« groups (11: 79; 14: 250). At the provincial level the »others« share has been somewhat higher, although, at the same time, with wider gaps between some of the provinces (traditionally, the highest score for those in the »other« groups has come from the Prairies). Now, if the absolute »contribution« of French Canadian provincial ministers in Québec were to be excluded from the calculations, the »others« share for the rest of Canada, except Québec, would be twice as high and comes very close to 25 %, i.e. the percentage of the »others« in the overall population. But the »other« minorities have been most successful at the local level. Thus a growing non-English and non-French representation and, consequently, a more proportionate ethnic balance in these structures is most likely to be the general trend where there is lower level of political power.

Basically the same is clearly reflected in the hierarchy of specific forms and levels of political participation in the Canadian public at large. For Canada, the traditional political science scheme for electoral participation is, for instance, as follows:

	Holding a public office Being a political candidate
Gladiatorial Level	Holding an office within a party Soliciting party funds Attending a strategy meeting or planning a campaign
Transitional Level	Contributing money to a political party Being an active party member Contributing time in a campaign Attending a meeting or rally Contacting a public official
Spectator Level	Attempting to convince people how to vote Initiating a political discussion Being interested in politics Exposing oneself to political stimuli Voting (13: 108)

Certainly, as van Loon and Whittington have aptly showed, the higher up in the hierarchy, the fewer participants there are. According to the estimates of the same writers, »at the most, 3-4 per cent of the Canadian people participate at the 'gladiatory' level while another 10 to 20 per cent participate in 'transitional' level activities« (13: 108-109).

Another source says that only 10 %, for example, are in some way party members (7: 191). Participation at the lowest – spectator level is indeed the greatest. The most 'popular' participatory form is, of course, voting.

But politics can hardly be confined solely to the electoral process. To round it out, here is another typical scheme outlined by political scientists, showing the hierarchy of non-electoral participation:

- Attempting to brief or otherwise persuade politicians or bureaucrats
on behalf of an organized group
- Holding office within a politically active
interest group (IG)
- Planning strategy within a politically
active IG
- Being an active member of a politically
active IG
- Demonstrating on behalf of an issue or group
- Being a passive member of an IG (13: 109)

Now, if the two hierarchies mentioned above are empirically screened by ethnic structure, it becomes clear that the top of the scale is still, though not at all absolutely, dominated by people of Anglo-Saxon origin. However, even with an increasingly mosaic or colourful picture of participants down the political activism scale, the British remain dominant nearly everywhere, which can well be reflective of this group's demographic position in the society structure. In other words, compared to the »top« of political participation ladder, the presence of the »other« groups in the more modest participatory positions is, of course, much more noticeable, yet this particular level and hence public level, is still first and foremost represented by the English Canadian majority. As for participation at transitional and spectators levels, all three ethnic components – English, French and the »other« Canadians – are by any estimation not unduly represented. Perhaps, the restricted but very indicative salience of minority groups at the lower levels can be attributed to forms of extreme political activism, something in which certain Canadian ethnic groups have been historically »overrepresented«. In the Canadian account of major political actions, famous largely for their extreme and violent nature, the main actors have come from among the francophone Quebeckers, the Doukhobours and from some East European immigrant groups. But the highly isolated nature of this political extremism in Canada calls for a rather cautioned and qualified approach to the issue.

Firstly, all these related cases have been very much limited in time and conditioned by specific circumstances that were soon to lose their significance. Secondly, this extremism found its expression not in mass-like but rather in institutional activities. It has been more a reflection of politics, or political tactics to be more precise, on the part of certain organizations (institutions) with a specifically ethnic support base (the most illustrative case is that of the notorious Front de Liberation Quebecois /FLQ/, a small separatist organization, largely known for its bombings in the late 60's), rather than a reflection of definite trends in political behaviour among ethnic communities (in this sense, the Doukhobours' extremism has to some extent been an exception – 27). Overall however, it should be said that, in sharp contrast to the English Canadian dominance at the upper stages of the participation hierarchy, political protest as a form of political parti-

cipation is, or at least it used to be, more peculiar to minorities within the specific ethnic category. Such minorities, in turn, are usually found among the community sectors that are the least assimilated and most open to radicalism.

Having said this, it is worth-while to note, however, that the formerly recognized correlation between assimilation and political activism seems to be subsiding presently. Firstly, as was true for some earlier periods, for instance the interwar period, the well noted inclination on the part of some European (Ukrainian and Finnish in the first place) immigrants to political radicalism (12) has for a long time been comfortably replaced – as a consequence of the changing socio-economic status of the new immigrant wave after the Second World War (8: 505) – by the much more moderate (in political-ideological terms) nature of their post-war immigration. Secondly, the very problem of assimilation is at present ever more losing its past dramaticism, and by doing so can hardly serve today as a determinant for the political participation of immigrants whose share, most importantly, in their respective – European and, notably Ukrainian, groups has been considerably and stably lesser than in the 1930-50's (5: 9). The political adaptation of contemporary European immigration, East European included, in Canada has actually become more dynamic and, furthermore, more efficient than it used to be decades ago. Consequently, it is less likely to demonstrate any specifically ethnic patterns. Several scholarly studies in political adaptation of immigrants have recently arrived at such a conclusion. For instance, J.H. Black in his analysis of indices for political interest, identification and participation among the Canadian born population, on the one hand, and people born outside Canada, on the other hand, found no major differences within the ethnic breakdown. First of all, practically identical (i.e. with a small statistical variance) levels of political interest and participation were scored both by the Canadian born and the foreign born. Thus nativity did not have any dramatic impact on political activism. Nevertheless the immigrants' level of activism was found somewhat higher, which may be very likely due to their natural needs in adaptation as a kind of special »political interest«. Secondly, among the Canadian born, practically identical levels of political interest and activism were scored by the English Canadians and all the »others« (1). Within the latter category only persons of East European origin may be considered likely to have a slight (but not substantial) deviation from the common trends. But this deviation is a far cry from what was found for persons of French origin, something that again leads to a notion of regionalism or ethnoregionalism rather than the ethnicity of nativity as an explanatory model for that variance. At any rate, the noticeable alienation of Québec from the Canadian political mainstream, in no way a volatile and strange phenomenon to the Canadian political scene, is no less felt also at the very grass-root level, and hence should be considered a reflection of this francophone province's distinct place within the predominantly English-speaking federation, i.e. as a specifically ethnic and politically closed-in, autonomous area of politics (4).

As far as the assimilation impact on political participation is concerned, the common trend for most Canadian ethnic groups is that the correlation is more likely to apply where participation is affected by an intensity of maintaining ties with one's own ethnic sub-culture. According to the findings of a survey held among ethnic groups in five Canadian cities, the indices for political participation among persons eligible to vote, within each social strata, were lower for persons who were keen on maintaining strong ties with their respective ethnic community. This is especially so for groups socially most distanced from the mainstream of Canadian publics (21). In this regard, other interesting parallels emerge

from studies in oriental immigration. For instance, the Chinese group with much stronger in-group ties and cohesion than, say, the Japanese were likewise found by Qou to be more apolitical, whereas the political behaviour and attitude indices among the Japanese were just about nearing those of the Canadian national sample. Furthermore, while the ethnic Chinese were quick to show their cynicism towards the Canadian government, the Japanese, on the contrary, were clearly in the lead with their political conformism and general political satisfaction (20). Surely, socialization within the ethnic community itself can hardly be the best tool in ensuring effective political adaptation within a larger society. Therefore, in political terms, the maintenance of in-group ties does in fact seem to reflect a level of political isolationism. Most frequently, this can be clearly seen in regard to the political structures that prove to be available and sufficient to Canadian ethnic communities.

Obviously, there can be two types of political structures whose facilities or influence ethnic groups may be encouraged to use. The first and politically most efficient are, of course, the political parties, by no means an ethnic phenomenon; the second type are traditionally represented by purely ethnic institutions – ethnic group organizations, or to put it simpler, ethnic organizations. To explore this point, let us briefly look at each of these types in regard to capabilities of ethnic groups to get involved.

The first thing that strikes us about the Canadian party structure is the fact that despite its colourful and age-old ethnic history Canada has never had a single real ethnic party, that is a political party formed along some definite ethnic lines. True, some writers might have treated this matter somewhat differently. For instance, J. Wearing has listed some of the smaller or even tiny parties like the New Labrador Party (in Newfoundland) along with the classical *Block Populaire* or *Parti Québécois* from Québec (26: 34, 252) within his vaguely defined «ethnic party» category. Yet, all these deviations only serve to prove the main point. Even in the case of Québec-based parties, the *Parti Québécois* (PQ) in particular, a party may be overwhelmingly, if not at all absolutely, ethnic in its composition, regarding membership of course, but, at the same time, large numbers of people outside this party, but within the group, can happily affiliate themselves or support other parties and policies. This is exactly what has been going on within all the Canadian communities, when community members have been traditionally split, though not always evenly, yet sufficiently enough not to be considered ethnopolitical monolith, at least in partisan terms. For instance, the PQ, the most successful to date Canadian ethnic party, originally formed on a truly ethnic (French in origin) ground, has always bent towards clearly defined political ends. Thus, in 1976, the year the PQ for the first time won the provincial election in Québec over their main rivals from the Liberal Party of Québec (LPQ), also provincial and no less French Canadian in its support base, more than 3/4 of the PQ supporters, according to the poll, were in favour of Québec separation in sharp contrast to only 7 % francophone separatists found among LPQ supporters (9: 317). Now, if the PQ is anything near to a true ethnic party, it is certainly a party of and for those of French Canadian or «Québécois» identity, for those who sees no better way for Québec to go other than separation. But as the 1980 provincial referendum clearly showed, Québec's French Canadian community was as split as ever in regard to the province's complete independence from the rest of Canada, with 55 % voting against and 45 % voting in favour of the separation among Franco-Quebeckers (among all Quebeckers the figures were 60 % and 40 % respectively) (22: 144).

Aside from the thus far evident political orientation of such parties, their »ethnic« nature also comes to be dismantled by the powerful regionalism Canada has long had to live with. In the case of French Canada, regionalism politically overrides almost anything else. There have been no attempts on the part of the PQ or the LPQ to try to fight for voters outside Québec. In this way, the French Canadian minority outside Québec, no matter how scarce and perhaps assimilated it might be, has to be backed up by the same party structures which back up the English Canadian majority and all the »others«. Moreover, some of the recently recorded exceptions, both in French Canada (e.g. the Parti Acadienne in New Branswick) and English Canada (e.g. the Party for Independent Newfoundland or the Western Canada Concept in Alberta) (25; 10), are made up, in the first place, by highly symbolic rather than practical political structures. Secondly and more importantly, they reflect the existence of parallels to the political trends in Québec, i.e. the separatist ideology. Thirdly and most importantly, they coin the Québec pattern of regional political organization.

As for the larger Canadian national parties, there seems to be little in the way of possibilities for ethnic groups to exploit these structures for their own political purposes. To begin with, no major Canadian party could ever afford to channel its appeal to any specific ethnic group, which, by all accounts, is only too fair in a society with deeply embedded democratic traditions. Furthermore, the ethnic composition of the federal parties is by and large very similar and, as noted earlier, more or less proportional to the general population structure. Moreover, even if some patterns of partizan preferences can be recorded along ethnic lines, they are more often than not too vague and shifting to allow for appropriate generalizations.

The obvious lack of facilities provided by major Canadian political parties to accommodate conflicting ethnic demands can be partly responsible for a flourishing network of purely ethnic structures, that is ethnic organizations, across the country. In a sense, the so called voluntary organizations of ethnic groups have actually managed to serve as a centerpiece for ethnically based political institutions. Unlike political parties seeking formal control of a government by way of electioneering, ethnic organizations are very close to interest groups seeking to influence those in formal control on behalf of group interests or an issue. However, in this capacity, ethnic organizations are more likely to be found somewhere in the middle of the widely recognized distinction of all interest groups into institutionalized and »issue-oriented« (19). Being both institutionalized and »issue-oriented«, with all respective benefits and limitations, ethnic organizations can pursue policies of group rights defense (issue orientation) on a rather stable, structural, long-term, and at the same time specifically oriented ground. Most often, this involves the presentation of briefs to and lobbying in state institutions with no clear guarantees for success, depending, of course, on the influence, mobilization and lobbying power of each group in each particular case. In this respect, only the Jewish and to some extent Ukrainian organizations have ever had a limited political success in pushing through their own different causes with the Canadian federal governments (2; 17).

Yet, the main political feature of all ethnic organizations in Canada is the fact that, despite a clear abundance of ethnic structures and their institutions, only a few of them can be really recognized as political, or at least politically active organizations. Indeed, the very institutionalization of all or nearly all Canadian immigrant groups has historically been circumscribed by natural demands to provide accommodation to and ensure

the more or less efficient integration of immigrants into a receiving society. To the extent that integration was meant to be all-embracing, it included adaptation and integration of a political nature also. Nevertheless, the fundamental and original functions of all the organizations have always been inward-looking and directed towards community needs to provide aid to newcomers, maintain community cultural life, ethnic festivals and so on. And though a good many politically amorphous ethnic organizations are often found capable to display, if necessary, a certain amount of concerted political interest and mobilization, in practice their political behaviour is more a response to external stimuli rather than a pre-planned platform of action. Hence the political actions undertaken by these ethnic organizations, even by the most active and successful ones, such as the Canadian Jewish Congress or the Canadian Ukrainian Comdex, have had a largely sporadic, responsive nature. The very foundations of these organizations has led them to follow mostly defensive political guidelines, if any at all. Needless to say, it inevitably takes some carelessness on the part of official institutions to give the alert to specifically attentive ethnic public and opinion leaders, and thus provoke their active defense of group interests allegedly endangered as a result of poor official policy-planning and lack of consideration. Certainly, this is something any governmental agency would better choose to avoid, let alone help create special conditions for outside pressure like this. In this respect, the contemporary Canadian political process, which has been more or less successful in integrating members of various ethnic communities into the national socio-political modes of behaviour, thus tends to substantially limit any potential scope of purely political activism for all ethnic organizations.

Conclusion

A tentative analysis into the discussed nature and contents of »ethnopolitics from within« enables us to outline some of the peculiarities prevalent in the Canadian case in regard to the relationship between ethnicity and politics. These are:

- a) On the whole, contemporary Canadian ethnonational development has been largely depolitized by official policies to accommodate various issues of ethnicity and immigration. Nevertheless, the democratic foundations behind the overall Canadian political process not only allow for the existence of political activism among ethnic structures, but envisages their parallel political functioning to defend group rights and interests.
- b) The political interests dominant within ethnic communities are almost adequately reflected in the structure of political attitudes common to the national political community at large, all the major parties included. With an absence of purely ethnic parties, specifically ethnic political structures can only seek defense of their own group interests, rather than formal political control by way of traditional interest group tactics. That is why the level of structural link between ethnicity and politics in Canada is relatively low.
- c) Partizan expression of political interests dominant within ethnic communities has been too vague to encourage any meaningful association between ethnicity and politics apart from ethnoregional separatism.

- d) Political activism of Canadian ethnic communities in formulating and promoting their group interests is heavily dependent on the level and extent of state intervention, as well as the contents of official policies. But a general caution and moderation of the latter is highly unlikely to provide a standing stimuli to such conflicts.

Above all, the Canadian ethnopolitical experience presents a well balanced version of the relationship in question – a fairly efficient version, as it seems today, which helps to ensure the non-conflictive coexistence of ethnic communities within a federative multi-ethnic state.

REFERENCES

1. Black, J.H. and N. McGlen. »Immigrant Political Adaptation in Canada: Some Tentative Findings«, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. vol 16, 1982, n. 1, pp. 3-27.
2. Bonez A. »Zionist Interest Groups and Canadian Foreign Policy.« in: T. Ismael (ed.). *Canada and the Arab World*. Edmonton: Univ. of Alberta Press, 1985. pp. 151-172.
3. Breton R. »Multiculturalism and Canadian Nation-Building.« in: A. Cairns (ed.). *The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity and Language in Canada*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1986. pp. 27-66.
4. Cook R. *Canada, Quebec, and the Uses of Nationalism*. Toronto: McClelland, 1986.
5. Darcovich, W. »The 'Statistical Compendium': An Overview of Trends«. in: W. Petryshyn (ed.). *Changing Realities: Social Trends among Ukrainian Canadians*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980.
6. Department of the Secretary of State of Canada. *The Charter of Rights and Freedoms: A Guide for Canadians*. Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1987.
7. Drummond, R. »A Political Perspective: Institutions and the Canadian Federal System«. in: W. Metcalf (ed.). *Understanding Canada: A Multidisciplinary Introduction to Canadian Studies*. New York: New York Univ. Press, 1982.
8. Евтух, Вл.Б. »Украинская иммиграция в Канаде: некоторые аспекты социально-демографической интеграции«, *Migracijske teme*, god. 6, 1990, br. 4., str. 497-510.
9. Gingras, F.-P., and N. Nevitte. »Nationalism in Quebec: The Transition of Ideology and Political Support.« in: A. Kornberg and H. Clarke (eds.). *Political Support in Canada: the Crisis Years*. Durham (N.C.): Duke Univ. Press, 1983.
10. Hiller, H. »Dependence and Independence: Emergent Nationalism in Newfoundland«, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. vol 10, 1987, n. 3. pp. 257-275.
11. Jenson, J. and B. Tomlin. *Canadian Politics: An Introduction to Systematic Analysis*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1977.
12. Laine, E. »Finnish Canadian Radicalism and Canadian Politics: The First Forty Years, 1900-1940.« in: J. Dahlie and T. Fernando (eds.). *Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada*. Toronto: Methuen, 1981, pp. 88-105.
13. van Loon, R. and M. Whittington. *The Canadian Political System: Environment, Structure and Process*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
14. Manzer, R. *Canada: A Socio-Political Report*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
15. Manzer, R. *Public Policies and Political Development in Canada*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1986.
16. Millett, D. »Defining the 'Dominant Group'«, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. vol 13, 1981, n. 1, pp. 64-79.

17. Nesdoly, S.J. »Changing Realities: the Ukrainian Canadians' Role in Canadian-Soviet Relations«. in: A. Balawyder (ed.). *Canadian-Soviet Relations: 1939-1980*, Oakville (Ont.): Mosaic Press, 1981, pp. 107-127.
18. Porter, J. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1965.
19. Pross, A. P. *Group Politics and Public Policy*. Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986.
20. Quo F. »Ethnic Origin and Political Attitudes: the Case of Orientals«, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. vol 3, 1971, n. 2, pp. 119-138.
21. Reitz, J. *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1980.
22. Sherill, P. »Separatism and Quebec«, *Current History*. 1980. November (N 460).
23. Smith, A.D. *The Ethnic Revival in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
24. Statistics Canada. *Census of Canada. Population by Ethnic Group, 1971, 1981*.
25. Theriault, Y. »Etat, ethnie et democratie: Reflexions sur la question politique en Acadie«, *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*. vol 11, 1984, n. 2, pp. 201-218.
26. Wearing, J. *Strained Relations: Canadian Parties and Voters*. Toronto: McClelland, 1988.
27. Yerbury J. »The 'Sons of Freedom' Doukhobours and the Canadian State«, *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. vol 15, 1984, n. 2, pp. 47-70.

ETNIČKA POLITIKA U MNOGOETNIČKOJ DRŽAVI: KANADSKE IMIGRANTSKE ZAJEDNICE I POLITIČKI PROCES

SAŽETAK

Rad obrađuje, s obzirom na kanadski primjer, sadržaj i osobitosti meduodnosa etničnosti i politike u suvremenim mnogoetničkim federalnim državama. Autor tvrdi da se u analitičkom smislu etnička politika može vidjeti kao utemeljena ili u skupini ili u državi. Nakon takve razlike, isticanje politike skupine, tj. »etnopolitiku iz unutra«, umjesto »etnopolitike odozgo«, pospješuje analizu svake komponente u okviru odnosa koji se može tentativno nazvati političkim funkcioniranjem etničkih zajednica. Ovaj se rad usredotočuje na političku predstavljenost i organiziranost kanadskih etničkih struktura, posebno izabranih radi prikaza središnje svrhe rasprave, tj. određivanje kontekstualnih razmjera potencijalnih modela osobitog etničkog političkog ponašanja. Prema različitoj empirijskoj građi, etnički obrasci političke participacije sve su manje razlučivi i jasni, a zacijelo ih je sve teže definirati. Ovo je neosporno odraz brže i efikasnije etničke mobilnosti i integracije svojstvene današnjoj Kanadi. Glede političke organizacije, opća tendencija prema integraciji umjesto partikularizma, a da ne govorimo o neintegraciji, bila je također odgovorna za nedostatak strukturalnih razmjera za etničke institucije, osim tradicionalnih, sporadičnih i visoko selektivnih interesnogrupnih politika od strane etničkih organizacija. Naposljetku, razmjerno nizak profil »etnopolitike iz-unutra« čini se da je dobro uskladen s jako promoviranim ali depolitiziranim oblikom etničkog pluralizma u kanadskoj »etnopolitici odozgo«.